

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
1	SUELLEN WAGNER	Dear Mr. Covalt, In order to begin to assess the Draft EA, we require 1)clear and legible maps with major streets, highways and other landmarks that are of high quality and can be magnified up to 1000% for all three options, that demonstrate flight paths and flight concentrations 2) FAA's form Runway Transition Data for Alternatives A and B. This will demonstrate flight headings, altitudes, and GPS coordinates for any waypoints, lengths of the flight legs, etc. These items are absolutely essential to begin review. Thank you and please advise as soon as possible. Studio City For Quiet Skies
2	lrittenberg@sbcglobal.net	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone
3	Stephanie	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone
4	Renee Mackler	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
5a	Heidi	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Heidi
5b	Heidi Abra	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you.
5c	Heidi Abra	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Heidi Abra
6	Wendy Baxley	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
7	Paul Hollombe	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
8	Dawn Tartakovsky	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you. Sent from somewhere over the
9	Howard J. Weg	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
10	Faust	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
11	Laura Loftin Norman Spieler	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. AT A MINIMUM, please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Laura Loftin Norman Spieler
12	Janice Marinelli Mazza	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
13	CECILE FEITSHANS	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
14	Jennifer Aslan	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. * 310.909.9166 jen.aslan@gmail.com
15	Michele Parsons	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Michele Parsons Studio City, CA
16	MHetznr	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope %20Hollywood Burbank%20 Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
17	George Mooradian	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. George Mooradian (Studio City) Right under the “newish” Flight path. Very disruptive, unacceptable to my Family’s life. Sent from my iPhone
18	Cindy Bloom	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Cindy Bloom 818-445-5602
19	Mike Mintz	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. ----- Mike Mintz mike@michaelmintz.com
20	Tim Stewart	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Tim Stewart
21	Jason	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Jason Sherman Oaks, 91401
22	steve weinstein	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
23	Jessica Poter	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Jessica Poter
24	Roy haugen	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Roy haugen Studio City resident
25	Jennifer	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you. Jennifer Sent from my iPhone
26	Louis Milito	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. — Louis Milito 818.823.6623 lmilito@me.com
27	Todd Schroeder	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you, Todd Schroeder

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Resident and homeowner in North Hollywood, California Sent from my iPhone
28	Geraldine	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
29	Adrian Sainsbury-Carter	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Best, Adrian Sainsbury-Carter (Resident impacted by noise from Burbank airport)
30	Jodie Kennedy	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Jodie Kennedy Sherman Oaks Sent from my iPhone
31	msuskinpub@gmail.com	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone
32	Charles Savinar	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
33	Nancy Kirhoffer	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
34	Phillip Musikanth, M.D.	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Phillip Musikanth, M.D. 5901 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 401 Los Angeles, CA 90036 T. 323.525.1101 F. 323.954.1081 W. phillipmusikanthmd.com This email and attachments are intended for use only by the intended recipient and should not be read by, or delivered to, any other person. This email may contain doctor-patient privileged or confidential information. Review or use of this email by persons other than the addressee(s) is not authorized. If you have received this email in error or without authorization, please inform the author at the above address and delete this email from your computer.
35	Eleonora Granata	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Eleonora Granata 17036 Rancho st Encino 91316 California Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device
36	Lee Arian	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone
37	Becca Stern	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you, Becca Stern
38	Steve Grushcow	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. - Steve Grushcow
39	Isabel Rosenbaum	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you, Isabel Rosenbaum
40	Sara Singer Schiff	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sara Singer Schiff Resident, Studio City
41	marie m	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
42	David A. Kimball	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. David A. Kimball Studio City, CA
43	Debra Reynolds	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Debra Reynolds Sherman Oaks
44	Vivian Gumbiner	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Vivian Gumbiner Sent from my iPhone
45	Kathi Flood	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Kathi Flood, Sherman Oaks
46	Jim Rosten	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Jim Rosten 310.738.1555 cell
47	Martha Devore	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Martha Devore Sent from my iPhone
48	crazyelmer	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
49	crazyelmer	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
50	crazyelmer	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
51	Miguel Almaguer	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Miguel Almaguer
52	Barrie Berg	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you, Barrie Berg
53	Alexis Prescott	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Alexis Prescott Studio City
54	Geralyn McGah-Miller	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Geraldyn McGah-Miller 4244 Kraft Ave Studio City, CA
55	Sandra Lokman	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. As is only fair, now more time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sandra Lokman Studio City, CA
56	Liz Craig, PsyD., MFT	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Liz Craig, PsyD., MFT Psychotherapist (310)801-0752 http://drlizcraig.com/
57	Karen Younce	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Karen Younce
58	S Forth	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you. S Forth
59	tomholland480@gmail.com	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
60	jzesq11	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
61	Elizabeth Barnes Keener	Dear Sir or Madam: My family and I live in North Hollywood near Chandler & Cahuenga, directly in the take-off path from the Burbank airport. I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I urge you to advocate for extending the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Sincerely, Elizabeth Barnes Keener 5513 Cartwright Ave North Hollywood 91601
62	William Vogt	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Best, William Vogt Studio City Resident
63	Darlene Yaplee	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you.
64	Katrin Youdim	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sincerely Katrin youdim
65	Dickerson, Justin	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
66	Deb Bender	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
67	Janey Robinson	I strongly urge you to grant a 2-month extension of the comment period for the 529 pages long draft Environmental Assessment (EA) regarding the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope Hollywood Burbank Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The FAA released this lengthy draft in the midst of the winter holiday period, after the FAA worked on this draft for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review and comment. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through at least March 24, 2024. Thank you.
68	Julie Ganis	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Julie Ganis
69	Pat Livinghouse	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
70	John Ruffner	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
71	Madeleine	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPad
72	Lydia Antonini	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you.
73	Joelle Birnberg	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
74	Lorna Murdock	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you Lorna Murdock Sherman Oaks, CA
75	Carol Rosenblum	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
76	Arman Levoni	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
77	Aileen Moreno	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
78	Amy Pell	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Amy Pell 818-516-3422 amy@amypell.com Coldwell Banker Realty 301 N. Canon Drive, Suite E Beverly Hills, CA 90210 BRE# 01438754
79	nova	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. nova
80	CHRISTOPHER CULLITON	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you. Handcrafted on an artisanal iPhone.
81	Julie Bleicher	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
82	lkrembert@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
83	Victoria Miller	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. V. Miller
84	Myra Doroshkin	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
85	Heidi MacKay	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Heidi MacKay
86	John Van Tongeren	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you. John van Tongeren Studio city, Ca. 91604
87	Alex Intelligator	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
88	Peter I. Hwang, Esq.	To Whom It May Concern: I hereby request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by at least 2 months, through at least March 24, 2024. Thank you. Peter I. Hwang, Esq.
89	Greg Weiss	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Greg Weiss, Studio City resident
90	Barbara Dourmashkin-Case	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Barbara Dourmashkin Barbara Dourmashkin-Case 3852 Camino de Solana C 818 421 2367 Sherman Oaks, Ca 91423 Barbara.dourmashkin@gmail.com
91	Noelle	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
92	Mikhail Mushkatblat	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
93	jill ettinger	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
94	KATALINA	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
95	Stephanie	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone
96	Llyswen Franks	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
97	Mari Feldmeier	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Mari Feldmeier

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		818.621.0799
98	Jim Praytor	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
99	Arman Levoni	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Arman Levoni
100	Molly Newman	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
101	Valerie Jaquith	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Valerie Jaquith
102	Beth Grant Chieffo	Hello, Hoping you have a wonderful holiday season. I’m writing to request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA just as the holidays are underway. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you, Beth Grant Chieffo Resident
103	Melanie Pimentel	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
104	Nora Doyle	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Nora Doyle Studio City 91604 Sent from my iPhone
105	Alex Izbicki	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Alex Izbicki Broker-Associate Re/Max One 2023 Re/Max Hall of Fame Honoree (818)613-0177 (949)554-5523 Email: alexforhomes@gmail.com Website: www.callalex.com Lic# 00993482 Since 1988
106	Roman Verba	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Roman Verba
107	Craig B.	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Craig B.
108	Dana Ward	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
109	Heather Lea Gerdes	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Heather Lea Gerdes
110	Gino V.	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. *****Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. ***** Thank you. Gino V.
111	Alison Martin	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Alison Martin
112	Alison Martin	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Alison Martin
113	Mary Baker	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Mary Baker
114	Jim & Marjorie Praytor	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
115	Jim & Marjorie Praytor	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you.
116	Jeff Brooks	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
117	Jeff Brooks	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
118	Mike Tantraphol	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
119	Mike Tantraphol	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
120	Laurie Rittenberg	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Laurie Rittenberg Studio City Sent from my iPhone
121	Laurie Rittenberg	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Laurie Rittenberg Studio City Sent from my iPhone
122	Jason Nesmith	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Jason Nesmith Sent from my iPhone
123	Lindsay Nesmith	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Lindsay Nesmith Sent from my iPhone
124	Lindsay Nesmith	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Lindsay Nesmith Sent from my iPhone
125	LINDSAY NESMITH	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone
126	LINDSAY NESMITH	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you. Sent from my iPhone
127	ruthj6.rl@gmail.com	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
128	Rich Hull	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Rich Hull Sherman Oaks, CA
129	R. Hull	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. R. Hull
130	Linda Clarke	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Linda Clarke Sherman Oaks
131	Jeff H.	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Jeff H. Studio City Resident
132	Kelly Hull	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
133	martha stevens	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
134	daniel nadsady	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
135	Jennifer Gal	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone
136	Sherri Elkaim	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sherri Elkaim Studio City
137	Don Fair	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Don Fair 310-980-5693
138	Brea Brumels	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
139	Carol Rosenblum	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you. Carol Rosenblum
140	A. Shapiro	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
141	Rose Thomas	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Rose Thomas
142	Uzi salamon	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
143	Danielle Valenciano	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
144	K M Flood	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. K M Flood, Sherman Oaks
145	Talin Tenley	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
146	Kevin Goetz	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
147	Fred Muir	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Fred Muir 2740 Ellison Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210 Right in the flight path.
148	Pam Pechter	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Pam Pechter
149	spechter@sbcglobal.net	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
150	Mark Indig	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
151	Rachel Dworkin	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Rachel Dworkin
152	Darlene Jacobs	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Darlene Jacobs
153	Janet Loeb	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Janet Loeb Studio City
154	Eileen wesson	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Eileen wesson
155	Joyce	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
156	Jeff Wachtel	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
157	Catherine Hayes	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Catherine Hayes Studio City
158	Kay Donno	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Kay Donno Studio City
159	Petra Tulic	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Petra Tulic
160	Daryl Didier	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Daryl Didier 222 N Catalina St, Burbank, CA 91505 drel.dda5@gmail.com
161	figus	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
162	NICHOLAS CAPRIO	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
163	Jeffrey Osmer	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Jeffrey Osmer 11138 Sunshine Terrace Studio City, CA 91604
164	cbarnathan@gmail.com	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you.
165	Angel Wiegand	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Angel Wiegand
166	Nicolas Bobroff	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Nicolas Bobroff 12020 Guerin St Studio City, Ca 91604
167	Ellen Byron	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Ellen Byron 3147 Dona Maria Drive Studio City, CA 91604
168	Kaye Clarke	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
169	Gail Wunsch Paul Wunsch	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Gail Wunsch Paul Wunsch Studio City stakeholders Sent from my iPhone
170	Lynn Crosswaite	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. ...sent from my iPhone made in China
171	Ada Gorn	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Ada Gorn

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
172	Hilary Liftin	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
173	Karen Cesse	To Whom It May Concern: I hereby request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you for your time. Karen Cesse
174	Yuliya Tarasevich	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
175	Mark Silverstein	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Mark Silverstein
176	chris Murray	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
177	Julia Bricklin	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Julia Bricklin Studio City 818-632-4747
178	Joan Krimston	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Joan Krimston
179	Karen Hamilton	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
180	Nicole Ostrander	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Nicole Ostrander
181	steve wolf	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
182	Stephanie Baio	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Stephanie Baio 3636 Goodland Drive Studio City, CA 91604
183	Danny Rose	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
184	Mason Newton	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Mason Newton
185	Del Persinger	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
186	Guy Sappington	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone
187	Jack Bornoff	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from Jack's iPhone
188	Katherine Tolford	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
189	Karen Brooks	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
190	lisabattista@mac.com	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
191	Yuvalronmusic	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. www.yuvalronmusic.com

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Gift yourself the Healing Power of 40hz Music by Yuval Ron To receive monthly updates join our mailing list!
192	Masami Fukuhara	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
193	Kimberly Turner	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Kimberly Turner
194	David Stein	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
195	Andrea Sher	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Andrea Sher. Sent from my iPhone
196	Morrison14 Board	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		-Morrison 14 HOA Board
197	Riley Dufurrena	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
198	lilavati sharma	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
199	Randy Feldman	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
200	Elizabeth Edinger	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sincerely, Elizabeth Edinger
201	marco capalbo	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. ---- marco capalbo 323 850 7367 917 302 0265 cell http://www.marcocapalbo.com/
202	Alana	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Alana --

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alana Garrop 818-681-9713 alanabgarrop@gmail.com www.linkedin.com/in/alanagarrop
203	Cindy Spitz	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone
204	Susan Dresher	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Susan Dresher susandrsh@gmail.com
205	Jane Goe	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
206	DAG	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. DAG 626-610-6101 www.dagmusic.net
207	Artin Babayan	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Juniper Financial LLC DBA Premier Plus Lending NMLS # 2444946, Equal Housing Lender. CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this email communication (including any attachment(s)) is strictly confidential and intended solely for the person or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, distribution, reproduction, or

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		other use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return email and permanently delete this communication (including any attachment(s)) from your system. CONTRACT NOTICE: Nothing within this email communication, including the signature block, should be construed as forming a contract, binding an offer, establishing acceptance, or constituting a signed agreement. The author of this email communication is not authorized, and has no intent, to make offers or enter into contracts or agreements via email communications.
208	Tom McWilliams	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
209	Jennifer Wheaton	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sent from my iPhone

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
210	Cynthia	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Cynthia
211	Laura C.	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Laura C.
212	Heidy Lee	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Hee Lee
213	Susan Dresher	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Susan Dresher
214	Jeremy Platt	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
215	Lisa Bates	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. -- Lisa Bates, RN BSN (323) 574-4702

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
216	Sally Stevens	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Sally Stevens 3104 Brookdale Road Studio City CA 91604 323.650.4842
217	Andrew Frankel	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Andrew Frankel
218	Robbie Tollin	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Very likely misspelled on my iPhone
219	Liz Craig, PsyD., MFT	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Liz Craig, PsyD., MFT Psychotherapist (310)801-0752 http://drlizcraig.com/
220	Marti Noxon	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Marti Noxon
221	David Sweeney	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Best, David Sweeney 323.822.3000
222	Jeff Wachtel	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Best, Jeff Wachtel
223	Brandon	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you Brandon
224	Liz Craig, PsyD., MFT	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Liz Craig, PsyD., MFT Psychotherapist (310)801-0752 http://drlizcraig.com/
225	Janet M. Brown	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. “Uniquely positioned at the intersection of real estate + entertainment” Janet M. Brown Vice President/Treasurer Samuels & Company, Inc. C: (213) 999-0900 www.SamuelsCompany.com CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic mail transmission is confidential, may be privileged and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete it from your system.
226	Reiko Nakashima	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Reiko Nakashima

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
227	Victoria Diamantidis	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Victoria Diamantidis 3154 Brookdale Rd Studio City, CA 91604 Sent from my iPhone
228	James Hornstein	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. James Hornstein 3154 Brookdale Rd Studio City, CA 91604 Sent from my iPhone
229	Simon	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Simon Simon Wise e: simonwise1@icloud.com c: +1 (818) 821-9677 Los Angeles, CA
230	kevin edelman	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. kevin edelman metelman media, inc. 818.655.9700ph www.metalmanmedia.com
231	Amanda Krentzman	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
232	Susan Geller	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Susan Geller
233	Bob Semanovich	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you, Bob Semanovich -- Bob Semanovich C. 310.418.9899 CalRE #02135176 BobSemanovich.com 301 N. Canon Dr., Ste. E Beverly Hills, CA 90210 WIRE FRAUD IS REAL. Before wiring any money, call the intended recipient at a number you know is valid to confirm the instructions. Additionally, please note that the sender does not have authority to bind a party to a real estate contract via written or verbal communication. Real estate agents are independent contractor sales associates, not employees. Owned by a subsidiary of Anywhere Advisors LLC.
234	Laura Loftin	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Laura Loftin
235	Dan Scheinkman	To Whom It May Concern: I know that the FAA doesn't give a shit about the people of the San Fernando Valley, where I used to live for nearly 40 years. After spending my life's savings to own a home in Sherman Oaks, as of 2017 it fell under a low-flying super highway of commercial airliners, allowing no peace in my home from the noise and shaking between 7am and 10pm due to the Metroplex flight plan changes affecting Burbank and Van Nuys airports. The City of Los Angeles has sued, you've received millions of complaints, yet you do nothing.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I've been forced to abandon living in the entire eastern portion of the San Fernando Valley because of this issue. Congratulations. You have evicted me from my home because I can't take the noise anymore. Ironically enough, I now live in Westlake Village, which is 35 miles from Burbank airport, yet I'm still in the concentrated flight path and still get noise at all hours. Additionally, I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. - Dan Scheinkman
236	Crystal C. Beecher	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. STOP WITH ALL THE FLIGHTS! THE VALLEY IS GETTING DESTROYED! Thank you.
237	Lydia Antonini	I am sure you are receiving a ton of emails - primarily that's because so far there has been a steadfast refusal on the part of the FAA to address the real world impact of these changes, its simply grotesque to ignore the needs, health and lives of American citizens with such brazen disregard. I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
238	Michael Rome	I write to request a 3-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope "Hollywood Burbank" Airport Southern Departures. An extension is warranted for the following reasons: • The EA is 529 pages long. • The EA was released in the middle of the holiday season. • The EA took the FAA nearly five years to complete; it is borderline absurd to ask the public to comment in such a short time and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 3 months, through April 24, 2024.
239	R D	To Whom It May Concern: I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is extensive at 529 pages long which requires considerable time to comprehensively evaluate and respond to. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of the winter holiday season when access to resources and community and govt. contacts for consultation is limited. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you.
240	Teri Hatcher	To Whom It May Concern: This is a very important request! Please take it seriously.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you. Teri Hatcher
241	Howard Deutch & Lea Thompson	To Whom It May Concern: The Bob Hope Burbank Airport air traffic has become relentless, disruptive to our sleep and our animals. We have horses and they are upset by the flights flying fairly low through Studio City, but we can’t explain to them what is happening. We are sure all the wildlife is also stressed by the air traffic and noise generated by the flight patterns and constant activity, as are our human neighbors. To fully digest what is happening, we need more time to assess our complaints/comments. We request a 2-month extension of the comment period for the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport southern departures. The draft EA is 529 pages long. The FAA released the draft EA in the midst of Hanukkah and the winter holiday period. The FAA has been working on this draft EA for almost 5 years. More time is needed for the public to review the draft EA and prepare substantive comments. Please extend the comment period by 2 months, through March 24, 2024. Thank you, Howard Deutch & Lea Thompson Studio City, CA Residents for over a quarter of a century

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
242	Nate	Dear FAA, Have you granted an extension of the comment period for the BUR environmental assessment? Thank you, Nate Sent from my iPhone
243	Nathaniel H. Hunt on behalf of the City of Los Angeles	Dear FAA, I am outside legal counsel for the City of Los Angeles. Los Angeles’ City Attorney’s Office is strongly interested in submitting comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for proposed departure procedure amendments at Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport. In 2019 to 2021, the Los Angeles and FAA were involved in litigation at the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit regarding the flight procedures that are evaluated in the Draft EA: SLAPP and OROSZ departure procedures. The City Attorney’s Office remains interested in those procedures and the potential environmental impacts on Los Angeles residents from the proposed flight procedure changes. To meaningfully evaluate and participate in the public review process, the City Attorney’s Office request the comment deadline be extended by thirty (30) days to February 23, 2024. An extension of the deadline is justified. The public has been waiting five (5) years for FAA to publish the Draft EA, which involves 529 pages of environmental and highly technical analyses. The comment period that began in December has included various holidays when City staff were on vacation. The City Attorney’s Office requires additional time to coordinate its internal process for submitting comments, consult with the City’s technical staff, evaluate the proposed flight procedures and the potential environmental impacts, and prepare and submit comments. Extending the comment period is reasonable given the extensive Draft EA and the significant time required by FAA to complete its environmental review. Granting an extension also furthers the “twin aims” of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.—that (1) FAA is fully informed of the environmental impacts of the proposed flight procedure changes, and (2) that the public is fully informed of the environmental impacts and afforded an opportunity to participate in the environmental review process. See <i>Baltimore Gas and Electric Co. v. Natural Resources Defense Council</i>, 462 U.S. 87 (1983). We respectfully request a response from FAA regarding this request for an extension as soon as possible. Thank you,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Nate Nathaniel H. Hunt Attorney at Law He/Him/His O 303.825.7000 D 303.825.7037 1675 Broadway Suite 2300 Denver, CO 80202 website vCard Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this e-mail message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient named above. Any metadata contained in this message or attachments is not intended for disclosure to the recipient or anyone else. This message may be an attorney-client communication and/or confidential work product. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you have received this document in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message. Please consider our environment before printing this email.
244	Benito Mueller	Dear FAA, We recently moved into the Studio City area and appreciate the very walkable neighborhood and the green hills, but the airport noise is a real downside. On some days planes come literally thundering over the ridge of the nearby hill, at very low altitude, making any conversation outside impossible. Also, there are repeated flights in the middle of the night - we recently noticed one at 3am and another at 5am. For the livability of the neighborhood we strongly encourage a mandatory curfew and a restriction on number of daily flights for both the Burbank and Van Nuys Airports. Best Regards, Benito Mueller BARRY FILMS 3720 Buena Park Dr Studio City, CA 91604

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Tel +1 310 871 3392 www.barryfilms.com
245	Sharon Kopman	Please be advised that we have reviewed the Environmental Assessment provided by the FAA for comment regarding departing flights out of Burbank Airport. We support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment. We live near the Mulholland corridor and are directly impacted by the current flight pattern of these flights. Thank you, Sharon Kopman -- Sharon M. Kopman sharon.kopman@gmail.com Mobile: (310) 291-0978
246	Cathy Moretti	Please be advised that we have reviewed the Environmental Assessment provided by the FAA for comment regarding departing flights out of Burbank Airport. We support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment. We live near the Mulholland corridor and are directly impacted by the current flight pattern of these flights. Thank you, Cathy Moretti
247	Fred Marcus	Please be advised that we have reviewed the Environmental Assessment provided by the FAA for comment regarding departing flights out of Burbank Airport. We support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment. We live near the Mulholland corridor and are directly impacted by the current flight pattern of these flights. Thank you, Fred Marcus
248	Lindsey Imber on behalf of the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council	To whom it may concern, On January 8, 2024, the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council (SONC) adopted the following motion pertaining to the Burbank Airport Environmental Assessment seeking an extension of the public comment period.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Whereas the Sherman Oaks community has been confronted with a change in Burbank airport flight paths that moved the departing flight over a substantial portion of Sherman Oaks's families dumping harmful chemicals, toxic pollution and unhealthy noise. This has been called the Southerly Shift. After confronting the FAA, the Task Force was convened and recommendations were made to unwind this harm. Early on the FAA said they needed to do an Environmental Assessment EA report; Whereas the FAA dragged this process out over 5 years, this long overdue EA was held until the beginning of the holiday season on December 11th when it was released with no announcements to the affected communities and families; Whereas the FAA stated that the Sherman Oaks community and others would only have until January 24th to make comments on this 529 page report that the FAA took over 5 years to write. This is unfair and very rude to the communities to only allow such a short period of time especially over this the busiest time of the year; Therefore, the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council "SONC" is requesting at a minimum an additional 60 days to study and comment on this huge report and its impact on the community. SONC's position is that flight paths should follow the historic paths and be as dispersed as possible and that the FAA needs to incorporate that dispersion in their final Action. Thank you for your attention, Lindsay Imber lindsay.imber.sonc@gmail.com President Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council
249	Lisa Platt	Dear FAA, Please be advised that we have reviewed the Environmental Assessment provided by the FAA for comment regarding departing flights out of Burbank Airport. We support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment. We live near the Mulholland corridor and are directly and negatively impacted by the current flight pattern of these flights. Thank you,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Lisa Platt Bel Air Ridge Homeowner Email: LisaPlatt26@gmail.com
250	Danielle Cohen	Please be advised that we have reviewed the Environmental Assessment provided by the FAA for comment regarding departing flights out of Burbank Airport. We support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment. We live near the Mulholland corridor and are directly impacted by the current flight pattern of these flights. Thank you, Danielle Cohen 2632 Claray Dr. Los Angeles, CA 90077 Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad
251	Diane Bartine	Please be advised that we have reviewed the Environmental Assessment provided by the FAA for comment regarding departing flights out of Burbank Airport. We support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment. We live near the Mulholland corridor and are directly impacted by the current flight pattern of these flights. Thank you, Diane Bartine
252	Beth Kase	We support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment provided by the FAA for comment regarding flights out of Burbank Airport. We live near the Mulholland corridor and are directly adversely impacted by the current flight pattern of these flights. They are extremely noisy, intrusive, and sometimes unnerving for children and adults. Thank you, Beth Kase 2675 Basil Lane, Los Angeles, CA 90077 beth.kase@gmail.com
253	Sabrina Azirian	Please be advised that I have reviewed the Environmental Assessment provided by the FAA for comment regarding departing flights out of Burbank Airport. I support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Environmental Assessment. My children and I live near the Mulholland corridor and are directly impacted by the current flight pattern of these flights. Thank you, Sabrina Azirian Charlie, Grace, Wyatt, and Sadie's mom Sent from my iPhone so please excuse any errors.
254	Ellen and Gary Michel	To All Concerned: After reviewing the Environmental Assessment provided by the FAA for comment regarding departing flights out of Burbank Airport, we support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment. We live near the Mulholland corridor and are directly adversely impacted by the current flight pattern of these flights. They are extremely noisy, intrusive, and sometimes unnerving for children and adults. Thank you, Ellen and Gary Michel 3056 Greentree Ct Los Angeles, CA 90077 ewmichel@yahoo.com
255	72 Rust	Our lives have been absolutely destroyed since the FAA implemented the new flight path out of the Burbank airport going more south than it ever went we live in the Toluca lake area. The planes always turned by time they got to Oxnard Street and never came as far as Magnolia and Riverside, we moved into a peaceful neighborhood, which is very difficult to find a city like Los Angeles and for years had a wonderful life and then woke up one day, essentially living on an aircraft carrier. The torture that we have endured cannot be described in words at 7 o'clock in the morning, seven days a week 365 days a year we have not slept in past 7 o'clock , it doesn't matter if we had insomnia it doesn't matter if we were sick it doesn't matter if there was a late night because it's 7 o'clock in the morning we are going to be put on full blast in addition to the fact that the flight path was never this far south, the fact that you have allowed and demanded the aircraft to fly at a lower altitude if you go to LAX or other airports and watch an airplane takeoff they're going up at approximately 45° angle they're going out at a 15 degree angle and continue to fly flat across thousands of homes. There is no possible explanation that you can say that this is for safety to not pick the altitude up is a disgrace and should be criminal. Why would you intentionally make an aircraft not build altitude up and get up in the air as quick as possible away from peoples homes, we need you to put back the original flight path or at the very least Plan B with the addition of making the right hand turn immediately out of the airport. We can look into our skies every day them turning their planes earlier and building up altitude does not interfere with any other aircraft , if we wanted to buy a house under a flight path we would have we can't have a window open we can't sit outside.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		We can't even talk to the mailman without having a conversation disrupted by low-flying aircraft through our neighborhood that was never here for 70 years we need relief and it is not that difficult for you to do and it will not affect the safety of anything , and as far as saving some fuel, that's not your business that's the airlines no one cares if you save \$.30 in fuel by doing this or that you saved off a minute and a half of a flight time we need to be fixed and do the right thing
256	John T. Hatanaka and Felicia Williams on behalf of Hollywood Burbank Airport	Mr. Lonnie D. Covalt Lead Environmental Protection Specialist Federal Aviation Administration Dear Mr. Covalt: Attached, please find a letter from Commissioner Felica Williams, President of the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority, owner and operator of the Bob Hope Airport, more commonly known as Hollywood Burbank Airport regarding the above entitled manner. Sincerely, John T. Hatanaka Senior Deputy Executive Director O: 818-729-2225 C: 818-381-7930 hollywoodburbankairport.com 2627 N Hollywood Way Burbank, CA 91505 Facebook Twitter Instagram ----- January 17, 2024 Lonnie D. Covalt Lead Environmental Protection Specialist Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th Street Des Moines, WA 98198

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		9-AJO-BUR-Community-Involvement@faa.gov Re: Draft Environmental Assessment for Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (FAA 693KA9-18-D00005) Dear Mr. Covalt: I write on behalf of the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority ("Authority"), owner/operator of the Bob Hope Airport, commonly known as the Hollywood Burbank Airport ("Airport"). This letter provides the Authority's comments to the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") on the abovereferenced Draft Environmental Assessment ("EA"). The Authority considers the Draft EA to be thorough and compelling in its analysis of environmental effects associated with the potential implementation of two proposed alternative procedures for Runway 15 departures at the Airport. My fellow Commissioners and I particularly support Alternative B (a modification of existing departure procedures to require a higher climb gradient) with consideration for early turns and dispersal, which was a recommendation made by the Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force that the Authority jointly formed with Los Angeles World Airports. Ultimately, as has been expressed in prior correspondence, to the extent possible consistent with public safety the Authority encourages the FAA to reinstate the historical flight procedures and dispersal flight patterns that were utilized at the Airport prior to the 2017 NextGen for aircraft operators. The Authority is aware that under federal law, the United States Government has exclusive sovereignty over airspace of the United States. The Authority also understands that, under the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 ("ANCA"), it cannot restrict access to the Airport to address local noise impacts without the FAA's approval. Your consideration of this comment letter is greatly appreciated. Sincerely, Felicia Williams President, Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority cc: Commissioners, Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority Frank Miller, Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		2627 N .. Hollywood Way • Burbank, California 91505 • (818) 840-8840 • Fax: (818) 848-1173 2907800.4
257	Steven Taber	Dear Mr. Covalt, I know that several other entities have sought an extension of time to submit public comments on the Draft EA for the Proposed Departure Procedures at Burbank Airport. Since the deadline is coming up within a week, I was wondering if the FAA had made any decision regarding the that request for an extension of time to submit public comments on the Draft EA. Thank you, Steve Taber Steven Taber Partner T: 626.796.4000 DD: 626.395.7300 F: 626.795.6321 Toll Free: 844.750.1600 E: staber@leechtishman.com Los Angeles, CA: 200 South Los Robles Avenue, Suite 300 Pasadena, CA 91101 Chicago, IL: 600 W. Jackson Boulevard, Suite 100 Chicago, IL 60661 PITTSBURGH CHICAGO LOS ANGELES NEW YORK PHILADELPHIA SARASOTA WASHINGTON, D.C. WILMINGTON, DE Privileged and Confidential: This e-mail may contain or attach privileged, confidential or otherwise protected information intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient, any review or use of it is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, you are required to notify the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		sender, then delete this email and any attachment from your computer and any of your electronic devices where the message is stored.
258	Joan Herman	I live near the Mulholland corridor and have been directly and negatively impact by Burbank Airport's current flight patterns. I have reviewed the FAA's Environmental Assessment and call for comment regarding departing flights out of Burbank Airport. I support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Assessment. Thank you for your consideration. Joan Herman 2800 Bottlebrush Drive Los Angeles, CA 90077
259	Davin Lin	We support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment provided by the FAA for comment regarding flights out of Burbank Airport. We live along the Mulholland corridor and are directly and adversely impacted by the current flight pattern of these flights, which are extremely noisy and intrusive to our community. Thank you for your time and consideration. Davin Lin Los Angeles, CA 90077
260	Daniel Joye	I live near the Mulholland corridor and have been directly and negatively impacted by Burbank Airport's current flight patterns. I have reviewed the FAA's Environmental Assessment and call for comment regarding departing flights out of Burbank Airport. I support Alternative A outlined in Chapter 2 of the Assessment. -- Daniel Joye 2628 Angelo Drive, 90077 +1 (949) 506 6770
261	Aunt Diva	1. YES to Alternative A! FAA has the legal and ethical obligation to implement Alternative A.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Benedict Hills Estates and Benedict Hills Homeowners Associations legally challenged the FAA-BUR southerly shift of flights in the time frame allowed by FAA. The Settlement Agreement was signed by all parties during February-March, 2018, including FAA, Acting Director, Maurice Hoffman, March 12, 2018 and Lane McFadden of the U.S. Department of Justice on March 16, 2018. FAA agreed to implement a new open SID procedure and create new turn points JAYTE and TEAGN, if they were proven safe and efficient. The EA has proven JAYTE-TEAGN turn points are safe and efficient. EA Section 2.2.1: “The new procedures meet the “Purpose and Need” of the project as they provide (a) additional operational flexibility needed to manage air traffic in the area, and (b) are consistent with Exhibit “A” of the Settlement Agreement regarding departures at the Airport.” 2. NO to No Action Alternative The EA states in 2.1: “The ‘No Action Alternative’ does not meet the “Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action.” Translation: The No Action Alternative is tantamount to the FAA and U.S. Justice Department breaching a legal Settlement Agreement for no reason, because the EA has proven Alternative A to be safe and efficient. The EA states, “BUR is considered a local airport for the San Fernando Valley area of Los Angeles.” BUR’s Wiki reads:”The airport serves Burbank, Hollywood, and the northern Greater Los Angeles area, which includes Glendale, Pasadena, The San Fernando Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley. West Los Angeles, south of Mulholland Drive, is not in any of the above-cited communities. It has its own airport. FAA-BUR have created low-altitude turn points more than a mile south of Mulholland Drive, far southwest of BUR, to turn jets north and east. These low altitude turns are typically at between 2,000-4,000 feet (factoring in

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the hills’1020 feet+ altitude). They occur over dense-brush, residential canyon neighborhoods and wildlife habitats. The complexity of the hills and canyon microclimate render overflights here more perilous as evidenced by the April 29, 2023 fatality plane crash into a canyon wall during dense fog. Alternative A rightly curbs FAA-BUR’s southerly turn points. 3. NO to Alternative B Increase of Climb Gradient EA 2.2.2 reads: “FAA analysis of departure climb data at BUR indicates that Boeing 737s achieve an average climb gradient of 1019 feet per nmi while Airbus A 320s achieve an average climb gradient of 1075 feet per nmi. These two aircraft ... comprise a considerable proportion of activity at BUR and indicate that the vast majority of aircraft utilizing BUR are already achieving the higher climb gradient included in this alternative. Since most aircraft departing BUR already exceed this rate of climb, vertical and lateral profiles are not expected to materially change from current operations for most aircraft, as a result of this alternative.” Essentially, Alternative B is no change at all. 4. Environmental Consequences All of the sections in EA 4.1 indicate implementation of Alternative A would not have any significant impact on Air Quality, Climate, or Fuel Usage. 5.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Noise Residents of West L.A. south of Mulholland live nowhere near BUR. They did not buy homes under BUR flight tracks. They do not reside in BUR communities. They have their own airport. The BUR noise problem requires a San Fernando Valley solution. 6. Conclusion FAA is legally, contractually, and ethically obligated to implement Alternative A.
262	chris Murray	Ever since the flight pathed was changed to a further south route our home has become virtually uninhabitable. We've tried for several years with the Burbank airport as well as the city of Los Angeles, who I know at one point did bring a lawsuit against the FAA concerning this now that you have completed your environmental assessment, we are begging you to put the flight path to it's original path you attempted to do this in Phoenix and were sued. You attempted to do it in Seattle and we sued. Why would anyone think that it is OK to randomly one day change the flight path over peoples homes that have been living in a neighborhood for many years and have paid millions of dollars for their homes to have their lives completely uprooted. If we attempted to move with the current interest rates our house payment would go from \$4500 a month to \$11,000 a month meaning we would never be able to afford a home here ever again , this new system that has been put in place has completely taken out all of the human factor and what kind of disruption and stress and torturous environment we have now been put in there is never been an air crash concerning commercial aircraft anywhere over the San Fernando Valley the fact that this has been changed makes zero sense it is not necessary. You are putting profits before people cause this has nothing to do with safety, if you're not gonna put it back to the original flight path, we need it to at least be a Plan B with the inclusion of a hard right turn as soon as the plane takes out of Burbank airport, not allowing it to come all the way to Magnolia we live in the 5000 block of Strohm ave Boulevard and you have literally destroyed our lives. Please put this back. The stress that this is put on us, and our relationships and sanctity of life has been destroyed beyond all recognition
263	Sandra moshi	I live near the Mulholland corridor and the airplane traffic over my home from Burbank airport has been very disturbing. The current flight patterns are truly affecting everyone in our home and neighborhood. I have reviewed the FAA's environmental assessment and I support Alternative A as outlined in chapter 2 of the assessment. Sandra moshi

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		10125 Baywood Court Los Angeles 90077
264	Sandra moshi	I live near the Mulholland corridor and the airplane traffic over my home from Burbank airport has been very disturbing. The current flight patterns are truly affecting everyone in our home and neighborhood. I have reviewed the FAA’s environmental assessment and I support Alternative A as outlined in chapter 2 of the assessment. Sandra moshi 10125 Baywood Court Los Angeles 90077
265	Chris Murray	The flight path at the Burbank airport had been the same for many many many years we lived in a beautiful quiet neighborhood that we worked extremely hard and saved every penny to be able to live in the neighborhood we live in which is the Toluca lake area several miles south of the Burbank airport we would always have some occasional plain noise on Weather and wins but when we woke up one day six years ago, or whatever it was to the constant airplane noise going over our house, it has been nothing less than torture. The only reason we have not sold the house is that we’ve been holding out hope that this was going to be rectified , we will never be able to buy another home again as the prices have increased and now the interest rates have increased will literally have to move out of the state of California that we have lived in for the past 40 years. We cannot even carry a conversation on when flights are going over and we have tried everything. We have put new windows in our home Pain we have tried earplugs. None of it matters you cannot have plans flying that low over peoples houses. They never came this far south there’s no reason in the world that they cannot make a right hand turn immediately after leaving the airport before they get a couple of miles down south , this cannot be a safety issue. There’s never been a problem in the entire time we’ve lived here and the people that live under a flight path bought a house under the flight path we did not. We’ve been literally living in our home for 40 years it has been devastating , please put the plate back to the original flight path from years ago or at the very least adult Plan B with a hard right turn after takeoff Also, the fact that the planes are flying at such a low altitude does not make any sense whatsoever. They were never this low. You can literally throw a rock and hit one of them now I know that is an exaggeration but that’s how low they are. why are they not picking altitude upand getting into the air and away from peoples homes you cannot say that this is safety. There’s no aircraft flying above them as they takeoff from the airport please please please help the citizens of this community.
266	Nate Kamiya	I have been living in North Hollywood the last five years, the noise of planes from Burbank airport is disruptive and unending, beginning early in the morning and going late into the night. It is unfair that the burden of air

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		travel in the region should fall so disproportionately on a mostly working class neighborhood. I strongly disagree with the FAA's proposal, the last thing that's needed is more air traffic in an already overtaxed region. The FAA should instead be cutting back on its disastrous expansion of air traffic at the airport and mitigating the disruption and negative quality of life impacts. Nate Kamiya North Hollywood, CA
267	Guy Prevost	Dear FAA: I have read the Environmental Assessment by the FAA, in particular the alternatives for action listed in Chapter 2. I am strongly and unequivocally in favor of Alternative A. As a resident of a hillside area in Beverly Glen Canyon south of Mulholland Drive, I have been dramatically and negatively impacted by the recent jet overflights from Burbank Airport that cause excessive noise and pollution. I have lived in my home for over two decades. It was, until a few years ago, a relatively serene and quiet place, close to a Los Angeles City dedicated “greenspace” hospitable to wildlife. The new flight patterns, which I believe were part of the “Next Gen” protocol, have changed all that by re-directing flights south of Mulholland Drive. The Southwest jets and other aircraft fly directly over my house at all hours of day and night, creating constant noise and spewing fuel discharges. My other reasons for endorsing Alternative A are as follows: 1. It’s my understanding that the protocol of Alternative A, involving new flight paths to be guided by way points JAYTE and TEAGN, north of Mulholland, was already agreed upon by the Benedict Canyon Homeowners, the Burbank Airport, and the FAA after litigation and settlement--- all this pending the results of the EA. 2. Those results are in. The EA stipulates that Alternative A poses no safety or environmental problems, so there is no reason not to implement it.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		3. It makes sense that flights serving Burbank and its immediately adjacent municipalities should fly over those areas for take-offs and landings. I, for one, do not live in any of these areas. It's my understanding that Burbank and other neighboring cities enjoy tax and other revenues from the Burbank airport. Accordingly, those living in these municipalities should take the burden of the overflights, if any. 4. The increase of fuel usage necessitated by Alternative A is negligible, that is, less than a 1% according to the EA, and this for only a tiny portion of the flight path. 5. The negative impact of flights over hillside areas is greater due to their higher altitudes. For example, my house is at 1000 ft. above sea level. So a jet flying at 3000 ft. is only 2000ft. above me. This would not be the case, obviously for homes in the San Fernando Valley, and the negative effects of overflights there would not be as onerous. Thank you...
268	Linna Carter	I am very upset by the current and proposed Burbank airport flight plans through Studio City. I have lived at the corner of Tujunga and Moorpark in Studio City for over 11 years. Over the past several years, the frequency and loudness of the planes from Burbank airport has increased to an unsustainable level. Since 8am this morning alone, there have been more than 8 planes that have flown over my home, and it is only 8:35am. (Real flight times: 8:02a, 8:11, 8:19, 8:24, 8:26, 8:28, 8:29, 8:33) Plus, the planes actually start flying over at 7AM and continue until 11PM. I work from home. I do voiceover. And this constant and continual noise makes it nearly impossible for me to work. I have to wait until late night or early morning when the planes finally stop. The constant planes also negatively impact my mental health, my physical health, and my hearing and that of my family. The proposed new flight plans seem to direct EVERY PLANE DIRECTLY OVER MY HOME. Literally. If this was your home, how would you manage the constant noise and stress that comes from jets continually flying over your home? When can you find a few minutes for your mental health? To meditate, to read, for healing? How can you make a living, if you are now unable to work from home? How does that new burden add to your stress and negatively impact your mental health? To add insult to injury, the community was never consulted when the flight paths were originally changed, YOU JUST CHANGED THEM . When looking for a place to live more than 11 years ago, I specifically

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		choose Studio City over the northern San Fernando Valley, because of the continual flights I heard when visiting properties in that area. I was not afforded a choice when the flights were redirected over my home. More needs to be done by the FAA, and community concerns about the quantity of flights and noise level over this area of Studio City needs to be addressed. Linna Carter -- Sent with Tuta; enjoy secure & ad-free emails: https://tuta.com
269	Matt Labate	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While the settling parties may benefit from these changes, does that "Purpose and Need" outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public? - Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA itself admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the former paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded. - The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) to make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017 with the No Action Alternative; (2) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations; or (3) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR in its comment supported Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that was the triggering event for the Benedict Hills lawsuit and ultimately led to this EA.
270	Talia Shandler	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
271	Dan Scheinkman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
272	Nancy Kirhoffer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
273	David	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. -

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. - David
274	Lee Arian	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
275	Vadim Bokin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
276	Molly Newman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
277	Heidi Abra	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
278	Heidi Abra	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
279	Donna Perris	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Donna Perris Sent from my iPad
280	John Porterfield	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
281	Matt Labate	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
282	Lynn Crosswaite	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
283	Leslie Poliak	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Leslie Poliak Studio City Resident
284	Matt Grimmig	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
285	Steve Grushcow	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. - Steve Grushcow
286	Richard G. Fagin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Richard G. Fagin rickster@english.ucla.edu
287	Aileen Moreno	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
288	Susan Horn	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Susan Horn Sent from my iPad
289	Jennifer Langheld	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
290	Dan Cohen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Dan Cohen 818-370-1234 oyrobot@gmail.com
291	Benj Thall	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Benj Thall HomeOwner and Resident impacted. West Toluca Lake / North Hollywood
292	George Mooradian	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. 100% I agree with this. My family and I have been living with NOISE and disruption way too long. Please please correct this ASAP!! Sincerely, George Mooradian Studio City 91604 4171 Camellia Ave.
293	Adrian Ashkenazy	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
294	Marilyn Davis	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. Please reconsider, reevaluate and study the changes in the flight path, specifically the Southern shift as you are required to do. Sincerely, Marilyn Davis
295	Tal Feldman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Tal Feldman
296	Rebecca Tantalo	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
297	Cynthia Bain	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that the BURBANK AIRPORT ITSELF, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should modify Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Cynthia Bain
298	Amy Pell	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Amy Pell 818-516-3422 amy@amypell.com Coldwell Banker Realty 301 N. Canon Drive, Suite E Beverly Hills, CA 90210 BRE# 01438754
299	Clarissa Lerchenfeld-Keller	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Clarissa Lerchenfeld-Keller Heart-Centered Life Coaching

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		www.clarissakeller.com (818) 943-3887
300	Samantha Auerbach	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
301	Amir Jacoby	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
302	DEBORAH LAKEMAN	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
303	BECCA STERN	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. BECCA STERN
304	Heidi Abra	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Heidi Abra
305	Dylan O'Brien	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Dylan O'Brian
306	Ken Frechman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Ken Frechman 6229 Satsuma Ave. North Hollywood, CA 91606
307	Julie Bleicher	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
308	Darlene Yaplee	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
309	Barbara	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
310	Julie Ganis	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. – - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
311	Stephanie	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
312	72 Rust	As a resident of North Hollywood, California, the Toluca Lake area, intersections of Magnolia and Riverside, 4852 strohm ave n hollywood as a lifelong resident for the past 30 years, we lived in a peaceful quiet, beautiful neighborhood until five years ago when you decided to change the flight path for absolutely no reason other than greed to try to save an airline a few pennies on gas that is not your fucking job do not respond with this is some sort of safety issue because it's not you can look up into the sky over the San Fernando Valley and there's never been aircraft interfering with other aircraft. The planes always came out of Burbank airport and made an immediate right turn well before Oxnard Street then you changed it and moved it farther south Before they started making their turns and it absolutely destroyed our lives. This flight path have been there for decades, and when people bought homes the ones that bought their homes in a flight path paid significantly less for their house as they knew they were buying a home in a flight path , you have not changed the landing path !! Other than in windy weather, which we've always had aircraft in the area as we do live in the vicinity of the airport which we understand but not doing perfect calm days the landing has always been the same but you decided to run to takeoff farther south into Magnolia and Riverside before they start making their turn do not respond back and do not say this is something to do with safety as it has nothing to do with it you can look up in the sky and see 50 fucking miles that there's no other major aircraft around that they would need to go this far especially with 90% of these planes go out and make a hard right turn and then go north there's no reason to send planes farther south to then have them just turn around and go north Also the fact that they are flying at such a low level you go to any other airport they're taking off at what appears to be damn near near of 45° angle. These planes are flying just several thousand feet above all these homes and literally are flying flat. They're not even attempting to gain altitude isn't that the point of a fucking aircraft on top of that starting last September you moved it again which is yet to acknowledge we have sent in complaints you've sent in photos showing as you can see nothing is changed and showed September and then six months later even though the photo so completely that you are several blocks closer than you were even six months ago we consistently get decibel, readings of 78 to 80 dB above our house, we would never be able to ever buy a new home here with the way home. Prices are, and it is inexcusable whatever change you're going to be back to the original flight path, and at the very least should be taking off and making an immediate right hand turn before Oxnard And for your department to not even reach out to people when they try to contact you is so criminal and disgusting you fucking cocksuckers I everyone you fucking Cunts get terminal, fucking cancer and die a horrible fucking death. This is what you've turned our lives into.
313	Amy Acker	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
314	Amy Acker	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
315	Nadia Mateen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best regards Nadia Mateen Sent from my iPhone
316	Kelly Hull	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
317	Deborah Llewelyn	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Deborah Llewelyn
318	Susanne Hayes	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
319	R Hill	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. R Hill
320	Richard Hull	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. ***** Richard Hull
321	Lydia Antonini	Sending the below because it's truly maddening and unconscionable that we continue to bear the brunt of BURBANK's noise issues. NextGen is a disaster for everyone on the ground and it's just another example of the airline industry prioritizing profit over safety. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
322	Marissa Cunningham	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Marissa Cunningham Studio City Resident Sent from my iPhone
323	Bonnie Schut	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
324	Jeff Kabakoff	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
325	David A.Kimball	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. David A.Kimball Studio City CA Sent using Zoho Mail
326	sambraziel@gmail.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
327	Harold Orchid	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
328	Jeffrey Filgo	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Jeffrey Filgo
329	Debra Smith	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Debra Smith Debrasmith4439@gmail.com 818-634-9559
330	John Wiseman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. John Wiseman Co-Producer - TED S1 (323) 359-2997
331	KIM DAVIS, PH.D.	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. KIM DAVIS, PH.D.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Clinical Psychologist, PSY 21796 Psychotherapy for Individual Adults & Couples • Relationship & Interpersonal Difficulties • Life Transitions, Personal Growth & Identity Development • Depression, Anxiety & Self-Esteem • Women’s Mental Health • Relationship to Food & Body 310.281.6645 drkimdavis.com drkimdavis@drkimdavis.com CONFIDENTIALITY WARNING: This communication may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure under applicable state or federal law. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of the communication is strictly prohibited. If you received the communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and deleting the message and any accompanying files from your system.
332	Janet Loeb	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Janet Loeb President Fryman Canyon Association Studio City
333	traceykdan@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
334	Patti Demoff	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Patti Demoff 3013 Hutton Place Beverly Hills, CA 90210 (310) 271-2769 home (310) 717-7437 cell

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		pattidemoff@earthlink.net
335	Phil Erenberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
336	Jeff Klemes	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
337	Tom Lehr	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Tom Lehr c. 310-625-9899 tslehr13@gmail.com
338	Noelle	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
339	dorian meehan	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
340	Dani Klemes	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
341	Gail Tisdale	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
342	Allison Klemes	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
343	John Van Tongeren	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. John Van Tongeren mc202vt@yahoo.com Studio City, Ca. 91604
344	Deborah Santana	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Deborah Santana
345	Chip Meehan	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
346	tamsynh Hunnewell	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
347	Tiffany Arrington	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
348	Joelle Birnberg	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
349	Linda Kristman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
350	Miles Kristman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
351	Sarina Klemes	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
352	Gail Tisdale	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
353	Jennifer Saunders	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Respectfully submitted, Jennifer Saunders 12207 Cantura Street Studio City, CA 91604
354	jspringer2030@gmail.com	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
355	Linda Hoffman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Linda Hoffman Resident Sherman Oaks Sent from my iPhone
356	Linda Branca	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Linda Branca Sherman Oaks Homeowners Sent from my iPhone
357	crazyelmer@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
358	Lisa Cook	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPad
359	Heidi MacKay	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Heidi MacKay
360	Gaby Bouzaglou	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
361	crazyelmer@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
362	Jim Praytor	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
363	Liza Abbott	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
364	Casey Brumels	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
365	Jeannie Roshar	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
366	Natalie Cariola	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
367	Barry Johnson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Barry Johnson 4166 Farmdale Ave. Studio City, CA 91604
368	Ada Gorn	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Ada Gorn
369	Mark Silverstein	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
370	Sherri Elkaim	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Please listen to our neighborhoods that have been so adversely affected by this southern shift. Sherri Elkaim, Studio City
371	Mark Brown	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Mark L. Brown 13127 Huston Street Sherman Oaks, CA 91423 Sent from my iPad
372	Mark Brown	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPad
373	Julie Bleicher	To Whom It May Concern: This has been going on for years! Jul 14, 2019, 3:29 PM [UproarLA has discovered the truth of how our community was sacrificed by the FAA and Burbank Airport in the name of efficiency and NextGen technology. And after callously betraying our once quiet community, and ruining tens of thousands of lives, the cover-up to keep us in the dark and under the path began.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The FAA lied to our Congressmen, Senators, LA City Officials, Burbank Officials as well as all of us. Help UproarLA hold them all accountable and demand this path that is decimating our community be changed, NOW, away from our homes, schools and protected parks.] I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA... which has been going on for years. Enough is enough!
374	Janet Edmunds Cohen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Janet Edmunds Cohen Sent from my iPhone please forgive any typos!
375	lynn Crosby	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. lynnrosby lynnrosby@mac.com
376	JOHN WALKER	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
377	Martha Hanrahan	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
378	Cynthia Upstill	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
379	Wayne Williams	I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Wayne Williams 15423 Sutton Street Sherman Oaks, CA 91403-3809 (818)905-8097 (h) (213) 705-5008 (c) Email: wwclick@mac.com
380	Sally Daws	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
381	shidan adlparvar	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR’s Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
382	Bob Semanovich	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Bob Semanovich 12020 Iredell St., Studio City, 91604
383	Stuart Brown	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
384	Nancy Friedman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
385	Liz Craig, PsyD., MFT	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Liz Craig, PsyD., MFT Psychotherapist

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		(310)801-0752 http://drlizcraig.com/
386	Eileen Wesson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
387	Melanie Contreras	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
388	Tomm Wells	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Get Outlook for iOS
389	Daniel Turrett	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
390	Brea Brumels	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
391	BREA BRUMELS	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. BREA BRUMELS PRESIDENT MR. BRONTOSAURUS INC. brea@mrbrontosaurus.com (310) 595- 5937 Mobile/ WhatsApp (323) 845-1178 office Skype: BreaDTisdale
392	Brea Brumels	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
393	Brea Brumels	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
394	Irina Faiman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
395	Crystal C. Beecher	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
396	Danny Rose	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Danny Rose
397	Alex Intelligator	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
398	Bryan Gorog	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
399	Doron Kauper	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
400	Ben Saine	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
401	Drew Filus	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
402	paul reavlin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
403	Robert Cantz	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
404	Robert Garbus	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
405	Debra Reynolds	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Debra Reynolds

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sherman Oaks Resident (under the pathways)
406	Paul Hollombe	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
407	Nora Doyle	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you Nora Doyle 12319 Hillslope St Studio City 91604
408	Faust	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
409	Bruce Eliot	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Bruce Eliot
410	Jennifer	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best, Jennifer Sent from my iPhone
411	Amanda Krentzman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
412	elgran2727	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device
413	Gary Lewis	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Gary Lewis
414	Michele Parsons	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Michele Parsons, Region North Instructional Data Coordinator Data Privacy, Analysis, & Reporting Branch Office of Data and Accountability office: (818) 654-3687 email: michele.parsons@lausd.net CONFIDENTIALITY: This e-mail (including any attachments) may contain confidential, proprietary and/or

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		privileged information and unauthorized disclosure or use is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the original sender and then delete this e-mail (along with any attachments) immediately.
415	Jeff Horowitz	I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
416	msuskinpub	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
417	Patricia Demoff	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Patricia Demoff 3013 Hutton Place Beverly Hills, CA 90210 (310) 271-2769 home (310) 717-7437 cell pattidemoff@earthlink.net
418	Patty Kirby	I live literally directly under the flight path (take off path) in Studio city. The number of flights, at times are EVERY 3 minutes and the noise is ridiculous and intrusive. To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		“Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Patty Kirby 818.209.8333 4434 Carpenter Ave. Studio City 91607 Patty.a.kirby@gmail.com "The world will not be destroyed by those who do evil, but by those who watch them without doing anything." - Albert Einstein.
419	Cynthia Galsor	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Cynthia Galsor Sherman Oaks resident
420	Adam Shell	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
421	Penny Alpert	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Appreciatively, Penny Alpert
422	Debbie	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that the BURBANK AIRPORT ITSELF, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kind Regards, Debbie Debbie C. Assistant at Cynthia Bain's Young Actor Studio E studio@cynthiabain.com W www.cynthiabain.com IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies thereof.
423	M. Hetzner	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. M. Hetzner
424	Michael Fields	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone Sorry for any typos due to Siri not listening to me....
425	Andrea Berloff	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
426	assimom@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
427	kcstudio@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
428	WENDY LUCKENBILL	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
429	Michelle Allen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Please do the right thing. Michelle Allen Studio City, CA 91604
430	Judd Lieberman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Judd Lieberman Studio City resident
431	Jamie Thompson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kindly and Respectfully- Jamie Thompson Studio City, CA Sent from my iPhone Jamie Thompson

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		310.430.4307
432	Enrique Monguia	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone - Enrique Monguia
433	Alan Slasor	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
434	Richard Hull	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. ***** Richard Hull
435	Jennifer Gal	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
436	Julie Harris Fisher	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for supporting the residents of Studio City. Sincerely,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
437	Laurie Arent	Julie Harris Fisher To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
438	Laurie Arent-Plotkin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Laurie Arent-Plotkin
439	Colleen Benard	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3)

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
440	Ilyse Pallenberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you. Ilyse Pallenberg 818.257.3720
441	Blues Saraceno	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Blues Saraceno
442	Donna Pennestri	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
443	Jane Drucker	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jane Drucker, Studio City
444	Vicki Nussbaum	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Vicki Nussbaum
445	Sandy Brumels	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sandy Brumels
446	Pam Pechter	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
447	Deborah Vossler	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
448	R KO	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
449	Sarah McHale	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for your attention to this. Kindly, Sarah McHale
450	S. Forthal	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, S. Forthal Studio City
451	Sujie Tang, MD, MS	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sujie

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sujie Tang, MD, MS Victory Hematology and Oncology 4940 Van Nuys Blvd, Ste 207 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403 Office: (818)-616-3998 Fax: (818)-784-8997 www.victoryoncology.com "Our Passion is Your Victory"
452	Jill Sandin Culinary Consulting	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone Jill Sandin Culinary Consulting 310.600.4671 Jsandin@culcons.com

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
453	Stephen Loguidice	www.culcons.com To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. s Stephen Loguidice
454	Shant Thomasian	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
455	David Thompson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thanks, David Thompson David Thompson Principal and Founder 6255 W. Sunset Blvd. Suite 920 Los Angeles, CA 90028

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Email: dt@assembledge.com Phone: 323 951 0045 ext. 10 Web: www.assembledge.com IG: @assembledge
456	Wang, Teale	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
457	Randee Benavente	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Randee Benavente Valley Village Resident Sent from my iPhone
458	Alisa .	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
459	KAREN KAPLAN	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Karen Kaplan Author of Open Faced: Single-Slice Sandwiches from Around the World Available Now on: Amazon Barnes & Noble Google Follow me at Karen-Kaplan.com and @karenopenfaced
460	Fox Newby	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
461	JIM ARMOGIDA	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
462	stephanie baio	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
463	tradgt@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
464	Barbara Brabec	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
465	Jill Meyer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jill Meyer Resident

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
466	lmarcinkoski@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
467	Susanne Hayes	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
468	Catherine Hayes	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Catherine Hayes
469	Kay Donno	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kay Donno
470	Gina Silverstein	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
471	raina penchansky	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
472	Suellen Wagner	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Suellen Wagner
473	Albert Shapiro	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you. Albert Shapiro 14623 Round Valley Drive Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
474	WALTER L SEBRING III	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
475	Miles Kristman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
476	Aaron Brownstein	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
477	Julia Badham	Aaron Brownstein To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPad
478	Lynn McCracken	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Lynn McCracken 818-416-2905
479	Hal Paris	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
480	Orly Meyers	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
481	Orly Meyers	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		“Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
482	Ronald Levinson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you. Ron Levinson Encino, CA Sent from my iPhone Sent from my iPhone
483	Erin Culling	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
484	Daniel Hagen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Dan Hagen 4129 Rhodes Ave Studio City CA 91604
485	Chloe Stearns	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Chloe Stearns
486	Laura croft	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
487	Caren Lieberman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
488	Jeremy Platt and Dona Christina	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best— Jeremy Platt Dona Christina Studio City, CA 91604
489	Fred Muir	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Fred Muir 2740 Ellison Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210
490	Robert	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
491	Howard J. Weg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
492	Paul Howard	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Paul Howard Filmmaker / Activist / Chief Executive of We Create Ripples (501c non-profit) We Create Ripples / Ann Asks / What's the Alternative? Productions m: 818.269.6399 e: Paul@getpaulhoward.com www.GetPaulHoward.com
493	Darlene Jacobs	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Darlene Jacobs Studio City Sent from my iPhone
494	Albert R	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
495	lizchex@mac.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
496	Chris Murray	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
497	72 Rust	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
498	chris Murray	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
499	steve wolf	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
500	Fay Bass	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
501	B.R. Granatt	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you - B.R. Granatt
502	Heather Lea Gerdes	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Heather Lea Gerdes Studio City resident
503	Laura Loftin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I STRONGLY oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Laura Loftin
504	JJO	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3)

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
505	Magda Lane	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best regards, Magda Lane Studio City Resident
506	Lindsay Doran	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Lindsay Doran 9916 Mark Place Beverly Hills, CA 90210
507	Alison Martin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
508	Jill Ettinger	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Jill Ettinger
509	Vshvarts	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
510	Susan Brooks	Hello, I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Susan Brooks Sent from my iPhone
511	Rodney Kemerer and Lindsay Doran	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. We now have upwards of 60-70 flights per day flying at very low altitudes. This is a constant noise and pollution issue everyday inside our home. We were given no notice of these changes or any opportunity to provide input. We have lived here for 46 years and now suddenly are living next to an airport. This is unacceptable and we will fully support all legal remedies to correct this egregious change that has negatively effected thousands of homeowners and residents of the Santa Monica Mountains. Rodney Kemerer Lindsay Doran 2337 Benedict Canyon Drive
512	Jennifer Wheaton	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
513	Phil Erenberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
514	Kevin Doty	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Best regards, Kevin Doty Studio City resident and homeowner. Sent from my iPhone
515	Jessica Poter	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
516	Karen Swallow	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
517	ccspechl@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
518	Debi Wagner	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Debi Wagner Quiet Skies Coalition Sent from my iPhone
519	Martha Stevens and George Shea	To Whom It May Concern: We live next to Woodbridge Park and the noise levels of planes has grown worse over the past few years. On top of that helicopters are constantly flying over our area. We hesitate to have a meal or conversation outdoors because of the noise. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Martha Stevens George Shea
520	Alexis Prescott	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you! Alexis Prescott Studio City, CA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
521	G Symon	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
522	Guido Zwicker	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
523	Sabrina Silver	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. May I add that growing up in this house in Valley Village, being outdoors in our garden was pleasant and you could have conversions. Something changed. It is now no longer possible to enjoy the peace of the garden, as every 10 or so minutes a large and unbelievably loud airplane ascends DIRECTLY overhead. Conversion must stop until the plane passes. Then again. And again. We never chose to live under a flight path. The routes changed and now planes fly over our house. Often. Unremittingly. It's torturous. Sabrina Silver Valley Village, CA Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer
524	Natasha Vogt	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Natasha Vogt
525	Stephanie	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
526	Laurissa Gold	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you, Laurissa Gold
527	francola@sbcglobal.net	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android
528	Molly Newman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
529	faust pierfederici	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
530	dadfamilyplan@gmail.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
531	James P. Higgins	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. James P. Higgins

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		13217 Valleyheart Drive North Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
532	pc pier	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
533	FAUST	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
534	Kelly Straub	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
535	Jihye Choe	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
536	Gail Wunsch and Paul Wunsch	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely Gail Wunsch Paul Wunsch Studio City stakeholders Sent from my iPhone
537	Trudy Green	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
538	Mike Goslin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
539	Daryl Didier	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Daryl Didier 323 632 1675 Drel.dda5@gmail.com Sent from my iPhone
540	Dana Ward	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best, Dana Ward Encino resident
541	Mark A. Fien	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Mark A. Fien Studio City, CA
542	Mark Indig	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
543	Paul Da Silva	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
544	Crystal C. Beecher	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
545	How The West Was Saved	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best, How The West Was Saved htwws.org
546	Carrie K. Wong	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Carrie K. Wong (702) 673-8301 Sent from my iPhone
547	Richard L. Escoto	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for your attention to this matter, Richard L. Escoto
548	Jeff Brooks	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jeff Brooks
549	Jay Pellizzi	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
550	Steve Pechter	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my mobile phone so please excuse any typos or misspellings. Steve Pechter Office: (818) 501-3768 Mobile: (818) 519-3754 Email: spechter@sbcglobal.net
551	Steve Pechter	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. ----- Sent from my mobile phone so please excuse any typos or misspellings.
552	RL Escoto	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. -RL Escoto
553	CHRISTOPHER CULLITON	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Handcrafted on an artisanal iPhone.
554	Wendy Baxley	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
555	The Morrison 14 Homeowners Association of North Hollywood	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Very truly yours, The Morrison 14 Homeowners Association of North Hollywood
556	Yaron Shlomi	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
557	Laeta Kalogridis	To Whom It May Concern: I am supporting UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies in opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options put out are: 1. The No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; 2. To make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or 3. To implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. (Note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.) In conclusion, I strongly oppose the Alternatives in the EA. I demand as a homeowner and stakeholder that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA to begin with.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Laeta Kalogridis CCO, Virago Productions, Inc (818) 635-8781 Lekvirago@gmail.com 15832 Valley Vista Blvd., Encino, CA 91436
558	Robert Shabkie	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
559	Mari Feldmeier	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Mari Feldmeier 818.621.0799
560	Duane Fogwell	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
561	Matt Grimmig	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, <u>Matt Grimmig</u>
562	Karen A. Hamilton	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
563	Alan Singer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
564	Todd Schroeder	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
565	Laurie Rittenberg,	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Laurie Rittenberg, Studio City Sent from my iPhone
566	Brea Tisdale	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
567	Todd Schroeder	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
568	Roy Haugen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Roy Haugen 11582 Moorpark St Studio City, CA 91602
569	Brea Brumels	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
570	Stephen Mapel	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Stephen Mapel 4135 Davana Road Sherman Oaks, CA 91423 (818)261-4733/cell Sent from my iPhone
571	Peggy Kono	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
572	Chloe King	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Chloe King www.chloecollects.com
573	Kirt Tisdale	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
574	lenihan519@earthlink.net	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
575	Karen Swallow	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
576	Soleil Beecher	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
577	John Birnberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
578	Mary Odson	To Whom It May Concern: I support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). Specifically:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		1. PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. 2. FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. 3. LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. 4. USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. 5. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. 6. FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016- 2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Mary Odson 3650 Woodhill Canyon Road Studio City, CA 91604
579	Karen Spangenberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Karen Spangenberg - 30 years free of overhead jet traffic until FAA instituted Next Gen,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		now everyday overhead jets North Hollywood, CA
580	Kathi Flood	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kathi Flood, Sherman Oaks
581	Gillian Hobson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thanks Gillian Hobson Kraft Ave, Studio City Sent from my iPhone
582	lilavati sharma	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
583	Jim Praytor	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
584	Cean Okada	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPad
585	Bern's Email	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
586	Paul Ganus	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Paul Ganus PaulGanusVO.com Sent from my iPhone, please blame Siri for typos
587	Andrew Robinson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Andrew Robinson
588	Ellen Bradley Ganus	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Ellen Bradley Ganus Home owner in Valley Village myesig.com
589	Jesse Sanford	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
590	TOM DEMKO	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
591	Jill Demko	TOM DEMKO To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jill Demko
592	Beth Rubin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
593	David Hope	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. David Hope
594	Lois Evans	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Many thanks, Lois Evans 9865 Easton Drive

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Beverly Hills, Ca . 90210 Lois0@icloud.com m. 310.795.2008
595	Julie Harris	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Julie Harris Homeowner Los Angeles, Beverly Hills P.O. Sent from my iPhone
596	Paul Wysocan	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Paul Wysocan 9866 Easton Dr Beverly Hills, CA 90210
597	Julian Beuzieron	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
598	sh@dogger7027.com	To Whom It May Concern:I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
599	k t	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
600	Rachelle Rosten	TO: 9-AJO-BUR-Community-Involvement@faa.gov SUBJECT: Public Comment on Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Amendments to the Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport Southern Departures BODY: To Whom It May Concern: To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Rachelle Rosten Executive Managing Director, Master Trust & Probate Division Douglas Elliman Real Estate 150 El Camino Drive #150 Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		CalDRE # 01255977 Mobile 310-710-5151 rachellerosten@me.com
601	Marvin Caesar	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
602	william calvert	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
603	Kim Turner	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Respectfully submitted, Kim Turner Studio City
604	Susan Birnberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
605	Susan Birnberg	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
606	Chris Fahland	*** Public Comment on Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Amendments to the Bob Hope "Hollywood Burbank" Airport Southern Departures To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
607	Maria Rotter	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kind regards, Maria Rotter
608	Thomas Markovits	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
609	Susan Goldberg Switzer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Susan Goldberg Switzer
610	Lori Chapman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Lori Chapman Production Supervisor 213-700-7180 lori.chapman@mac.com CARNATION • JOB #2404 Florence 1300 Highland Ave, Suite 102 Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
611	Raymond Levy	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Raymond Levy
612	HILDA ANAN	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
613	Kristin Campbell	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for your time. Kristin Campbell Summerfield Drive
614	Gary Silver	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
615	Stephen Ginsburg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPad
616	Paula Trattner	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
617	Karen Cease	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for your time. Karen Cease
618	Edson A. Benedict LLC	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		This is totally unacceptable. Currently there are , on average, 40,50,60,70 low flying commercial jets 7 days a week flying directly over my house. Previously there had been none. The constant noise and pollution is ruining our life. We do not have a moments peace INSIDE our home. This is an out of control situation in which we were given no opportunity to comment or have any input into this change in flight paths. It makes zero sense to fly into the Santa Monica Mountains. You have lost altitude. The historical flight pattern of turning right out of Burbank before the 101 Freeway had less impact. I believe this falls under the “unlawful taking” of my right to the peaceful enjoyment of my home. You have moved me next door to an airport. This has to stop! Edson A. Benedict LLC 9916 Mark Place Beverly Hills, CA 90210 Sent from my iPhone
619	Ramona Mou	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you Ramona Mou

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
620	LORA MORADI	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best Regards, Lora Pournazarian Sent from my iPhone
621	Janine Milne	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. There is such bitterness in the community because the Federal Government, who exists only because of taxpayers, has been deaf to any solutions that would solve the burden of people living under constant flight noise at low altitudes. Or address the protected hillsides that make the low altitudes lower still for those people, as well as wildlife, living there. Janine Milne Studio City CA. Janine Milne ** Please don't forget to update your records ** NEW EMAIL: janinemilnestudio@gmail.com
622	Dina Levy	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Dina Levy
623	Stacy	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Stacy
624	Rachelle Rosten	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Rachelle Rosten Executive Managing Director, Master Trust & Probate Division Douglas Elliman Real Estate 150 El Camino Drive #150 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 CalDRE # 01255977 Mobile 310-710-5151 rachellerosten@me.com
625	Andrew	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
626	Stephen Loguidice	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
627	Neil Wilson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
628	Yo G	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
629	Rita Haft	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you , Rita Haft Benedict cyn resident Sent from my iPhone
630	Tim Olson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. sincerely, Tim Olson
631	Eszter Neuman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
632	Pat Livinghouse	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
633	Seth Green	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. -- Seth Green Sent from the land of kittens & toys & fun & love.
634	Carol Schatz	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Carol Schatz 2740 Ellison Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210
635	Clare Green	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. -- Clare Green
636	Ed Clarke	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Ed Clarke Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
637	Yigal Hay	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. YIGAL HAY Twenty-Six Corners

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		phone 310.704.2100 fax 310.277.2226 email yigal@my26.com social @yigalhay 9663 Santa Monica Blvd #737 Beverly Hills, CA 90210 California DRE Broker License: 01409637
638	ro design	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
639	Marc Walleston	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
640	Rachel Rovner	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
641	Chad Knowles	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Onward, Chad Knowles 1824 Benedict Canyon Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210 chad@chadknowles.com
642	Ted Koland & Brad Huff	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Ted Koland & Brad Huff 11455 Canton Drive Studio City CA 91604
643	Reagan Restall	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Reagan Restall
644	Barbara Nichols	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
645	Rachelle Rosten	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Rachelle Rosten Executive Managing Director, Master Trust & Probate Division Douglas Elliman Real Estate 150 El Camino Drive #150 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 CalBRE # 01255977 Mobile 310-710-5151 rachellerosten@me.com
646	The Colony 104 In Westwood	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
647	Arash Afshar	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
648	wiretap.author0d@icloud.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
649	Ebet Dudley	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Ebet Dudley 10020 westwanda dr
650	Don Henley	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Don Henley
651	Jonathan Haft	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jonathan Haft Benedict Canyon

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
652	Gary F Bird	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Gary F Bird 2719 Benedict Canyon Drive Beverly Hills Ca 90210
653	Jonathan Haft	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
654	Doris La Frenais	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Doris la Frenais With great LOVE ALL is possible Light and bliss XXX Doris (on iPhone)
655	Suzanne Rosencrans	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
656	Suzanne Rosencrans	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Suzanne Rosencrans 3010 Hutton Drive

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
657	Clarissa Lerchenfeld-Keller M.A.	Beverly Hills (post office), CA 90210 To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Clarissa Lerchenfeld-Keller M.A. Heart-Centered Life Coaching www.clarissakeller.com (818) 943-3887
658	Mitchell Wilen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Mitchell Wilen 9827 Whitwell Drive Beverly Hills, CA. 90210
659	Janet Silverman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Janet Silverman 2955 Hutton Drive Beverly Hills, 90210 Sent from my iPhone

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
660	Dr. Shadiar Ohadi	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Dr. Shadiar Ohadi Family Medicine (818) 848-4400 Warning: The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.
661	Bruce Goldsmith	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Bruce Goldsmith

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		9722 Oak Pass Rd. Beverly Hills, (Benedict Canyon) Ca. 990210
662	Andrea Knowles	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Andrea Knowles Benedict Canyon Dr Beverly Hills, CA 90210
663	Ivar Combrinck	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kind regards Ivar Comnbrinck
664	Scott Lyon	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
665	Jordana Glick-Franzheim	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for your time, Jordana Glick-Franzheim 310.951.2727 jordana3@me.com
666	Gordon Trachtenberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
667	Beth	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Beth
668	Elizabeth Parry	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Elizabeth Parry 2570 Benedict Canyon Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210
669	Arash Afshar	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Get Outlook for iOS
670	Deepa Salastekar	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you, Deepa Salastekar
671	Jason BLUMENFELD	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
672	Rabin Pournazarian	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you. Rabin Pournazarian 818.205.2436
673	irena.m2010@yahoo.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
674	David Gaines	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. David Gaines Studio City, CA 91604 dscgaines@gmail.com 818/522-9040 "If you want a happy ending, it depends where you stop" Orson Welles
675	Michael Kramer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
676	Jennifer Flackett	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jennifer Flackett 15260 Ventura Blvd. Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
677	Craig M.	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		—————-> FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. <————— - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. ***** In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Craig M. Studio City
678	Mike Mintz	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. ----- Mike Mintz mike@michaelmintz.com
679	Kathleen McGrath	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. -Kathy McGrath Sherman Oaks
680	Danielle Valenciano	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
681	afi10s@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
682	Rebekah LeBeau	From a concerned citizen in studio city- I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
683	budandvic1@sbcglobal.net	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR’s Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
684	STUDIO CITY RESIDENT	I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. STUDIO CITY RESIDENT
685	Stéphanie Eisen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
686	Andrew Eisen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Andrew Eisen 3687 Willowcrest Ave Studio City, CA 91604
687	Heidy Lee	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
688	Eric Biddle	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Eric Biddle ericbiddle@gmail.com
689	Susan Collins	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
690	Jesse Carmichael	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank so much Jesse Carmichael Sent from my iPhone
691	Miles Kristman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
692	WILLIAM SOBEL	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
693	John Ferrie	Sent from my iPhone To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
694	Derek Anthony Gray	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
695	Kathy Zarbakhsh	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kathy Zarbakhsh 9830 wanda park dr Beverly hills, CA, 90210 Sent from Gmail Mobile
696	Joyce Grunauer	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
697	Nicolette Gabay Hanasab	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
698	Daniel Avedon	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Daniel Avedon 2964 Deep Canyon Dr Sent from my iPhone
699	Karla Oleary	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
700	Jay Cohen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
701	Stephen Wolf	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
702	David Norrell	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, David Norrell
703	Gordon Trachtenberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Gordon Trachtenberg TCM, LLC 9840 Wanda Park Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210 Phone: 310-980-0996
704	Cunneen, Scott, M.D.	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Scot Cunneen 3053 Hutton Dr Beverly Hills, CA 90210 Sent from my iPhone IMPORTANT WARNING: This message is intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this information is strictly prohibited. Thank you for your cooperation.
705	Robert Wallerstein	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
706	Robert Wallerstein	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
707	Rosette Delug	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from Uranus
708	tracey ormandy	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
709	ROBIN KISSELL	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
710	thomash53@yahoo.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
711	W Morris	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. W. Morris

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Resident of the Santa Monica Mountains
712	Bob and Matlin Mirman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
713	Michele Gruska	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Love, Laugh and be kind, Michele
714	jkohnlaw@gmail.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
715	Nancy V	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Nancy V Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device
716	A RR	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
717	Jeffrey Kohn	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
718	gb irock.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
719	Jim Rosten	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jim Rosten 310.738.1555 cell
720	Sally Shultz	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sally Shultz CEO at Sable Education P: 310-980-9092 E: Sally@SableEducation.com
721	Stephen Loguidice	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
722	Len Jacoby	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
723	Joanna Stingray	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
724	Jim Rosten	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jim Rosten 310.738.1555 cell
725	Enrico Bressan	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best Regards, Enrico Bressan enrico@artecnica.com Tel. +1 323 655 6551 Cel. +1 310 497 6554 www.artecnica.com
726	Brian Cohen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Brian Cohen 9782 Donington Place Los Angeles, CA 90210 213-304-8437
727	Farhad Melamed MD	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
	Roya Melamed Micah Melamed Mia Melamed Luca Melamed	I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely Farhad Melamed MD Roya Melamed Micah Melamed Mia Melamed Luca Melamed Sent from my iPhone
728	Farhad Melamed MD Roya Melamed Micah Melamed Mia Melamed Luca Melamed	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely Farhad Melamed MD Roya Melamed Micah Melamed Mia Melamed Luca Melamed Sent from my iPhone
729	Sharon	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. I live in Studio City. Sharon
730	Casey Spira	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
731	Leslie & Michael Zinberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Leslie & Michael Zinberg Please excuse any typos.
732	lesliezinberg@gmail.com	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Please excuse any typos.
733	Benjamin Marsh	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
734	Susan Wallerstein	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
735	Mina Javid	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
736	David Ickovics	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
737	Morgan	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Morgan
738	Ryan Cleary	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
739	Matt Weisbarth	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Matt Weisbarth
740	Matt Weisbarth	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Matt Weisbarth
741	Matt Weisbarth	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Matt Weisbarth
742	Daniel Hanasab	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
743	linetoliz (null)	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Liz Levitt Hirsch Beverly Crest
744	Gail Na	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPad
745	Jonathan Hanasab	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best, Jonathan Hanasab (310) 806-1722 Sent from my iPhone
746	Janice Marinelli Mazza	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
747	Joanna Stingray	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
748	Chad Knowles	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Onward, Chad Knowles m: (213) 500-2423 e: cknowles@stratuscore.com Sent from my mobile device. Please excuse any typos.
749	Tom Mazza	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
750	Miles Kristman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
751	Lauren	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best Always, Lauren.
752	Patti Linsky	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Patti Patti Linsky 818.517.1475 (cellular) American Conference of www.pattilinsky.com Artist-In-Residence Altar EGO Sent from my iPhone

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
753	tracey ormandy	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
754	Bernice Rudolph	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
755	Lisa Haas	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
756	Jeanne Schroeder	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
757	Maria Cina	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
758	Lisa Carloss	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
759	Tim Hunold	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
760	Lisa Cerone	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
761	Rachelle Carson-Begley	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
762	Chase Love	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
763	Ingrid Sacerio	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
764	Lori Story	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Lori Story Sent from my iPhone
765a	Denise and Jay Gruska	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Denise and Jay Gruska
765b	Jay G.	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Jay G. https://jaygruska.com Composer/Songwriter
766	Gail Malmuth	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
767	Gail Malmuth	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
768	Barry Johnson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Barry Johnson 4166 Farmdale Ave. Studio City, CA 91604 (818) 761-0983
769	Mary Moon	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
770	GM	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my Gphone sorry for spelling errors
771	Jerome Kamer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Jerome Kamer jkamer@me.com +1 (310) 890-9931
772	monique ussini	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
773	Donald Fenning	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. DONALD FENNING
774	Joyce	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
775	Jasna Jerecic	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jasna Jerecic
776	Walter Sebring	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
777	Jeri Weil	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jeri Weil California you

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
778	Sara Singer Schiff	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
779	Jeffrey Zink	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
780	Nadia Mateen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best regards Nadia Mateen Sent from my iPhone
781	Brian Harms	To Whom It May Concern: I have lived with the ever-increasing noise and disturbance from the Hollywood Burbank Airport for over 15 years. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Brian Harms 818-590-4196
782	william henry	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
783	lorraine jonsson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best, Lorraine Johnson 3750 Oakfield Drive Sherman Oaks 91423
784	Aileen Gram	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
785	Jim Rosten	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jim JIM ROSTEN Co-founding Principal Benedict Canyon Equities, Inc. 10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 420 Los Angeles, CA 90067 C 310-738-1555 jrosten@bceproperties.com bceproperties.com
786	Cheri Minns	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Cheri Minns Studio City Home Owner Sent from my iPhone
787	North Vincent	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
788	Katrin Youdim	I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Stop harassing us with plane noises Stop killing our children Sincerely Katrin youdim
789	Audrey Gordon	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
790	bobstiefel@aol.com	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		“Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
791	k borirak	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
792	Clarissa Lerchenfeld-Keller	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Clarissa Lerchenfeld-Keller Heart-Centered Life Coaching www.clarissakeller.com (818) 943-3887
793	Joan August	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Joan August
794	Nick Vincent	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you.
795	Michael Kramer	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
796	Dan Scheinkman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
797	Gaye Barnes	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Respectfully yours, Gaye Barnes
798	David Alderman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
799	Brea Brumels	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
800	Brea Tisdale	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
801	Andrew Magarian	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
802	Katherine Kato	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Katherine Kato Studio City resident
803	Edward Lifson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Edward Lifson
804	Daniella Karidi	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
805	soup Federici	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
806	Jeffrey Ringer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sincerely, Jeffrey Ringer
807	Nicole Ostrander	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Nicole Ostrander Sent from my iPhone
808	Debra Smith	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Debra Smith Debrasmith4439@gmail.com 818-634-9559
809	Phil Erenberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
810	Rachelle Rosten	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Rachelle Rosten Executive Managing Director, Master Trust & Probate Division Douglas Elliman Real Estate 150 El Camino Drive #150 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 CalBRE # 01255977 Mobile 310-710-5151 rachellerosten@me.com
811	Robin Barris	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
812	Laura Whipple	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
813	Jennifer Messer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
814	Amir Jacoby	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
815	Jeff Filgo	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Jeffrey Filgo
816	Laurel Mintz	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Laurel Mintz J.D./M.B.A (she/her) CEO Elevate My Brand 818.452.9880 x 102 ABOUT SERVICES WORK BLOG PODCAST WEBINAR
817	Paul Da Silva	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
818	patricia marlatt	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
819	patricia marlatt	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
820	Dickerson, Justin	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
821	Paul Hollombe	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
822	Amy Pell	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Amy Pell 818-516-3422 amy@amypell.com Coldwell Banker Realty 301 N. Canon Drive, Suite E Beverly Hills, CA 90210 BRE# 01438754
823	CHRISTOPHER CULLITON	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Handcrafted on an artisanal iPhone.
824	Geoffrey Berens	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
825	Alex Izbicki Real Estate	To Whom It May Concern: I want to state the following.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Alex Izbicki Broker-Associate Re/Max One 2023 Re/Max Hall of Fame Honoree (818)613-0177 (949)554-5523 Email: alexforhomes@gmail.com Website: www.callalex.com Lic# 00993482 Since 1988
826	Michael Fields	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone Sorry for any typos due to Siri not listening to me....
827	Phil Flores	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
828	Juan Moreno	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
829	Bryan Gorog	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
830	Juan Moreno	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
831	Stephanie K	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Get Outlook for iOS

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
832	Kyrie Bass	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
833	Amber	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Burbank resident loving under flight path of both departing and arriving flights, Amber
834	Will Vogt	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Will Vogt Managing Director Crescent Canyon Management Construction 6380 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1600 Los Angeles, CA 90048 Office: 310-338-0500 Direct: 323-633-3565 www.crescent-canyon.com
835	Artin Babayan	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
836	Artin Babayan	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. 818-370-1933 NMLS# 304962 13412 Ventura Blvd #220 Sherman Oaks, Ca. 91423 Juniper Financial LLC DBA Premier Plus Lending NMLS # 2444946, Equal Housing Lender. CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this email communication (including any attachment(s)) is strictly confidential and intended solely for the person or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, distribution, reproduction, or other use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return email and permanently delete this communication (including any attachment(s)) from your system. CONTRACT NOTICE: Nothing within this email communication, including the signature block, should be construed as forming a contract, binding an offer, establishing acceptance, or constituting a signed agreement.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The author of this email communication is not authorized, and has no intent, to make offers or enter into contracts or agreements via email communications.
837	Rose	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best to you, Rose 818.406.6465 rose@homeopathyway.com
838	lilavati sharma	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
839	DAG	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. DAG 626-610-6101 www.dagmusic.net
840	Barbara	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
841	Casey Brumels	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
842	Gail Robins	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Gail Robins 3954 Ventura Canyon Ave Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
843	Heather Lea Gerdes	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you, Heather Lea Gerdes
844	Renee Mackler	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Renee Mackler
845	Fay Bass	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
846	Ms. Robinson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Ms. Robinson
847	Larry Peitzman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
848	Carol Rosenblum	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
849	Jacqueline Krause Fecske	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Jacqueline Krause Fecske, Broker Woodbridge Estates Inc. CA DRE# 01441109 818.414.6898 Cell
850	RICHARD HULL	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
851	Debbie Llewelyn	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Debbie Llewelyn Sherman Oaks
852	Adele Cygelman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Adele Cygelman 9750 Yoakum Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210 Adele Cygelman acygelman@gmail.com 310.205.0502
853	Cynthia Hart	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best, Cynthia Hart Hart Designs 310-713-2882
854	Nicholas Matus	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
855	Mimi Steinbauer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. MIMI STEINBAUER RADIANT FILMS INTERNATIONAL President 303 North Glenoaks Blvd., Suite 200 Burbank, CA 91502 Office: +1 310 601 2726 Mobile: +1 310 614 3541 mimi@radiant-films.com www.radiant-films.com
856	Tyler Ganus	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Tyler Ganus Cell: (818) 731-6978 Northwestern Baseball
857	Denise Eliot	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
858	Nancy Valen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Nancy Valen Sent from my iPhone
859	Ferdinand Fam	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Ferdinand Fam
860	Gary Alter	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Gary J. Alter, M.D.
861	Jim Leserman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
862	LisaBay Santiago	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for your understanding. Sincerely, LisaBay
863	Alana Garrop	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. The Sherman Oaks community will be negatively impacted by these airport changes. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alana -- Alana Garrop 818-681-9713 alanabgarrop@gmail.com www.linkedin.com/in/alanagarrop
864	Cynthia Schwieger	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
865	Lars Brauer	I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
866	Edward Singer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
867	Kathy Nelson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kathy Nelson Kathy Nelson Company

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		1-310-995-4004
868	Justine Lieberman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thanks, Justine Lieberman Real Estate Agent Team Lieberman Los Angeles DRE#: 02062251 Compass m: 818.535.4266 call/text e: justine.lieberman@compass.com
869	Miles Kristman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
870	scott teeple	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR’s Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
871	Judith Raminfar	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Judith Raminfar
872	Virginia O'Brian	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. I am not able to have a conversation in my backyard as planes fly over. I am at the top of Benedict Canyon Dr. at Mulholland. This seems to get worse every year and the aircraft get louder. Virginia O'Brian 3195 Benedict Canyon Dr. Beverly Hills, CA 90210
873	Ian Slotin	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
874	Crystal C. Beecher	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
875	Jennifer Gal	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
876	Daniel Han	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
877	Dr. John T. Walker PhD	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Dr. John T. Walker P.hD. 818.980.9497
878	Rose	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best to you, Rose 818.406.6465 rose@homeopathyway.com
879	Mike Chambers	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
880	Nick Vincent	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you.
881	Carla Barr	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
882	Tatiana Santa Cruz	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Tatiana Santa Cruz 3104655479
883	LORRAINE STERMAN	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
884	Leslie & Michael Zinberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Leslie & Michael Zinberg Please excuse any typos.
885	Monali Misra	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Monali Misra 3053 Hutton Drive, Beverly Hills, CA, 90210
886	Phil Erenberg	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
887	Laurissa James	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
888	Stephanie Baio	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Stephanie Baio 3636 Goodland Drive Studio City, 91604
889	Steve Pechter	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		----- Sent from my mobile phone so please excuse any typos or misspellings. Steve Pechter Office: (818) 501-3768 Mobile: (818) 519-3754 Email: spechter@gmail.com
890	Dan Frater	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
891	Parents In Partnership	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
892	Richard Hull	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. ***** Richard Hull
893	Lucie Ayres	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Lucie Ayres
894	Margot Hutchings	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
895	Kristen Vossler	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone Kristen Vossler
896	April Prosser	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
897	Helo Zink	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
898	Ari	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
899	Evelyn Shapero	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
900	m kash	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
901	midweek-08morgen@icloud.com	To Whom It May Concern: My family and I are directly impacted by the FAA’s irresponsible actions with regard to BUR and I am submitting the following comment. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
902	David Brown	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
903	Kevin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kevin
904	Julia Bricklin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
905	Fox Newby	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
906	Arman Zatikyan	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best Regards Arman Zatikyan
907	Annie Fitzgerald	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
908	Brea Brumels	Annie Fitzgerald To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
909	Barbara Nichols	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
910	Joe Regis	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need"

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Joe Regis 310-890-8977
911	Wanda McDaniel	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Wanda McDaniel Executive Vice President Entertainment Industry Communications Worldwide Giorgio Armani Corporation 436 North Rodeo Drive

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Beverly Hills, CA 90210 T 310 271 5555 C 310 612 0333 F 310 271 9571 wmcdaniel@giorgioarmani.com
912	Shirley Stamen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Shirley Stamen 51 year resident ARBY Drive Beverly Hills Ca 90210 *strong noise and vibrations through entire house every day! Sent from my iPhone
913	Oscar Sanchez	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
914	budandvic1@sbcglobal.net	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
915	Julie Stern	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
916a	Cynthia Bain's Young Actor Studio	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: 1. PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. 2. FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. 3. LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. 4. USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. 5. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. 6. FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that the BURBANK AIRPORT ITSELF, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
916b	Cynthia Bain	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016- 2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BURBANK AIRPORT ITSELF, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kind Regards, Cynthia Cynthia Bain Owner at ★ Cynthia Bain's Young Actor Studio E cynthia@cynthiabain.com W www.cynthiabain.com IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies thereof.
917	francola@sbcglobal.net	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android
918	cynbain	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
919	Robert Shabkie	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
920	Trudy Green	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
921	Hamilton Trust	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Hamilton Trust 9819 Easton Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210 Sent from my iPhone
922	Bill Ehrlich	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for addressing this issue! Bill Ehrlich
923	Katina Trotsuk	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. S
924	DEBORAH LAKEMAN	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
925	Bonnie Schut	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
926	Gina Resnick	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
927	David King Lassman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, David King Lassman
928	Victoria Bullock	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best, Victoria
929	Dana Ward	To Whom It May Concern: Stop the madness! I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Dana Ward
930	Marjorie Coster-Praytor	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
931	Shigeko Coster	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
932	Jim & Marjorie Praytor	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
933	Kristi Hall Stern	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
934	Julia Badham	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPad
935	Judith Parker	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
936	Lester Bass	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
937	JO ANNA KORNGUTE	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. I'd like you to consider that I have been living in my home for 33 years not one airplane unless it was a private plane or a police helicopter news helicopter ever went over my beautiful backyard with my pool now the planes are flying solo I can identify what carriers there are, and I'm sure they're dropping fuel all over my garden doesn't even look good And it's stressing me out. It shakes my house they're very low stay in the valley get off of my hill I'm a mile south of Mulholland at 2617 Deep Canyon Dr. thank you very much get your planes out of the skies they don't belong here this is LA we're not BURBANK. Thank you. Jo Anna KORNGUTE Hall LOVE ALWAYS HURT NEVER
938	Jen Dickerson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
939	Marykate Harris	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Marykate Harris Studio City CA Sent using Zoho Mail
940	Geoffrey Berens	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
941	David Kadin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for your consideration. David Kadin, 1611 San Ysidro Dr., Beverly Hills, CA 90210.
942	Brian Moreno	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Brian Moreno Los Angeles resident
943	Sandy Patten	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sandy Patten 818-970-8986
944	David Kadin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my mobile phone.
945	s ross	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer
946	Lucien Lacasse	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
947	Shelly Gilad	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
948	Nancy V	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Nancy V Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
949	Mark V. Phillips	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
950	Mason Newton	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Mason Newton Studio City
951	Douglas	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
952	Randy Feldman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
953	Boni Gellis	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPad
954	C K	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
955	Boni Gellis	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPad
956	Donald Fenning	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Stop worrying more about aviation interests over the quality of life for the residents of the area,,, Shameful Donald Fenning
957	Frances Hagan	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
958	Kevin Keyser	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kevin Keyser Los Angeles
959	Jackie Spicer	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
960	Don Fair	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
961	Amy Higgins	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
962	Amy Higgins	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
963	amy higgins	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
964	Ezra Dweck	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thanks -Ezra Via <--device
965	Charter	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
966	Alan Kaye	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Alan Kaye 310.277.9400

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
967	cynbain	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
968	Laura croft	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
969	Petra Tulic	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Petra Tulic Toluca Lake, CA
970	Cindy Sanders	To Whom It May Concern: Please take this to heart for our health and safety and to reduce THE NOISE LEVEL.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Cindy Sanders 4225 Mary Ellen Avenue #302 Studio City, CA 81604 newse825@aol.com
971	Nicole Kent	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for your time, Nicole Kent Studio City California Resident Nicole Kent nickent@mac.com
972	Terri Larronde	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Terri Larronde 810 Kemp Street Burbank CA 91505
973	Tony Knight	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
974	Martha Morrison	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
975	Martha Morrison	To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
976	David Kadin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sent from my mobile phone.
977	Gabrielle Chamberlin	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
978	Edith Becker	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies. We provide an alternative below that Burbank Airport supports as well. We oppose ALL of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular, PURPOSE AND NEED This Environmental Assessment (EA) fails to evaluate accurately the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. – THERE IS A FALSE BASELINE

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA ADMITTED in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR overhead air paths had occurred. Today's EA studied flights from calendar year 2022! That is three years AFTER the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017 were made - which moved departing BUR flights over two nautical miles SOUTH of the historic previous years paths. These shifts have NEVER BEEN STUDIED OR RECTIFIED. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded they made earlier, thereby creating a false baseline. LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts" but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. – USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts --we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017;

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		(2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B with required modifications. Alternative B is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required modifications and changes In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the Environmental Assessment and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Edith Becker Sherman Oaks 818-986-8640
979	C. Cram	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
980	Stephanie Wescott	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you. Stephanie W. Burbank Resident effected by 2016-2017 fight path shift, prior to which no planes were seen or heard at my home (which is why I chose this location in 2012)
981	Marge Morris	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3)

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
982	Beau Kochsiek	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
983	Robin Middleton	I could not find how to submit my comments online, so I am emailing my comments below to you. ***** Please regulate the flights arriving and departing out of VNY and BUR airports. Over the last three years, the increased air traffic and resulting air traffic noise over Sherman Oaks has increased greatly, becoming unbearable. The noise has resulted in disrupted sleep and stressful living conditions. Departing planes out of VNY fly over my home at all hours of the night and are often non-stop

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		throughout the day. I am constantly being awakened by loud planes flying over my home. Voluntary quiet hours were established between 11 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., but they are often ignored. I have been awakened innumerable times in the early morning hours and cannot get back to sleep. Also, I cannot enjoy being outside during the day because of the non-stop onslaught of the air traffic noise. I have lived in Studio City and Sherman Oaks for over 30 years, and I have never experienced this amount of air traffic over my home before. I believe it was in March 2023 that VNY agreed to return to its previous protocol of having departing planes turn over the Sepulveda Basin. For a short time, the air above my home was less congested, but, unfortunately, BUR must have seen the opportunity to fill that open air space with BUR flights because I started experiencing Southwest Airlines planes flying low over my home! Previously, I only had to deal with VNY air traffic. Now, I was having to deal with BUR traffic, too?? During one particular morning in January 2024, 11 flights flew over my home in a short 45 minute period. The noise from the planes was nerve wracking and totally disrupted our attempted enjoyment of outside activities. The constant barrage of noise from these planes was extremely disturbing, and we had to move back indoors. Unfortunately, being back inside the house only helped slightly. When I checked the WebTrak site, during this particular time, not a single plane had turned over the Sepulveda Basin. Zero planes had turned over the Sepulveda Basin, yet 11 planes had turned further south over our residential area. In 45 minutes. The frequency of flights is common. In the FAA’s Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport Draft Environmental Assessment dated November 30, 2023, Section 4.8.6 Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use states: “Furthermore, significant increases in noise exposure would generally occur in heavily developed areas, where newly introduced aircraft noise would be part of a patchwork of ambient urban noise making it less discernable.” I disagree strongly with this statement. Can you have a glass full of water and think that if you pour more water into the glass that nothing will happen? That no water is going to spill out of the glass and make a mess all over your counter? If noise reaches a certain level, additional noise might be the proverbial “straw that breaks the camel’s back.” The increased noise becomes more than one can safely tolerate. This level has been surpassed for many of us in Sherman Oaks and the surrounding areas. Please do something about the increased air traffic noise over Sherman Oaks. Please regulate the number of

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flights, the flight paths, the flight hours, the decibels ... anything that will help mitigate the noise pollution caused by the increased air traffic over Sherman Oaks and the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Thank you for your help with this matter. Best regards, Robin Middleton Robin Middleton
984	Tom McWilliams	To Whom It May Concern: I have owned my home in Studio City for 23 years. I am selling my house and moving. Departure traffic from Burbank Airport has been re-routed directly over my home. Now, every morning at 7:02am my room shutters and I am awakened by the first flights of the day to take off from the airport. Then the onslaught begins; 7 days a week. I have never experienced insomnia in my life. Now I suffer gravely from it because I cannot sleep once I have been awakened by the planes flying overhead, often right after one another. I own my own business and have worked out of my home-office successfully the entire time I have resided here. When the flights first started coming over my house with no prior notice, they were overshadowed by the challenges of the pandemic and my losing many clients to the economic and health crises. Now that my work is thriving again, I am distracted all day by the flights that head straight for my office window and interrupt my work. Between the distractions and fatigue from many months of living with insomnia, my work has suffered greatly, and my clients seem to have become aware of my new decline in work performance. I need to relocate in order to regain my quality of life, good health and to salvage my business. Unfortunately, I cannot afford to relocate within California, so I am forced to move out of the state that I grew up in and have lived in my entire life. I did not buy a home under a major airport low-altitude traffic lane, but now I must sell that same house that is plagued with deafening noise and home rumbling all day long into the night. I have built up equity in my home over 23 years, and I fear that my home value has been decimated by this cruel assault on the public by the FAA and airlines. I submit this with a small hope that citizens and homeowners will be remedied from this harmful and drastic change in Studio City living, but I am skeptical that any priority will be given to the residents over the powerful lobby from airlines and a myopic view and respect for us residents. For this reason, I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Tom McWilliams
985	Steven Rosenwasser	My wife Kelli Sager and I fully support the comment submitted by the Benedict Hills Estates Association and the Benedict Hills HOA. We have lived in Benedict Canyon for more than 20 years. One of the things that attracted us to the area was the tranquil, rural nature of the canyon. However, in around 2010, we began noticing low-flying planes making U-turns over us. In the years since then, flight activity has gotten worse. These days, we are woken up by those planes and are subjected to a steady stream of them the rest of the day. It is a constant assault of noise and pollution. In 2012, I joined with neighbors to protest against the flight paths moving south over our neighborhood. In July 2013, I was one of the concerned residents who attended the meeting with the FAA at their Hawthorne office. At that meeting, we presented the FAA with flight logs, petitions, letters from many canyon homeowners, and a lawn furniture cushion saturated with jet fuel soot. We told the FAA of our personal experiences with the low-flying planes. And we explained the danger and harm caused by the increase in low-flying aircraft over the canyon. The FAA told us that the problem was a perceptual one, and that there had been no changes in the way the planes were being flown. We now know from the Landrum & Brown study

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		that what the FAA told us was incorrect, and that we were experiencing what is now referred to as the “southern shift”. In 2014, the FAA issued a formal announcement that the existing flight procedures in the Southern California Metroplex airspace were outdated and inefficient, and that they were initiating an environmental assessment in connection with implementing NextGen. My HOA, and our neighbors’ HOA, sent comments to the FAA reiterating the points that had been raised at the July 2013 meeting. The HOAs also hired aviation expert Barry Yurtis, who proposed departure routes that followed the freeways as much as possible. However, the NextGen routes that the FAA announced and implemented disregarded the routes Yurtis proposed, and have perpetuated the constant stream of planes over our homes. In October 2016, our HOAs filed suit, alleging that they had requested curved departures from VNY and BUR that would make use of the freeway system to minimize noise impacts, not only on Benedict Canyon, but on other noise-sensitive areas of the San Fernando Valley and the Hollywood Hills, and that failing to adopt those routes was inconsistent with the goals of the NextGen program. The HOAs participated with the FAA in court-supervised mediation for a year and a half, resulting in a Settlement Agreement that provided that flights departing BUR’s southern runway would be turned north as soon as practicable by air traffic control. To get the HOAs to agree to the settlement, the FAA provided a January 2018 Noise Screen, which showed the predicted flight paths and their noise and emissions impact under the proposed agreement. According to the FAA, under the Settlement Agreement, the flight paths would be dispersed, and most aircraft would fly north of, or along, the 101 freeway before being vectored to the waypoints in the north valley. In reliance on that analysis, the Boards of Directors of both HOAs approved the Settlement Agreement. However, at around the same time, the FAA implemented the new NextGen departure routes that the HOAs had sued to stop, which caused many people to think mistakenly that there was some connection between the two, and that the Settlement Agreement caused the NextGen departure routes that are harming all of us. Despite the HOAs’ repeated requests to the FAA, they have refused to allow disclosure of the January 2018 Noise Screen. That document should be made publicly available. In 2019, I attended a meeting with the FAA’s representatives, at which they said that the draft EA would update the January 2018 Noise Screen. It does not do that. In fact, the draft EA disregards the main provision of the Settlement Agreement: that flights departing BUR’s southern runway will be turned north as soon as practicable by air traffic control. The FAA should live up to its agreements. It should provide an alternative that complies with the Settlement Agreement; that rids Benedict Canyon of the dangerous, low-flying stream of planes; that gets planes to vectoring altitude as soon as possible; and that puts departing flights as close as

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		possible to freeways and non-residential areas that are less noise-sensitive. Respectfully submitted, Steven Rosenwasser 9729 Moorgate Rd. Beverly Hills, CA 90210
986	Mike Tova	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION
987	Anthony Stypinski	Dear FAA: I'm writing to object to your proposal in this matter. We have suffered for over 10 years with southbound aircraft taking off flying over our community. We negotiated a settlement with you but your proposed Alternative A is not what our community negotiated, and our family is opposed to it. We maintain the following: • The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop as is interferes with our quiet enjoyment of our property, as it does for all neighborhoods in our community.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• The FAA should implement the flight procedures your agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. • Please make public your 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. I appreciate your attention to this matter. Sincerely, Anthony Stypinski 3139 Deep Canyon Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210-1035
988	Charlex Vaziri	It is of utmost importance that the FAA and local communities continue the efforts to refine and tailor the flight paths and protocols that have impacted the communities greatly in recent years. Alternative A has flaws and deficiencies that have been pointed out. Alternative B also seems to miss some important refinements. The stakeholders of the affected communities are confident and optimistic that the ongoing discussions with the FAA can bring a breakthrough scenario for optimized flight operations. As a stakeholder myself, I take great pride in witnessing the progress being made in this matter. May all parties find great fulfillment in this process, and reflect on the profound impact these discussions have on the citizenry of this great country. Respectfully, Charles Vaziri
989	Jacuzzi 25	To Whom It May Concern: I am awakened every morning at 7 a.m., so I cannot get enough sleep. When I am outside and see a plane, I cannot hear what the person next to me is saying, the air and noise pollution is considerable where I live in Studio Village in Studio City. I would hope that the plane paths can be diverted as to not devalue my property, my health, and my joy of living in Studio City, CA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION Sent from Mail for Windows
990	Juliana Sampson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Section 4.7 on the Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice fails to accurately report how many people fall into the low socioeconomic areas that are unaware, under-educated, non English speaking and powerless to write a response to this EA and to fight for their rights against noise and air pollution that exceeds tolerable human levels. The FAA has not done any outreach to these low socioeconomic areas to obtain their input when these disenfranchised populations are unable to make their voices heard. A mailer with return postage should have been sent to the entire area affected by the changes at the airport for the people to respond to via mail, along with a telephone number hotline for people to call into to express their opinions in case they cannot write or are disabled. The EA does not take into consideration the opinions of the lower socioeconomic groups thereby depriving them of the opportunity to speak for themselves against noise pollution and cancer-causing contaminants. As such, this EA has not been adequately circulated for comment. In Chapter 5, it states that the FAA did outreach to all ‘consulting’ parties. These parties are not the low socioeconomic and disabled populations that require special noticing and opportunities to be heard. As described above, all parties in the affected area, every single household, should have been sent mailers with an opportunity to respond with pre-postage paid cards and telephone hotlines to call into. I am sure the FAA consulted with the major airlines and their representatives while deciding to implement these new procedures. They did not consult the low socioeconomic communities of people affected by these changes and this constitutes discrimination and racism against the people by a Federal Agency. -- Juliana Sampson
991	Susan Davidson	Susan & Dr. Robert Davidson 9646 Wendover Dr. Beverly Hills, CA 90210 310-278-5182 sbd0742@gmail.com To the FAA: We have occupied our home in Benedict Canyon, in the Benedict Hills HOA since 1975. We purchased our

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		home because of the country and rural feel, the quiet and the natural setting. Over fifteen years ago, we noticed the increase in airplane traffic over our area. The number of planes increased and they were flying low at almost the highest point in the Santa Monica Mountains. Not only were planes flying over our homes, because we frequently spent time hiking in Franklin Canyon Park, we also noticed an increase in airplane traffic over the park. The results of this increase in low flying aircraft was of course noise, which often prevented conversations and a tremendous increase in particulate matter coating everything. As a retired teacher of high school biology and chemistry I knew how detrimental this particulate material, consisting of hydrocarbons, is to all living things and to our homes. As a concerned homeowner living in Benedict Hills , I participated in meetings with the FAA in July of 2013. Now after litigation, and negotiations that concluded six years ago, we are still suffering from the effects of these totally ridiculous flight paths, and the literal “fall out” from incessant airplane traffic over our area. This letter is in support of the Benedict Hills HOA and the Benedict Estates HOA comment that has been sent to you. Susan Davidson
992	Sivan Barkhordarian	To whom it may concern, The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop. We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible. The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths. We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft. Thank you for your time, Sivan Barkhordarian
993	Bob Graziano	To Whom it May Concern: I have been a resident of Beverly Hills PO for 25 years and have seen first hand the change in aircraft over our home. The planes now fly over us from early morning until late at night and quite low to our home. Last weekend, I hosted a post-LA Marathon gathering in our backyard and the intense noise from the airplanes flying overhead was palpable. This is a significant change over the last decade. I know there was a settlement agreement in place negotiated by many of the affected residents — please honor it! • The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop. • We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. • The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. • We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. • The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths. • We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. • The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft. Bob Graziano Bob Graziano 3178 Hutton Drive rvgraz@gmail.com
994	Wendy Wachtell	To Whom it May Concern: I have been a resident of Beverly Hills PO for 25 years and have seen first hand the change in aircraft over our home. The planes now fly over us from early morning until late at night and quite low to our home. This is a significant change over the last decade. I know there was a settlement agreement in place negotiated by many of the affected residents — please honor it. • The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop. • We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible. • The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. • The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. • We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. • The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths. • We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. • The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft. Wendy Wendy Wachtell 3178 Hutton Drive Wwachtell@gmail.com Sent from my iPad
995	Brian and Katie Jacobs	To whom it may concern, Please do what you can to illuminate added pollution to canyons in all of our neighborhoods. I realize how difficult it is to change but if we do not change then we are just perpetuating the cycle.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop. • We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible. • The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. • The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. • We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. • The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths. • We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. • The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutant Thank you for your consideration, Kind regards, Brian and Katie Jacobs
996	Carrie Williams	• The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible. • The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. • The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. • We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. • The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths. • We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. • The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft. Carrie Williams Carriegreenberg@yahoo.com Sent from my iPhone
997	Robert Mann	To Whom it may concern: Attached kindly find the response of Save Our Canyons to the FAA’s Draft Environmental Assessment. SAVE OUR CANYON

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		March 23, 2024 Via Email: 9-AJO-BUR-Community-Involvement@faa.gov PUBLIC COMMENT OF SAVE OUR CANYONS REGARDING THE FAA’S DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT RE; DEPARTURE PROCEDURE FROM BURBANK AIRPORT To Whom It May Concern: Save Our Canyons (“SOC” joins with and supports the comments of the Benedict Hills Homeowners Association in particular and more generally the many other organizations and individuals opposing all the Alternatives presented in the FAA’s Draft Environmental Assessment (“DEA”). The DEA is not only based on demonstrably false assumptions and demonstrably untrue statements of “fact,” it also ignores the settlement reached with the Benedict Hills HOA that requires departing flights to be turned Northward “as soon as possible,” and replaces this previously agreed upon procedure (and historic practice) with an untenable and illegal further Southward drift of flights directly over Benedict Canyon, a quiet residential community nearly 14 miles away from the Burbank Airport. We make particular note of the following illogical, unmeritorious and frankly, untruthful statements in the DEA: 1. The justification upon which the FAA repeatedly relies in the DEA is that of “safety.” The FAA claims, without evidence, that turning departing flights Northward as soon as possible, and maintaining departures over the 101 freeway would result in unsafe conflicts with other aircraft, especially incoming aircraft into Burbank Airport. This is simply false. For over 40 years incoming flights have maintained and still maintain the same flight path. For the same period of time, until the Southward Drift took place, departing flight stayed over the 101 Freeway or North of the 101 freeway. In 40 years there was no safety concern. There is no legitimate safety concern at this time. This “safety” concern is simply a fabrication, created by the FAA to cloak its abuse of discretion in terms intended to justify an otherwise untenable position. 2. The FAA, by its own Rules and Regulations, is not permitted to solve aviation issues by moving noise from one community to another community. However, that is exactly what the FAA has done and exactly what the FAA proposes in the DEA. The FAA seeks to excuse this flagrant Rules violation by concluding that the noise levels in Benedict Canyon do not rise to the level that they are a concern. In this regard, the FAA concludes that

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the noise levels created by departing flights over Benedict Canyon are not more than the level of normal conversation between two people inside a quiet residence. This conclusion is so appallingly contrary to the facts that one must question the good faith of those who allowed this position to be asserted in the DEA. One need only to spend a few hours in Benedict Canyon to realize that departing aircraft are so loud that residents, both indoors and outdoors, have to pause conversations until the flights have left the area---because it is too noisy to have a normal conversation or to work outdoors without interruption. The particular topography of the canyons makes this problem even worse because the sounds echoes off the hillsides and effectively increases in volume. In addition, because Mulholland Drive is approximately 880 feet above sea level, and because the departing flights are extremely low as they gradually turn North, this condition makes the flights effectively lower than if they were departing over flat land. 3. The DEA concludes, without evidence, that the alternative of turning flights Northward as soon as possible, and keeping flights well North of Mulholland Drive (e.g., over the 101 freeway) is not a viable alternative. The FAA has no evidence or analysis to support this conclusion. It is obvious to anyone, even to a person without any aviation expertise, that the FAA had a desired result in mind before the DEA was drafted and the DEA is simply an attempt to throw manufactured “evidence” out to the public in order to justify the FAA’s pre-ordained result. This is not only intellectually dishonest, it also demonstrates that the FAA has no regard for the rights of citizens on the ground, the facts or the truth. The noise from departing aircraft from both Burbank and Van Nuys airports has destroyed the quiet nature of our community and the canyon and hillside environment. We believe that it is causing serious health problems at both a physical and psychological level. Our homes and backyards are covered with black soot from the exhaust of jet engines. The literature is clear that this particulate matter contains carcinogens and the destructive nature of fine particulates is well known in scientific circles. At the same time, the residents of our community did not knowingly and voluntarily elect to purchase homes near an airport with an awareness of the noise and pollution that results from close proximity to a busy airport facility. We live 14 miles away, not next door the Burbank Airport. It is unreasonable that our community is now exposed to, on average, more than 65 flights per day, starting at 6:30 a.m. and (especially from Van Nuys Airport), continuing throughout the night. On average, it takes about 90 seconds for the noise to rise and fall as an aircraft flies over Benedict Canyon. That might not sound like much, but when you multiply it by 65 flights per day, that’s more than 97 minutes of concentrated noise every single day. That means that more than 1.5 out of every 24 hours a day is filled with noise that is so loud that normal life comes to a halt. That equates to nearly 550 hours a year of intolerable noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The FAA needs to understand how destructive these flights paths are and the FAA needs to honestly assess the environmental and other detriments that it has created. If the FAA does so in a transparent and scientifically sound manner, we are confident that the FAA will realize that all of their proposed Alternatives are in fact untenable and the FAA will return to the simple goal of keeping flights over the 101 Freeway and turning them Northward as soon as possible. Very truly yours, Save Our Canyons By /s/ Robert Mann, Vice President
998	Travis Longcore	Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th St Des Moines, WA 98198 To Whom It May Concern: The noise analysis presented in the above-referenced document does not meet scientific standards or best practices to evaluate impacts on wildlife. The approach, using DNL average noise levels, is intended for evaluating impacts on humans and is useless for understanding wildlife impacts. The EA admits as much on page 3-32 (noting the DNL metric is used to measure the effects of noise on humans). But because of the use of DNL figures and not a metric relevant to wildlife (see refs in attached pdf), there is in fact no analysis of the impacts of noise on wildlife in the EA, making it fatally flawed as an informational document under NEPA. The impacts of intermittent and chronic noise on wildlife are well-described and species show sensitivity at far lower values than those for disturbance to humans. The proposed EA does not properly reference or incorporate the state of knowledge on noise impacts on wildlife and consequently the conclusions about impacts to both wildlife and public park lands are unsupported by substantial evidence. Please see attached pdf for a brief summary of relevant issues. By way of background and credential, I am a professor of environmental science and a Certified Senior Ecologist. I have extensive experience with environmental impact analysis, including the impacts of lights and noise on wildlife. This EA fails at the most basic level of describing the character and changes in noise from the proposed project.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Sincerely, Travis Longcore, Ph.D. — Travis Longcore, Ph.D. (310) 247-9719 tlongcore@mac.com www.travislongcore.net <i>Editor’s Note: This comment included three attachments (articles titled “A synthesis of two decades of research documenting the effects of noise on wildlife,” “The effects of anthropogenic noise on animals: a meta-analysis,” and “Adverse Impacts of Airplane Noise on Wildlife in the Eastern Santa Monica Mountains and San Fernando Valley.”) The attachments are not specific comments on the DEA, and not included here. The original comment is available upon request in the format in which it was received.</i>
999	Benedict Canyon Assoc BCA <info@benedictcanyonassociation.org>	www.benedictcanyonassociation.org March 23, 2024 Via email: 9-AJO-BUR-Community-Involvement@faa.gov PUBLIC COMMENT OF THE BENEDICT CANYON ASSOCIATION REGARDING THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION’S DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT DEPARTURE PROCEDURE AMENDMENTS FOR HOLLYWOOD BURBANK AIRPORT (FAA-2023-27143) To Whom It May Concern The Benedict Canyon Association (“BCA”) joins with, and supports the comments of, Save Our Canyon, LA, Benedict Hills Estates Association, Benedict Hills HOA, UproarLA, Studio City For Quiet Skies and the many other concerned organizations and individuals opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, the Benedict Canyon Association strongly opposes all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Benedict Canyon Association By /s/ David Kadin, President
1000	Tony Tucci	Dear Administration members and staff, Please accept and circulate CLAW's response letter (PDF attachment) to Burbank Airport's Draft Environmental Assessment which has a comment deadline of March 24, 2024. With appreciation, —TT Tony Tucci (he/him/his) Chair & Co-founder Citizens for Los Angeles Wildlife (CLAW) 12444 Ventura Blvd. Suite 205 Studio City, CA 91604 o. 818-821-6000 c. 310-968-6314 www.clawonline.org ----- June 23, 2024 Federal Aviation Administration Western Service Area 2200 S. 216th Street Des Moines, WA 98198 Via email: 9-AJO-BUR-Community-Involvement@FAA.GOV Re: Opposition to FAA 693KA9-18-D00005 - Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA)

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		To Whom It May Concern: Citizens for Los Angeles Wildlife (CLAW) is a non-profit environmental organization concerned with the wellbeing of wildlife and wildlife habitat for the City of Los Angeles and beyond. A citizenry of more than 5,000 individuals support our organization’s multiple calls for practices and policy to benefit biodiversity in LA City, County, California and the globe. CLAW asks that every step be taken to abate and avert noise from sensitive wildlife habitat, including the Santa Monica Mountains. Studies have consistently shown that aircraft noise can lead to negative impacts on wildlife, including lower reproductive success. Currently, Burbank Airport’s flight paths lead aircraft directly over acres of sensitive habitat areas. These regions have been identified and protected both federally (e.g. The Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area), and by local agencies (e.g. Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority). The Santa Monica Mountains is known to be habitat for both endemic and imperiled species, including the local mountain lion population, which receives protection as a candidate under the California Endangered Species Act. Mountain lions were not included among the four protected species listed in Section 3.3.3.3 of the DEA, despite numerous videos and photos of a mountain lion in the mountain areas between the 405 and 101 freeways, and a number of other known individuals west of the 405 and in the San Gabriel Mountains. More study should be given to the impacts of flight paths on mountain lions. Discussion of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in Section 3.3.3.5 is limited to bird strikes. However, a study in California on the effects of aircraft noise on birds found that birds built fewer nests and laid fewer eggs in noisier areas¹. Consideration needs to be given to the long term effects of such impacts, in addition to immediate effects such as bird strikes. The Eastern Santa Monica Mountains rise to an altitude of over 1,000 feet, which means that despite an aircraft’s climb from Burbank Airport below, it is still relatively close when it flies above the terrestrial animals who live in the mountains. The loudness is further exacerbated by the reverberation effects of the canyons throughout the mountain range. With such direct negative impacts taking place over critical habitat areas such as the Santa Monica Mountains, we believe wildlife is being affected by these flight paths in ways not mitigated by the DEA. CLAW joins the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		community in urging you to change the current flight paths in order to abate noise, and avert planes away from sensitive habitat areas to the fullest extent possible. Sincerely, Tony Tucci, Chair ¹ F. Awbrey, D. Hunsaker II. Effects of fixed-wing military aircraft noise on California gnatcatcher reproduction. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 102 (1997), p. 3177 CLAW is a public benefit non-profit 501(c)(3) environmental organization that works to protect and restore the environments of wildlife of Los Angeles and California from dwindling open spaces. Our mission is to promote, educate and protect the fundamental importance of wildlife, wildlife habitats and wildlife corridors everywhere.
1001	Roslyn Dahl	Please see attached letter with public comments in response to the FAA Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for BUR Airport - Draft EA dated November 30, 2023. FAA Order 1050.1F, 6-2.2(g) BUR Public Comments on Draft EA ----- BY EMAIL TO 9-AJO-BUR-Community-Involvement@FAA.GOV March 23, 2024 Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th St Des Moines, WA 98198 FAA Order 1050.1 F, 6-2.2(g), Public Comments on a Draft EA Re: FAA Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) - Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) dated November 30, 2023 To Whom It May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		This letter summarizes my response to the above-referenced Draft EA for BUR. A. STANDING AS RESIDENT IN THE IMPACTED COMMUNITY I am a resident of Sherman Oaks, CA and employed in the San Fernando Valley (SVF), CA. I am also a member of the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council (SONG) Airports Committee and the VNY Citizens Advisory Council, representing thousands of citizens highly impacted by SFV airports and air-traffic, including BUR and VNY. Prior to early 2018, any air-traffic and patterns over my residence in the Santa Monica Mountains, being 6 nautical miles southwest of BUR, were so nominal as to be neither noticeable nor result in any negative impact on our quality of life. Since the implementation of the SoCal Metroplex Nextgen RNAV procedures OROSZ and SLAPP, my residence has been subject to the repetitive direct overflight (or within 0.25 miles) of up to 200 jets from BUR daily and the unrelenting adverse noise, pollution, and adverse quality of life impacts this has introduced to our environment. The proposed OROSZ THREE/SLAPP THREE Alternative A departure amendments stand to impact my community and residence directly through the implementation of new waypoints that will eliminate any opportunity for dispersal which historically existed, further concentrating air traffic patterns over our homes, causing irreparable harm. Therefore, as a resident who will be adversely impacted by the outcome of the FAA's response to the Settlement Agreement negotiated with homeowner associations from other communities, I oppose the imposition of Alternative A amendments. Refer statement below articulating my responses to each Alternative/Proposal presented in the EA: B. STATEMENTS ON PROPOSED ACTION 1. ALTERNATIVE A -I oppose Alternative A as described in the BUR EA. • Historical departures out of BUR were not dictated by waypoints but rather carried an "open leg" and therefore implementing waypoints will not, holistically, or practically, better restore historical exposures or achieve greater dispersion sought by the community. It is unacceptable to implement waypoints to solve an issue for one community to the detriment of others who are suffering from the same issue. • Alternative A, which purports to be the Benedict Hills Homeowners Association (BHHA), Benedict Hills Estates Association, and the FAA Settlement Agreement is inaccurate because it fails to include the FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		agreed year of monitoring of ATC with reports to petitioners, after implementation of the new BUR departure procedure(s) as dictated in said agreement Section II. It does not satisfy the Settlement Agreement. - Alternative A also fails to include the FAA's agreement to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. Given the frequency and concentration of traffic patterns at distances 5-8 nautical miles southwest of BUR airport, when such concentration did not historically exist and for which FAA's own charts clearly depict a shift, it seems implausible that radar vectoring is occurring as soon as practicable. Indeed, during the entirety of the COVID-19 lockdown period when air traffic was at its lowest level in years with no observable conflicting traffic (or traffic even in the near vicinity of the BUR or VNY airports and within 12 NM visible), on traffic monitoring tools such as FlightAware, ATC continued to direct air traffic over our homes, deep into and south of the Santa Monica Mountains s.4(f) green space, many miles southwest from BUR airport before aircraft were vectored north. - As a participant in the SFV Taskforce meetings regarding BUR & VNY flight path concerns, the overwhelming majority of the participating communities impacted, and Taskforce member themselves, specifically rejected and opposed any BUR procedure that would result in the implementation of JAYTE & TEAGN waypoints. Nothing has changed. The FAA, as a federal body, has an ethical responsibility to all the citizens of the US to promote and advance actions that are equitable regardless of which neighborhood or community citizens may reside in. 2. ALTERNATIVE B - I request the FAA adopt with operational feasibility tests Alternative Band explore options for a further increased climb gradient. - As noted in the EA, climb gradients for OROSZ/SLAPP departures already significantly exceed 600ft per NM and have done so without safety incidents, and historically climbed at steeper rates under conventional procedures. As it is technically feasible and will bring relief to the vast majority of communities impacted today, the FAA should pursue amendment of procedures to integrate a higher climb rate. - It is irrelevant to restrict possible solutions for a noise abatement RNAV SID due to a low volume of General Aviation aircraft that already have existing alternative procedures to accommodate them. - The FAA implemented Nextgen RNAV procedures on the premise that it would reduce ATC workload and increase efficiency and safety. If altering an RNAV climb rate could potentially increase ATC workload, this is

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		just an offset to the time savings that should have already been captured in the RNAV solutions deployed to date. • If the BUR/VNY airspace is as congested as described by the FAA and others, the FAA should reallocate or hire additional ATC resources to this region. Further, if the airspace is so congested, outside of reducing air traffic itself which seems improbable, the obvious solution would be to require greater separation in BUR departures to relieve ATC workload. Indeed, the residents in the communities adversely impacted by the current BUR air traffic southerly departures strongly advocate for additional ATC training, resourcing, and monitoring to be devoted to this airspace to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable to alleviate the current issues. • Despite statements presented in the EA, there is no data made available to substantiate any conflicts with departures taking the VNY3 obstacle departure and being less than 3% of departures it cannot justify failure to implement a solution that could relieve thousands of residents of some of the current adverse impacts. 3. NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE - this is not an alternative; it is the current adverse state. • It can be called into question as to whether the 'No Action' alternative, should in fact be presented as an alternative, when it is only the '<i>current state</i>' - a state with new impacts that was never studied or presented to the public. This <i>current state</i> is a situation in which there has been a marked shift in BUR air traffic departure patterns and concentration well beyond 5 nautical miles southwest, deep into and beyond the Santa Monica Mountains s.4(f) protected green space before ATC vectoring of aircraft north. Many of the residences impacted today were not under a designated flight path per mandatory City home purchase disclosures, because they patently were not under a concentrated pattern of air traffic that would necessitate that specific disclosure until this southerly shift transpired. The appropriate true Alternative C to compare to Alternative A and B, would have been the historical conditions under conventional procedures - the dispersal, noise and impacts in that situation. While it is clearly understood that a return to conventional procedures is not an option and of course contrary to the RNAV concept itself, the investigation and further analysis of any other solutions that would either attempt to restore similar historical dispersal AND alleviate noise and other adverse impacts in any form using current technologies and flight techniques, should have and could have been done. For all the communities impacted by this southerly shift, including Sherman Oaks, CA, which is not a party to the Settlement Agreement, it therefore appears that a broader suite of solutions that might have resolved the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		same BUR departure issues to their benefit also were not studied or included in the EA. .. not because they may not be feasible, but because, as is repeatedly reaffirmed in the EA, the EA was only prepared to satisfy the 'purpose and need' of the Settlement Agreement, which front and center was the implementation of the JAYTE & TEAGN waypoints. • NEPA does not impose limits on the FAA's ability to analyze alternative flight path solutions that fall outside the 'purpose and intent' of the FAA's own Settlement Agreement with a select group of homeowner's associations. Instead, limiting the analysis of additional alternatives may indeed be contrary to NEPA governance in which other alternatives should have been studied. Further, Congress and NEPA, and widely accepted consensus is that efficiency shall not come at the expense of altered home environments or citizen health, safety, and well-being on the ground. • Alike, D.O.T. Section 4(f) also defines that efficiency shall not come at the expense of altered natural habitats, wetlands, parks, and other federally protected land - land such as the Santa Monica Mountains and other green space which is now directly under the heavy concentration of BUR departure air traffic patterns due to the southerly shift. There is no obvious indication that the FAA filed required s. 4(f) documents in respect to this EA or upon the implementation of NextGen in this area. C. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS • I ask that the FAA formally request directly of all Commercial Airlines utilizing BUR Airport, and their relevant management that have the authority and practical ability to impact Airline departure climb protocols, to implement the following noise abatement procedures: Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) but with ultimate "quiet climb" considerations to RAYVE (7000) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000) on OROSZ such as: • Maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practical (safe) but at minimum 3000 ft. • Other considerations as applicable: deck angle, KIAS, and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• Adopt with operational feasibility tests Alternative B per the EA and explore options for a further increased climb gradient. • Adhere to "Settlement Agreement" monitoring requirements only, without implementation of Alternative A waypoints, and provide BUR Airport, for public dissemination, quarterly reports for one (1) year of FAA monitoring of turn directives for SLAPP and OROSZ to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths which stakeholders believe arise from late turn directives or lack of ATC resources to execute timely directives. • Re-train ATC staff on early-turn requirements and conditions for turning north 'as soon as practicable'. Allocate additional ATC resources to the handling of BUR air traffic to closely monitor for early turns. Incentivize ATC resources and evaluate early turn compliance in performance reviews. • Reconsider simultaneous use of multiple headings to achieve optimal dispersal, through a radar vector procedure. • Reconsider wind knots thresholds to restore previous distribution of simultaneous departures heading North on RWY 15; another option for aircraft unable to meet increase climb gradients. • DO NOT implement Alternative A proposed amendments and waypoints JAYTE & TEAGN. Sincerely, Sherman Oaks, CA Resident
1002	Jeff Wachtel	To Whom It May Concern: I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. In particular, re: PURPOSE AND NEED. This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. Re: FALSE BASELINE. Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. Re: LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - Re: USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED. The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. Re: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS. The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. Re: FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES. The FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required changes. Thank you for your consideration. Jeff and Sheryl Wachtel
1003	Aunt Diva	As the BUR (EA) comment period draws to a close, this is one last entreaty for YES on Alternative A!! Please honor the provision cited below in the signed, dated, legal Settlement Agreement between the Federal Aviation Administration, Benedict Hills Estates Association, and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association. III. Miscellaneous Provisions Defense of this Agreement. The Parties agree to vigorously and actively defend this Agreement and all terms embodied herein as fair and reasonable and to vigorously and actively defend the same against any challenge by any individual or entity. The Parties further agree not to undermine directly or indirectly this Agreement or any terms set forth therein for so long as this Agreement remains in effect.
1004	Dr. Linda Makuta DDS	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		1. The planes fly so close over my house in the Encino Hills that it feels as if I were flying a kite that it would sweep it away or I could hit it with the kite. 2. The noise from so many planes flying so close to our homes in the Encino Hills can be extremely loud and jolting. It is a huge disturbance and the sound seems to echo through the hillside as I live near a canyon. Was there any research done to see how the noise gets amplified against the Hills? 3. I am a healthcare practitioner and I am concerned about the amount of air pollution that is caused by the airplanes flying so close in proximity to my home and the neighborhood of which I reside. The amount of toxic fumes coming from airplanes is very damaging to people, plants, animals, and the environment. When it is so close to my home, I feel like it can do some serious health damage. The FAA should be responsible for any negative outcome from any damage to people's health from having the planes fly so close to our homes or find a different way to fly through our skies. Regards, Dr. Linda Makuta DDS
1005	Alford, John for Congressman Brad Sherman	Please see the attached letter from Congressman Brad Sherman regarding the Draft EA for Proposed Departure Procedure Amendments for Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport. Regard, John Alford Office of Congressman Brad Sherman 818-501-9200 5000 Van Nuys Blvd. #420 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403-1791 ----- March 24, 2024 BRAD SHERMAN UNITED STATES CONGRESS PH: (202) 225,5911 FAX: (202) 225-5879 Hon. Michael Whitaker Administrator Federal Aviation Administration

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		800 Independence Avenue SW Washington, DC 2-591-0004 Ms. Larri Frelow Community Engagement Officer Southern California/ Arizona Office of the Regional Administrator (A WP-1) FAA Western-Pacific Region 777 S. Aviation Blvd., Suite #150 El Segundo, CA 90245 Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 S. 216th Street Des Moines, WA 98198 Re: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Bob Hope "Hollywood Burbank" Airport. Dear Administrator Whitaker and Ms. Larri Frelow, In December 2023, the FAA released the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Bob Hope "Hollywood Burbank" Airport (BUR). I am writing today on behalf of my constituents in the San Fernando Valley and the Santa Monica Mountains to express my concern that this much awaited EA offers no practical option which will undo the daily injury to quality of life caused by the FAA's previously implemented SLAPP TWO and OROSZ TWO flight procedures. Forced to determine the lesser evil among the proposals presented, only Alternative B appears to provide the opportunity for even minimal relief. It is important to remember that the proposed Departure Procedure Amendments described in this EA were prompted by the work of the Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force ("Task Force") of which my office was a non-voting participant and the "Settlement Agreement" entered by the FAA with two local Homeowners Associations. Importantly, the advocacy of both parties originated in opposition to the FAA's previous relocation of flights (along with attendant noise and pollution) without environmental review. This

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		was also the substance of the litigation brought by the City of Los Angeles in 2019, only to be dismissed on procedural grounds. In chorus, the community has advocated for mitigation of the concentrated "Southern Shift" in flight paths which resulted from the F AA's actions. Adjusting procedures to approximate historic flight paths remains both the advocacy of Hollywood Burbank Airport and Recommendation # 1 of the Task Force. It is disheartening to see the FAA discard this objective outright, citing "changed circumstances." It is all the more injurious when you consider that these changes were made by the FAA, without advance notice, environmental review, or community input. Also troubling, the FAA's analysis of the proposed procedures makes the familiar mistake of employing the inaccurate and ineffective Day-Night Average (DNL) metric to evaluate the anticipated noise suffered by the community below a given flight path. This same faulty metric was used to grant "Categorical Exclusion" (CATEX) to the SLAPP TWO and OROSZ TWO flight procedures in the first place. That this initial finding of "No significant Impact" was inaccurate is made clear by the thousands of residents in the San Fernando Valley and Santa Monica Mountains who rose up after it was implemented, organizing a Task Force which held public meetings over the course of nine months to address the injuries that followed the procedure's implementation. As I have cited in previous correspondence, the Government Accountability Office completed a review of the DNL metric in 2021, concluding that it "do[es] not provide a clear picture of the flight activity or associated noise levels at a given location." Moreover, Congress has offered its own directive, included in the FY23 Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies appropriations bill, which expressly instructs the FAA to reexamine these noise metrics. Seeking not to undo the damage already done and continuing to evaluate departure procedure options with the same mistaken metrics that created the problem, the FAA has offered the community seeking relief a three-way Hobson's choice. The community may continue to suffer the current injury of the FAA's actions with a "No Action" Alternative. Or they may suffer similarly under Alternative A, which the EA admits "will not materially change from current operations." Or the same injury may result from Alternative B, of which the EA notes, "when compared to the No Action Alternative, functional differences in how aircraft are expected to depart BUR are modest in Alternative B." Forced to choose, only Alternative B offers some hope for a modicum of relief. As the EA notes, "requiring aircraft to climb at a higher rate than the current procedure has the potential to ensure that aircraft gain altitude

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		as quickly as practicable." Even here the EA manages expectations, going on to report that the "operational feasibility" of this modification, "has not been determined at the time of the production of the EA." In summary, the proposed departure procedures presented in the EA fail to satisfy the reason for which they are under consideration. None address the "Southern Shift" in flight paths out of Burbank Airport, which continues to have detrimental impact on the environment and quality of life in the San Fernando Valley and the Santa Monica Mountains. Instead, citing faulty metrics, they offer only marginal variations of current departure procedures, which themselves have never undergone NEPA review. I stand ready to work with the FAA to advance the consideration of a broader set of strategies to address the situation it has created. To this, I and many of my colleagues in the House and Senate continue to urge the FAA to take immediate action to disperse air traffic, raise aircraft altitudes, and enforce nighttime curfews. You may reach John Alford in my district office at 818-501-9200 or john.alford@mail.house.gov if you have any questions or comments about the foregoing. Sincerely, BRAD SHERMAN Member of Congress
1006	Heather Lee	I have reviewed the environmental purposed departure procedures at Bob Hope Hollywood Burbank Airport. I have made the following assessments and attached the sections to which they refer. PURPOSE AND NEED 1. There is erroneous mention of controlling air traffic since Santa Monica Municipal Airport is going to close at the end of 2028—this needs to be accounted for in the flight patterns. Page 2-2 speaks to air traffic having a separation from other aircraft in and near the San Fernando Valley, including arrivals into Santa Monica Municipal Airport. The Santa Monica Municipal Airport is going to close at the end of 2028. The removal of air traffic from this airport will change the dynamic of air traffic and therefore change the environmental review stated herein. This should be mentioned and accounted for as a permutation in the alternatives. There should be an alternative on the heavy usage of Runway 15 – dispersion of the takeoffs from the other three runways as a result of the removal of the Santa Monica Airport and this alternative should be analyzed. It should also include such an analysis to actually demonstrate the impact of the Santa Monica air traffic, whether truly impactful or in fact negligible to the Burbank Airport’s activities.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		2. The terrain surrounding the Burbank airport has not changed since the opening of the airport in May of 1930, and cannot realistically be a reason to make adjustments to the flight pattern. Page 2-2 discusses the onboard RNAV capability of the aircraft and how aircraft are handled after departing the immediate Burbank airport including terrain and air traffic constraints. How and in which ways, has terrain – which has been the same since the construction of the Burbank airport in May of 1930 become a bigger constraint that previously? It has not become a bigger constraint and reference to it as a reason for the recent adjustments to the flight paths should not be considered since flights came and went from the airport for almost 90 plus years without the heavy use of the current air traffic paths used now. 3. There is no proof that pilots or air traffic control require new routing of aircrafts due to safety concerns. Burbank Air has had no major airline crashes out of airport since its inception. Thus changing the routes for this reason is obfuscation. Page 2-3 states that efficiency could include reduction of complexity for air traffic controllers and pilots. There is no proof that there has been jeopardy to air traffic control or pilots prior to the new routes being installed. Air traffic control and the pilots have had no major airline crashes out of Burbank airport. In fact, there have been a total of 10 crashes in the past 90 years which took place in small private aircraft and for various reasons, the crashes are unrelated to air traffic control. They are not the major jets that fly overhead causing the noise and pollution now. 4. The Air Quality analysis is inadequate, it does not include all the exposure in all possible situations. For example, there is no analysis of what happens when the pollutants are under 3,000 feet. Also there is no analysis of how the contaminates are affecting the people under or next to (on the mountains) the flight path of airplanes. Section 3.3.1 on Air Quality states that pollutants emitted above the mixing height are exempt from the General Conformity Rule and not considered in the air quality analysis. This is assumed to be 3,000 feet AGL. Where AGL was not defined in the report but is assumed to be Above Ground Level. If the major jets only achieve approximately 300- 600 feet per minute (as referenced on page 2-8 section 2.3.3 for Runway 15 using SLAPP TWO and OROSZ TWO, then the aircraft takes approximately 7 plus (and probably more considering the low altitude at which they are flying before they reach nonattainment levels) minutes to reach the 3,000 AGL level above which no air quality analysis is required. Prior to that, it is within the 3,000 AGL and must be analyzed for the contaminants. It is unclear what the actual contaminate exposure is to the people below 3,000 feet.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Citing metric tons does not identify the health hazards of increased contaminants below the 3000 AGL and the duration of exposure due to the flight patterns maintaining low altitude for a longer period of time. Where is the chart showing the duration of aircraft contaminant exposure prior to reaching 3,000 AGL? Furthermore, why are we using standards, NAAQS comparing whether we meet attainment levels, from 1978 and 1971? These are outdated and should not be used as the standards for health considering where we are today in 2024. Please revise the analysis of Table 3-1 Criteria Pollutant Emissions Below Mixing Height to identify human health conditions exacerbated by these contaminants. 5. The noise analysis is woefully inadequate. The study used computer modeling, which is inaccurate. A noise study must be done in real time and is the standard and accurate measure for noise pollution. A new noise study should be required. Section 4 on Noise Analysis states that a computer modeling system was used as opposed to an actual noise study with sound measured at different locations. The modeling is not an accurate measure of what is happening in real life. As a result, modeling does not reflect what the experience of the people are. Specifically, Table 4.6-6 summarizes that only 1,758 people would be impacted by an increase of 3dB or higher. I can attest to the fact that the modeling has underestimated the number of people affected by the mere pushback of the community and there is no real basis for the number of people affected by the noise “guesstimated” by the modeling system. Without actual ‘on the ground’ testing, the modeling system is in error and a response to why the FAA has not conducted actual live sound modeling based on what is ACTUALLY happening, needs to be responded to in this report. The FAA does not do in real life noise studies because then they would not be able to implement the changes that they want to make. Furthermore, please add the aircraft noise in decibels associated with multiple feet above ground level, i.e. 500 feet, 1000 feet, 1,500 feet, 2,000 feet, 2,500 feet, 3,000 feet above ground level. Please see Figure 3-11 on page 3-31. How can heavy traffic constitute 89 dB and yet in Table 3-6, page 3-35, it states that only 80 people will be affected by 70-75 dB from aircraft noise? Is this to mean that aircraft is less noisy than heavy traffic? Where is the chart on compounding noise? The noise analysis also did not look at the definitions of noise pollution which include a human’s sensitivity to the noise over the course of a day. Or even repeated exposures to the noise above 55dB. My house has double paned windows and on Friday mornings, experiences non-stop consecutive jet take offs over my home, which is approximately 5 miles from the airport and the aircraft are flying less than 3,000 feet AGL above my home. The time during which the aircraft is emitting noise over the house is approximately 23 seconds. Then there is a

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		short space of time, approximately one minute, before the next aircraft can be heard overhead. Experiencing this over and over is crazy making. Where is the study in the EA that shows human stress as a result of the noise? There isn't any, and in an era of increased mental illness, homelessness, drug abuse, crime and other changes in the population, this type of stress is exacerbating the human condition and not in alignment with any sort of balance between encouraging safety and efficiency in the use of the airport and the surrounding population. This is another example of being out of alignment with good health and welfare practices. FAILED TO CIRCULATE AND GET RESPONSE FROM IMPACTED COMMUNITY 6. The FAA failed to reach out to low socioeconomic populations to obtain input from disenfranchised populations and therefore many seniors, disabled, and non-English speaking citizens are unaware and their real-life experience has not been factored into the current impacts of air traffic and future plans. Section 4.7 on the Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice fails to accurately report how many people fall into the low socioeconomic areas that are unaware, under-educated, non English speaking and powerless to write a response to this EA and to fight for their rights against noise and air pollution that exceeds tolerable human levels. The FAA has not done any outreach to these low socioeconomic areas to obtain their input when these disenfranchised populations are unable to make their voices heard. A mailer with return postage should have been sent to the entire area affected by the changes at the airport for the people to respond to via mail, along with a telephone number hotline for people to call into to express their opinions in case they cannot write or are disabled. The EA does not take into consideration the opinions of the lower socioeconomic groups thereby depriving them of the opportunity to speak for themselves against noise pollution and cancer-causing contaminants. As such, this EA has not been adequately circulated for comment. In Chapter 5, it states that the FAA did outreach to all 'consulting' parties. These parties are not the low socioeconomic and disabled populations that require special noticing and opportunities to be heard. As described above, all parties in the affected area, every single household, should have been sent mailers with an opportunity to respond with pre-postage paid cards and telephone hotlines to call into. I am sure the FAA consulted with the major airlines and their representatives while deciding to implement these new procedures. They did not consult the low socioeconomic communities of people affected by these changes and this constitutes discrimination and racism against the people by a Federal Agency. 7. The airport records are incomplete. The information on current use of runways with respect to total departures, etc.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Please include a chart showing the previous use (prior to the changes of today) of the runway use by percentages, such as shown in Table 3 of Page 10 of 39 in Appendix A for the years 2017-2023. Please include a chart showing the previous Total Departures by Aircraft Weight Class for the years Jan 2018-Dec 2018, Jan 2019-Dec 2019, Jan 2020-Jan 2020, Jan 2021-Dec 2021, Jan 2022-Dec 2022, Jan 2023-Dec 2023. Please see Table 2 page 10 of 39 of Appendix A as a reference. Please Update Table 1 page 9 of 39 in Appendix A Burbank Itinerant Operations Data for 2018-2024. Attached please find the above response attached response to the Environmental Assessment of the Burbank Hollywood Airport. Thank you, Heather Lee
1007	Mark V. Phillips	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. In west Studio City we experience a ridiculous amount of aircraft noise: Jets from Burbank flying over my house, tour helicopters returning to Burbank flying over my house, every police helicopter darting and returning from Van Nuys flying over my house, news helicopters flying over my house, private jets and planes flying over my house. IT IS RIDICUOUS! IT'S NEVER QUIET!

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
1008	Adele Slaughter	To Whom It May Concern: I vehemently support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). I have lived in Studio City since 1994, and I currently serve on the Studio City Neighborhood Council and am on California Forest Advisory Committee. UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies carefully defines many of the inadequate assessments of the airport traffic which heavily impacts our entire community. Please pay attention. I would like to underscore UpoarLA’s comments about CUMULATIVE IMPACTS. They state: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. They also fail to note the airplane traffic noise effect on wild life as well as that the people in the Santa Monica mountains who live there. Residents have witnessed the pollution from jets which has substantially degraded MRCA land for plants and wildlife, and for recreation. (LA Audubon summary on adverse impacts attached). Many friends of mine, who live in the Santa Monica Mountains, cannot function on the days when the airport traffic is so constant that they are unable to get relief from the noise. One friend describes the fuel and oil that coats the plants in her yard on the hillside. None of us can speak outside when planes are going overhead, even in the flats. The noise and air pollution from air traffic has a serious, negative impact. Additionally disturbing, is the failure of the FAA to inform the populations that will be adversely affected by the noise and pollution and who have no recourse. Many non-English citizens, seniors and disabled have not been asked to give feedback about the impact of airport noise and pollution on their lives. The EA does not take into consideration the opinions of the lower socioeconomic groups thereby depriving them of the opportunity to speak for themselves against noise pollution and cancer-causing contaminants. As such, this EA has not been adequately circulated for comment. Due to these points and more, I strongly oppose the findings of the EA and demand that the FAA go back to the drawing board. The community requires an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that is accurate

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and does not employ miscalculation, poor study design, antiquated standards for noise and air quality and/or self-serving data analysis. With Respect, Adele Slaughter Studio City Resident
1009	Cody Chiarella	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Section 4.7 on the Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice fails to accurately report how many people fall into the low socioeconomic areas that are unaware, under-educated, non English speaking and powerless to write a response to this EA and to fight for their rights against noise and air pollution that exceeds tolerable human levels. The FAA has not done any outreach to these low socioeconomic areas to obtain their input when these disenfranchised populations are unable to make their voices heard. A mailer with return postage should have been sent to the entire area affected by the changes at the airport for the people to respond to via mail, along with a telephone number hotline for people to call into to express their opinions in case they cannot write or are disabled. The EA does not take into consideration the opinions of the lower socioeconomic groups thereby depriving them of the opportunity to speak for themselves against noise pollution and cancer-causing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		contaminants. As such, this EA has not been adequately circulated for comment. In Chapter 5, it states that the FAA did outreach to all ‘consulting’ parties. These parties are not the low socioeconomic and disabled populations that require special noticing and opportunities to be heard. As described above, all parties in the affected area, every single household, should have been sent mailers with an opportunity to respond with pre-postage paid cards and telephone hotlines to call into. I am sure the FAA consulted with the major airlines and their representatives while deciding to implement these new procedures. They did not consult the low socioeconomic communities of people affected by these changes and this constitutes discrimination and racism against the people by a Federal Agency. -- Cody Chiarella C +1 818 497 6891 cchiarella2@gmail.com
1010	Linda Jackson	As a homeowner just west of the Van Nuys Airport, I am concerned about the fact that JAYTE/TEAGN will dramatically alter home environments by intensifying and directing with consistency repetitive air traffic over select areas, including homes farther west of the waypoints which would be new to the exposure, and by the intensity of the increased volume of traffic. Our neighborhood is already being affected by the air traffic to and from Burbank Airport that pollutes our air and creates additional noise to the already overbearing problems we have with VNY. Increased volume of low-flying planes is the last thing we need to add to the already unbearable air pollution and noise we are experiencing on a daily basis. Please reconsider this proposal with the best interests of affected homeowners in mind. Suggestions include: • Institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. Can a more steep climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures (to help abate noise and pollution) that are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, and on protected 4(f) resources. • Reconsider simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings, maintaining an open segment departure. It’s not clear from the EA whether the FAA considered and tested different headings in the context of an open segment departure without the use of waypoints. Thank you. Linda Jackson

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
1011	Alisa Wilson	I am a resident of Benedict Canyon and am disturbed by the noise of airplanes flying over my property and the FAA’s non-adherence to a settlement agreement that was signed years ago. • The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop. • We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible. • The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. • The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. • We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. • The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths. • We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. • The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft. Alisa Wilson, Ph.D.
1012	A. Howard	March 23, 2024 Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center Re: FAA Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for KBUR -Draft EA dated November 30, 2023 To Whom It May Concern: This letter is in response to the above-referenced Draft EA for KBUR. COMMENTS FROM AN OLD-TIMER IN IMPACTED SAN FERNANDO VALLEY COMMUNITY:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		As a veteran who just passed the threshold of nine (9) decades on this planet, I have experienced an array of air traffic changes in our Valley. With ebbs and flows, no change has been as notable, disruptive and devastating as the clumsy NextGen rollout that was void of any thoughtful or lawful consideration of the terrain and life in our region. Whether referring to the utter devastation felt by new communities impacted by a southerly shift in the BUR departures or the FAA’s egregious violation of NEPA and D.O.T. Section 4(f) in respect to their unnecessary (below 10k MSL) and careless redesign of the LADYJ, the common denominator of failure appears to fall upon the Air Traffic Control (ATC) division who relies on “safety” as an excuse for their shortcomings and lack of interest in cooperating for fair resolve or lawful corrections. I am an airman, or I was in my younger years. I respect and appreciate the responsibility and load TRACON / ATC carry. With that said, and I say this with all due respect, laziness, false entitlement, thoughtless opinion resulting in an abuse of power and a reduction of personnel in our towers and TRACON are notably at the heart of all the unacceptable flight track changes in our region. The FAA’s defiant and unjustified refusal to correct them is simply abhorrent. Procedure options proven operable are being purported as inoperable in contradiction of best practices and the FAA meeting its duty to the Nation and its citizens. The FAA must take a hard look at its noxious disregard for the health, sanity, quality of life, civil rights and liberties and well-being of citizens, and the irreparable harm it is doing to Section 4(f) land. Tim Arel needs to reassess the leadership and lack of cooperation coming from the AJO divisions when it comes to correcting NextGen missteps that resulted in capricious and arbitrary flight path changes. Congress has already contradicted the FAA on its assertion of “efficiency” to validate the altering of millions of home environments and federally protected land. It’s time for the FAA to make moral and ethical choices in correcting the failures being witnessed in their ATC personnel. BUR DEPARTURE TURN DIRECTIVES AND ALTERNATIVES: Despite the FAA’s best efforts to convince the public that the turn directives to the North on the BUR departures is occurring promptly as safety dictates, such an assertion is implausible. Pilots are reporting the new technology creates a comfort zone for TRACON that allows the aircraft to remain on the assigned header longer than necessary and that chatter in the control center supports a lack of urgency in a timely turn. Moreover, ATC reported a near 40% reduction in personnel for the KBUR area upon the implementation of NextGen. FAA itself should desire an audit of the BUR North turn directive however in the absence of such a

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		responsible interest, the FAA should honor the Benedict Hills Homeowners Association (BHHA), Benedict Hills Estates Association, and the FAA (“Settlement Agreement”). My own flight experience suggests that the FAA may resolve the southerly shift simply by overseeing lax turn directives and increasing personnel in the KBUR and KVNY airspace, which includes one KLAX operation for the SILEX and TWINE intersections. Such a resolution then would not require comment on the alternatives that the FAA presented in this KBUR EA. Alternatives that were void of true environmental analysis. Fix your lax turn directive problem and you’ve fixed the southerly shift problem. No further effort required. Without the one-year monitoring effort, the FAA can not claim a prompt turn directive. DEPARTING NOTES: As a Valley resident adversely impacted by KBUR, KVNY and KLAX operations only after the NextGen rollout, I take issue with the FAA destroying the quality of life in the few remaining years that I have left on this earth. Especially after risking that life for this Country. I used to fly the GORMAN SID out of LAX and I have reviewed the proposed modification for the LADYJ, which in essence restores the CASTA tracks below the OROSZ WP and that modification is operable. I listened to a recent KLAX roundtable meeting with my grandson and was astounded that ATC has wrongly convinced the FAA to act in bad faith and abandon this modification and I hope that responsible parties do a 180° and pivot back toward honoring the commitment to restore environments along the proposed LADYJ/CASTA route or the seven years of grievances expressed resulting in the KBUR southerly shift will now be matched or exceeded by the injustice of the FAA’s lack of cooperation on the LADYJ situation. STOP USING UNSUBSTANTIATED SAFETY AND WORKLOAD AS EXCUSES AND START COOPERATING IN IMPLEMENTING RESOLVE WHERE ARBRITARY AND CAPRICIOUS FLIGHT PATH CHANGES HAVE WREAKED HAVIC IN OUR REGION. The FAA is not doing itself any favors by loosing the respect and deference of the American people. Workload is never a viable or respectable excuse. Workload is a cost of doing business and due diligence is the FAA’s JOB and RESPONSIBILITY. SAFETY is not preventing a timely turn directive for the KBUR departures in a significant percentage of cases, nor is it preventing the implementation of the LADYJ modifaciton at KLAX. Increase your personnel and restore the integrity in which the FAA operates. A.Howard
1013	Lotfi Mehdiian	• We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes, in Benedict Canyon area,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• I am a 75 year old man with lots of health issues, I take medications 24/7 to overcome my very serious anxiety, I have lost my 52 year old son, and these constant noise is erupting my nervous system. • Please have mercy.
1014	Kenneth J. Freed, Esq.	• The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop. • We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible. • The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. • The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. • We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. • The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths. • We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. • The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft. With regards,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Kenneth J. Freed, Esq. 4340 Fulton Ave., Third Floor Sherman Oaks, CA 91423 Office: 818-990-0888 ext. 102 Fax: 818-990-1047 kfreed@kjfesq.com This message, together with any attachments, is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is confidential and prohibited from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you have received this item in error, please notify the original sender and destroy this item, along with any attachments. Thank you. THIS COMMUNICATION IS AN ATTEMPT TO COLLECT A DEBT. ANY INFORMATION OBTAINED AS A RESULT HEREOF WILL BE USED FOR THAT PURPOSE.
1015	Debbie McBeth	BUR Environmental Assessment Comments attached. ----- Burbank Airport (BUR) Environmental Assessment (EA) - Comments Flight paths of aircraft departing and arriving to/from Burbank Airport have changed, increased, and are flying at much lower levels. Blame it on the FAA's NextGen or the FAA implementing the Optimized Profile Descents, which doesn't reduce commercial jet noise when traveling under 4,000 feet over residential homes located in multiple cities except Burbank, Glendale or Pasadena. The Environmental Assessment of departures only addresses half of the issues with Burbank Airport. ARRIVALS add to the environmental and noise nightmare for those who have chosen not to live near Burbank airport. The irony is those who actually live in Burbank, Glendale or Pasadena aren't impacted at all The current flight paths need to change entirely and BUR needs to spend the \$31M in federal dollars to alter their arrival and departure paths. This is doable because planes do land on Runway 15 from the north, planes can depart east instead of west, but BUR taking federal dollars (and profiting significantly from increased flights), hide under the cover of having to abide by the FAA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		OPD and NextGen only allow for more planes, which equal more emissions, which equal more health hazards for those living under these flight paths. BUR commercial airline operations increased 23% in Dec, 2023 with general aviation operations increasing 16% from Nov. 2022 levels, that's 151,916 flights averaging 416 per day, none of which fly over Burbank, Glendale or Pasadena. The biggest issue is BUR air traffic only impacts those who don't live in the cities that the airport revenue supports. The Burbank Environmental Assessment Supplemental Graphic clearly illustrates this – and these are only departures, you'll need to double the flights for arrivals flying east/west at 15-minute intervals. <i>Editor's Note: The comment letter includes three graphics with comments, which could not be included here due to formatting issues. The original comment is available upon request in the format in which it was received.</i> The FAA insists that planes can only land west to east on Runway 8, which results in planes flying past BUR then making a U-turn to fly across 7+ cities at less than 4,000 feet (Calabasas, Woodland Hills, West Hill, Canoga Park, Winnetka, Reseda and Van Nuys). Again Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena are not impacted at all. Oddly, we do see planes landing from the north on Runway 15, but I'm sure it's not financially feasible for both the airline, airport and FAA (profits over people). And VNY which has just as many private Jets and propellers utilize just one runway – departures to the south and arrivals from the north. It's just as windy with the same temperatures. Appears to be a few other options available for both departures and arrivals that wouldn't impact so many cities outside Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena. The issues are more than just flights are now traveling a little more south over the JAYTE waypoint at or above 2,400 feet and then turning northwest to fly over the cities the BUR airport revenue doesn't support. Any plane flying within a 3-mile radius at less than 5,000 feet is LOUD with disgusting emissions. ▪ Issue #1: Departures shouldn't turn northwest period; they should turn northeast. ▪ Issue #2: Arrivals shouldn't fly over multiple cities of the valley because the FAA says they can only land on Runway 8, when in fact these jets can land north/south by flying north over the mountains to the east of the airport, making a U-turn to then land south on runway 15.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		▪ Issue #3: Planes are flying over our homes at a constant rotation and at exceptionally low altitudes (THEY'RE LOUD), both departures and arrivals. We have lived here since 2003 and were never impacted by BUR arrivals/departures until the last 2-3 years. We already have Van Nuys Airport which appears to have quadrupled its private jets flying north/south, we don't need BUR's commercial and private jets flying over our communities in all directions – north, south, east and west. We're exasperated by airports hiding behind the FAA and the FAA making decisions that affect residents in communities they aren't familiar with nor care anything about, and that their policies are resulting in serious damage to the health and wellbeing of residential communities due to the hundreds of BUR planes that fly across multiple cities at altitudes of less than 4,000 feet daily. Summary of Issues: Planes that were rarely seen, heard or smelled prior are now negatively impacting multiple cities, except for the cities that benefit financially from the airport (Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena). The Environmental Assessment clearly shows how both the current flight paths are an environmental nightmare for those who chose not to live near Burbank Airport, yet those who do live near this airport aren't impacted at all. And NextGen and OPD aren't helping reduce any environmental impact, because the unintended consequences are that airlines and airports are able to have more planes polluting the communities below.
1016	City of Los Angeles	Dear Federal Aviation Administration, Operations Support Group, Please see the attached comment letter. Thank you Jarrett Thompson Transportation Deputy District Office: (323) 866-1828 City Hall: (213) 473-7005 Los Angeles City Hall 200 North Spring St., Room 440 Los Angeles, CA 90012 cd5.lacity.gov --- City of Los Angeles

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		March 22, 2024 Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 S. 216th Street Des Moines, WA 98198 Re: Draft Environmental Assessment for Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank Airport” Dear Federal Aviation Administration, Operations Support Group, We respectfully submit these comments in response to the draft environmental assessment for the proposed settlement agreement for the departure procedure amendments at Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank Airport” issued on December 11, 2023. We appreciate the FAA making the Draft Review available to the public for its review and comment; however, the Draft Review is insufficient. Please see our comments below. 1. The FAA provides no clear definition of the “proposed action” under review or the specific purpose and need for the project, in violation of NEPA. If the sole purpose of the proposed action is to implement the Benedict Hills Settlement agreement—which involves FAA’s implementation of a specific flight procedure and no other alternatives—then FAA’s purpose and need for the proposed action impermissibly restricts the range of alternatives considered under NEPA, and FAA’s NEPA review is unlawfully predetermined. 2. The FAA fails to consider an appropriate range of reasonable alternatives and arbitrarily limits its alternatives analysis to only two action alternatives A and B. The FAA itself has not determined whether Alternative B is even “operationally feasible,” which violates NEPA’s requirement that the FAA consider a range of reasonable alternatives. 3. The No Action alternative improperly consists of departure procedures that themselves have never undergone NEPA review. Specifically, the FAA has never evaluated the “southern shift” of the departure procedures under NEPA, which was the subject of litigation between the City of Los Angeles and the FAA at the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		4. The FAA does not evaluate whether the proposed action will correct or exacerbate the southern shift of the departure procedures that the FAA has acknowledged exists. It is also unclear whether the FAA evaluated the southern shift as part of the no action alternative or existing conditions. 5. The FAA does not evaluate the rate, frequency, location, and altitude of flights that will be vectored off the proposed flight procedures, which should be considered as an effect of the proposed action under NEPA. 6. The FAA fails to consider the impact of aircraft noise on wildlife and biological resources, and FAA relies only on noise modeling to assess impacts on wildlife and biological resources. 7. The FAA fails to adequately consider the mountainous terrain and higher elevation of resources under the flight procedures in its analysis of potential environmental effects, including but not limited to noise impacts. 8. The FAA fails to adequately consider the environmental effects of concentrating aircraft on the flight procedures. The FAA arbitrarily assumes no adverse effects because certain areas already experience overflights. 9. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires the FAA to consult with all local governments concerning impacts to historic resources. The FAA did not consult with the City of Los Angeles or other local governments with jurisdictions that may be potentially affected by the proposed action. 10. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act requires the FAA to consult with local officials regarding potential impacts to publicly owned parks, recreational areas, and historic resources. The FAA did not consult with the City of Los Angeles regarding Section 4(f) properties. 11. The FAA’s Section 4(f) evaluation is limited to noise modeling and the FAA did not adequately consider the individual attributes of Section 4(f) properties—especially noise sensitive properties such as parks and wildlife refuges—to determine the potential visual and noise impacts on Section 4(f) properties. 12. The FAA did not adequately evaluate measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential noise impacts to NHPA and Section 4(f) properties. In conclusion, the Draft Environmental Assessment is insufficient and fails to consider an appropriate range of alternatives. The FAA must prepare a Draft Environmental Assessment that addresses the deficiencies in the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		noise analysis, the land use impacts, the significant impacts to historic resources, and the cumulative impacts of the proposed procedures with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions. The City stands ready to consult with and assist the FAA in this process, but also reserves the right to supplement these comments as it receives information it has requested from the FAA. Thank you in advance for your consideration. Sincerely, PAUL KREKORIAN President, Los Angeles City Council Councilmember, Second District KATY YAROSLAVSKY Councilwoman, Fifth District NITHYA RAMAN Councilwoman, Fourth District IMELDA PADILLA Councilwoman, Sixth District
1017	Judith and Laurence Dornstein	Gentlepeople We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes in the Deep Canyon area of Los Angeles which drop soot and grim and hazardous pollutants on our homes and backyards and interfere with our right to quiet enjoyment of our homes. The current flight path over our homes did not exist in 1980 when our home was built, and only became apparent after Burbank Airport greatly expanded from a small local airport without a baggage room to a much larger national airport for jet planes which fly all over the country and the world. Our Benedict Hills HOA spent years and huge legal fees to negotiate a settlement with the FAA. The draft EA the FAA issued does not update the Noise Screen. In fact, it completely ignores the settlement agreement in which the FAA agreed that southern departures from Burbank Airport will be turned to the north by air traffic control “as soon as practicable after takeoff.” Instead, the EA proposes as Alternative A the worst case scenario flight path over Valley Vista. And it proposes as Alternative B the routes the planes are currently flying over our homes. While Alternative A would keep planes from flying over Benedict Canyon, it is not what we negotiated, and is opposed by numerous groups including the Benedict Hills HOA. The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Settlement Agreement. The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. Also, the FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths and to analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants caused by the departing aircraft.. The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop. We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures need to be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off and airplanes turning around over the #101 Freeway. To reiterate: The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of the routes they fly as agreed in the Settlement Agreement, and move the flight paths closer to the #101 Freeway, so that flights from Burbank Airport turn around over the #101 Freeway, as it agreed to do in the Settlement Agreement between the Benedict Hills HOA and the FAA. Sincerely, Judith and Laurence Dornstein 3120 Deep Canyon Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210 jdornstein@roadrunner.com
1018	debbie hovsepian	• I have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. • I am fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. • I am fed up with finding soot and grime in my backyard.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft.
1019	Rabin Pournazarian	To whom it may concern, • The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop. • We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible. • The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. • The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. • We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. • The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths. • We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. • The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft. This noise needs to stop. It's unbearable and not part of the agreement that was made.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Rabin Pournazarian Admitted in CA 6345 Balboa Blvd Suite 247 Encino, CA 91316 Direct+Text+Fax 818.600.5554 Main 818.995.4540 Resolve Law Group is a registered DBA of Price Law Group, APC.
1020	Mr. & Mrs. Weisenfeld and Family	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. I WOULD LIKE TO ADD HOW COME WHEN STRONG WINDS OCCUR AIR TRAFFIC CAN MOVE ALL TAKE OFFS TO ANOTER DIRECTION WHICH I BELIEVE IS NORTH OVER THE MOUNTAIN AREA CAUSING VERY LITTLE PROBLEMS FOR THE FEW THAT MAY BE BELOW. MR&MRS WEISENFELD FAMILY
1021	William Rouse	My comments, shared with many of the homeowners in our surrounding neighborhoods follow: 1. For well over a decade the southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been relentless, continuing to be a major noise annoyance and continuing irritant. One wonders if this will ever cease? The constant noise and pollution continues to be overwhelming from both a health and public safety perspective causing a feeling of hopelessness. Why does it appear that the FAA is not being held accountable regarding the air pollutants,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing planes? 2. We believed, from input received from our HOA during the last 5-6 years, for the FAA to implement the flight procedure they agreed to in the Settlement Agreement. We struggle to grasp the promised and agreed upon procedures have not been implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north asap and practical after take-off. 3. In keeping with full and complete transparency, why is the FAA not making public its 2019 analysis (Noise Screen) as to how departures would be flown under terms of the Agreement? 4. Why has the FAA considered moving the flight paths closer to the freeways? 5. Why does the FAA not increase the rate of ascent regardless of routes flown? Very truly yours, William Rouse
1022	Mark Paul	• The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop. • We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible. • The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. • The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. • We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. • The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. • The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft. Mark Paul mark@markjpaul.com
1023	Anonymous	To whom it may concern, I have been living in Benedict Canyon since 1993 and have seen a continued increase in flights over our neighborhood. The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop. A Settlement Agreement was made, and we have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. • The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain if that is not feasible. • The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. • The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. • The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths. • The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft. I would appreciate your not making public my identity and contact information. Thank you,
1024	Ariel Neuman	I am a homeowner at 3104 Hutton Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90201 - in Benedict Canyon. I write because the southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures it agreed to in our neighborhood's Settlement Agreement. I object to the draft EA and request the FAA to adhere to the terms of our settlement agreement. The agreed-to procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways, or at least explain why that is not feasible, and should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. Thank you. -- _____ Ariel Neuman aneuman@gmail.com
1025	scott teeple	The quality of my life in my home is negatively impacted by the fight path noise. I live in Studio City. Scott Teeple Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone
1026	Roe Wiczuk	My name is Roe Wiczuk and I live at 9875 Gloucester Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210. My telephone number is (310) 385-0865. I am a resident of the Mulholland corridor in Los Angeles near Benedict Canyon and Beverly Glen Blvds. The air traffic from Burbank airport has been a non-stop nuisance, due to constant noise, and potential public health issue for all of us in the flight path due to exhaust particulates, and we demand that the recommendations in the settlement with among others, the Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association. Further; • The southern shift of planes over Benedict Canyon has been going on now for more than a decade and needs to stop.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• We have been waiting since 2018 for the FAA to implement the flight procedures they agreed to in our Settlement Agreement. Those procedures should be implemented, particularly air traffic control turning southern departures to the north as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA should make public its 2019 analysis (or Noise Screen) of how departures would be flown under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. • The FAA should consider moving the flight paths closer to the freeways. • The FAA should consider and analyze dispersing the initial headings of departing aircraft. • The FAA should increase the rate of ascent of aircraft regardless of which routes they fly. • The constant noise and pollution from planes over Benedict Canyon create a public safety issue. • We are fed up with the constant airplane noise over our homes. • The FAA should use modern scientific methods in analyzing the noise impact on people living below the flight paths. • We are fed up with finding soot and grime in our backyards. • The FAA should properly analyze air pollutants, particularly hazardous pollutants, caused by the departing aircraft.
1027	SAVE OUR SKIES LA	2. Failure to consider cumulative impacts of Van Nuys Airport (VNY) air traffic shifting over same area as Burbank Airport (BUR) air traffic in 2017-2018. See attached screenshots from FAA's Presentation to the Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force documenting that BUR air traffic moved southward from 2008-2019, coinciding with a shift southward in VNY air traffic. This is a cumulative impact that the EA fails to acknowledge or to take into account when assessing the impacts of Alt A. <i>Editor's Note: This comment includes five graphics, which could not be included here due to formatting issues. The original comment is available upon request in the format in which it was received.</i>

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
1028	SAVE OUR SKIES LA	BY EMAIL TO 9-AJO-BUR-Community-Involvement@FAA.GOV Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th St Des Moines, WA 98198 To Whom It May Concern: Additional General Comments SAVE OUR SKIES LA (SOSLA) represents thousands of impacted residents who reside and work in Studio City, Sherman Oaks, Encino, and areas near the Mulholland ridge of the Eastern Santa Monica Mountains (approximately from Wilacre Park in Studio City to San Vicente Mountain Park south of the Encino Reservoir). SOSLA questions the legal sufficiency of the Draft Environmental Assessment for Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport (BUR EA) for the following reasons: 1. Failure to consider the cumulative impact of a new, "more efficient" BUR terminal. The proposed new BUR terminal will demolish the two old terminals at BUR, and relocate them to one larger terminal that sits close to the north end of Runway 33, which is where aircraft depart southward toward Los Angeles. The net impact of this change will be to reduce dramatically taxi time, and to remove current impediments to air traffic flow at the airport. The cumulative impacts of the new BUR terminal on the FAA's proposed changes have not been addressed by this EA. The combined effects of more efficient BUR terminal gates (all lined up next to each other and close to the take-off location) and the use of new RNAV procedures (functioning as runway extensions by allowing jets to depart in closer space and time than is possible with the use of conventional procedures) -- creates conditions that allow for an increase in airport throughput that this EA fails to consider. Please see attached screenshots showing actual flight paths of VNY and BUR jets traversing the same areas and turning over the same locations in the Santa Monica Mountains. Please also see attached screenshots from Burbank Airport website showing existing and future airport land use plan, and note the location of the new replacement terminal close to Runway 33 departure location, on the other sides of Runways 8/26.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		<i>Editor's Note: This comment includes three graphics, which could not be included here due to formatting issues. The original comment is available upon request in the format in which it was received.</i>
1029	Luiza Ricupero Negret	To Whom It May Concern: I joined a group of concerned neighbors over 5 years ago because of the changes in flight paths out of BUR. In addition to the comments below, my family specifically chose our home because at the time of our purchase in 2016 flights did not go directly above our house. It was one of our conditions for selecting a house in the valley that we were not directly under the flight path. We moved in and had a few peaceful months and then suddenly, one night, the windows were shaking and the TV was drowned out because of a plane flying overhead. And ever since, this nuisance has persisted. In that time frame, my baby son developed asthma, something that nobody in our family has ever experienced and which is possible it may have been a result of increased exposure to chemicals that are released from jet fuel. With all of that, I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Luiza Ricupero Negret
1030	Lynn and Bill Lustig	Lynn and Bill Lustig (Sherman Oaks Residents): We OPPOSE (Reject) Alternative A because historical departures had an open leg without waypoints that promoted dispersion. JAYTE/TEAGN will dramatically alter home environments by creating a repetitive, concentrated, and high volume flow of air traffic with unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution for safe and peaceful living.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• Alternative A fails to include the stipulation that “aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off” (Settlement Agreement ¶ A) Without this item and without the monitoring to which FAA agreed, the FAA will not have met their settlement obligations which have at their core to substantiate that the turn directives are occurring as soon as practicable after take-off. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under the Clean Air Act (CAA) and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The increase in fuel burn and longer straight-out leg as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. Lynn and Bill Lustig (Sherman Oaks Residents): Procedure Design - Alternative B Re: re FAA’s BUR departure procedures...We Ask for the following: • A true Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) with ultimate “quiet climb” considerations to RAYVE (7000 ft) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000 ft) on OROSZ as practicable: • maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practicable, but at a minimum until 3000 ft (climbing to higher altitudes similar to John Wayne Airport’s noise abatement procedures are preferred); • other elements as feasible: deck angle, KIAS and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft. • Adhere to Settlement Agreement. FAA to make clear that ATC protocol will include controller training and directives to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. FAA to provide Benedict Hills petitioners and BUR -- for public dissemination — quarterly reports of monitored turn directives to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths, for one full year. • Institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. Can a more steep climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures (to help abate noise and pollution) that are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, and on protected 4(f) resources. • Reconsider simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings, maintaining an open segment departure. It's not clear from the EA whether the FAA considered and tested different headings in the context of an open segment departure without the use of waypoints. Lynn and Bill Lustig Sherman Oaks-Stone Canyon residents 15016 Marble Dr., SO 91403
1031	Victoria Dailey and Steve Turner	To Whom It May Concern: I support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: Because BUR wishes to expand does not mean it can adversely affect neighborhoods that are far from its runways. Do not fail to consider the Purposed and Need of homeowners in the affected communities. This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. We live in the area that is south of the airport, on the other side of

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the mountains that separate the Los Angeles basin from the Valley areas. We should not be expected to suffer from the very loud noises caused by low-flying jets that create excessive noise as they fly over our previously quiet nature reserve and canyons. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. Alternatives must be found to the significant noise impacts that are occurring in the parklands and canyons of the Santa Monica Mountains, which are definitely 'noise sensitive areas.' - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. This is obvious, the FAA must use the correct metric. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. We residents of Los Angeles, including Bel Air, as well as Beverly Hills, should not have to pay the price of excessive jet noise because BUR wants to increase its revenues. This is an excessive expectation; please do not treat homeowners as passive victims of excessive noise pollution created solely by one airport's desire to expand. Thousands of people are affected by the noise created by an airport that is 15 to 25 miles distant. The jets fly so low that we can see their markings and by flying so low, the noise is excessively loud, especially because it echoes off the canyon walls. It is unacceptable—creating a major disruption to quality of life is a big enough reason for the FAA to abandon the 'southern shift' plan. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. For the FAA to impose environmentally negligent jet paths onto an unwilling population reeks of government overreach. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. Please consider Alternative B as a way to mitigate the problems caused by Southern Departures. In conclusion, we strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Victoria Dailey Steve Turner 1433 N. Beverly Dr. Beverly Hills, CA 90210
1032	Joan Bullard	To Whom It May Concern: Please, please pay attention to this. There must be better ways to handle flight paths than to place the burden on the people who live near airports. The planes fly so low my windows rattle. The noise and vibration affects the quality our lives. As is true of many I don't have the money to move out of the southern shift area or somehow soundproof my house. Enjoyment of the outside is often ruined. I know the FAA has a huge job and so many responsibilities, but protecting the public from significant impacts on the quality of their lives is a is also a trust you hold. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA
1033	Lynda Nishimoto Lax	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. Lynda Nishimoto Lax 1452 Benedict Canyon Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
1034	Laura Owens	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: 1. PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - 2. FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from the calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths but has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - 3. LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. 4. USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. 5. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		6. FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has the potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that the BURBANK AIRPORT ITSELF, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should modify Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identify solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Kind Regards, Laura Enrollment Administrator at ★ Cynthia Bain's Young Actor Studio E enroll@cynthiabain.com W www.cynthiabain.com IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies thereof.
1035	Laura Feldman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: 1. PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - 2. FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from the calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths but has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - 3. LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. 4. USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. 5. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. 6. FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has the potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that the BURBANK AIRPORT ITSELF, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should modify Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identify solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Laura Feldman
1036	CBYAS	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: 1. PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - 2. FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from the calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		south of the historic paths but has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - 3. LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. 4. USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. 5. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. 6. FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has the potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that the BURBANK AIRPORT ITSELF, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		required modifications. FAA should modify Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identify solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1037	L.D. Kurtz	You have to start cutting back on flights, they make too much noise. We have to stop our conversations when your planes take off. Lloyd Kurtz Studio City
1038	John Weiser	we have lived in sherman oaks for 30 years and we have never experienced the amount of loud noise that the airport and planes are currently causing. We are often woken up at 4-6 am with flights that rumble our house and make so much noise that it hurts. During the day i can no longer make business calls outside because the plane noise overpowers the calls im making. The planes new flight paths are crushing the enjoyment of our home and its constant and unfair. These new flight paths were made without doing any environmental studies. According to the state and our ins company, we are in a high fire zone...how can planes fly over us at low altitudes? its just not safe as evidenced by a plane dumping jet fuel over a school and kids got covered in it in their playground, and leaves on our property have black jet fuel slime on them...how can this be ok? We need noise reducing flight paths. When the flight paths used to do turn arounds over the 405 there were several thousand complaints compared with the 50,000 plus complaints now caused by these intrusive current paths Please help everyone in this area by not approving the alternative A plan and going with the alternative B plan...all of these new flight paths hurt our peace of mind as homeowners but B hurts less. John Weiser Weisertv2014@gmail.com
1039	Caden Concepts	Dear FAA Operations Support Group: My entire family resides in the hills of Sherman Oaks, California, the direct path flights departing and arriving from the Hollywood Burbank Airport fly over. You have released your environmental assessment of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		proposed new Burbank departure procedures, which is partly the result of a settlement with Bendict Hills HOAs. The residents of Sherman Oaks, including my entire family, reject your Procedure Design Alternative A for the following reasons: • Historical departures had an open leg without waypoints that promoted dispersion. JAYTE/TEAGN will dramatically alter home environments by creating a repetitive, concentrated, and high-volume flow of air traffic with unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution for safe and peaceful living. • If Alternative A purports to be the Benedict Hills HOAs lawsuit settlement, it is inaccurate because it fails to include the stipulation of FAA’s monitoring with reports to petitioners, after implementation, of the new BUR departure procedure(s) in said agreement: “The FAA agrees to provide to Bob Hope Airport, for public dissemination, quarterly reports for one (1) year regarding the FAA 's monitoring of the open departure procedures SLAPP and OROSZ shown in Exhibit "A" to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths. The FAA further agrees to provide copies of such reports to the Associations.” (Settlement Agreement Between the Federal Aviation Administration, Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association dated March 16, 2018, ¶ I) ("Settlement Agreement") • Alternative A fails to include the stipulation that “aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off” (Settlement Agreement ¶ A). Without this item and without the monitoring to which the FAA agreed, the FAA will not have met their settlement obligations, which have at their core, to substantiate that the turn directives are occurring as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA’s analysis of air quality and climate impacts under the Clean Air Act (CAA) and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The increase in fuel burn and longer straight-out leg as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes, should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. We also reject your Procedure Design Alternative B due to the following: • This proposal states that climb gradients achieved by most Runway 15/33 departures already significantly exceed 600 feet per NM, but fails to explain why the FAA did not then propose a climb gradient in excess of 600 ft per NM and include it in the procedures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• Most older GA aircraft are not certified for RNAV SIDS and thus should not be a consideration of a noise abatement RNAV SID as there are alternative procedures in place to accommodate them. As cited, there is only about 3% expected older GA aircraft in operation at BUR. Therefore, implementing a noise abatement RNAV SID would not result in an appreciable increase in controller workload. Also, the overall benefits of a noise abatement RNAV SID, in terms of reduced noise and air pollution, align with NEPA and the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus’ intent that efficiency should not be at the expense of citizens’ rights, health, and well being. • If controller workload is a concern, the saturated airspace of the VNY/BUR area may warrant a greater separation in departures at BUR, and implementing greater separation also would relieve controller workload. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under CAA and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The lower altitudes and shift southward in air traffic over rising Santa Monica Mountains terrain as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. As a resident whose home, yard, and environmental surrounds have been severely affected by your unilateral decisions, I respectfully request the FAA’s departure procedures include the following: • A true Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) with ultimate “quiet climb” considerations to RAYVE (7000 ft) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000 ft) on OROSZ as practicable: • Maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practicable, but at a minimum until 3000 ft (climbing to higher altitudes similar to John Wayne Airport’s noise abatement procedures are preferred); • Other elements as feasible: deck angle, KIAS and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft. • The FAA must adhere to the Settlement Agreement, and needs to make clear that ATC protocol will include controller training and directives to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. The FAA needs to

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		provide Benedict Hills petitioners and BUR -- for public dissemination — quarterly reports of monitored turn directives to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths, for one full year. • The FAA must institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. We request a steeper climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures to help abate noise and pollution as they are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, including Sherman Oaks residents, and on protected 4(f) resources. • Reconsider simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings, maintaining an open segment departure. It’s not clear from the EA whether the FAA considered and tested different headings in the context of an open segment departure without the use of waypoints. I thank you in advance for your consideration and give full merit to our rejections and requests. Our homes and environments are being debilitated by these flight paths, and there are measure the FAA can make to rectify the matters, but are not. These concerns have been going on for over seven years now and the FAA must finally listen to our grievances, the scientific studies showing the damage these flight paths so low are causing, and the above information. Best, Ivan Caden Sherman Oaks Resident
1040	Jodi Caden	Dear FAA Operations Support Group: My entire family resides in Sherman Oaks, California, the direct path flights departing and arriving from the Hollywood Burbank Airport fly over. You have released your environmental assessment of the proposed new Burbank departure procedures, which is partly the result of a settlement with Bendict Hills HOAs. The residents of Sherman Oaks, including my entire family, reject your Procedure Design Alternative A for the following reasons: • Historical departures had an open leg without waypoints that promoted dispersion. JAYTE/TEAGN will

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		dramatically alter home environments by creating a repetitive, concentrated, and high-volume flow of air traffic with unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution for safe and peaceful living. • If Alternative A purports to be the Benedict Hills HOAs lawsuit settlement, it is inaccurate because it fails to include the stipulation of FAA’s monitoring with reports to petitioners, after implementation, of the new BUR departure procedure(s) in said agreement: “The FAA agrees to provide to Bob Hope Airport, for public dissemination, quarterly reports for one (1) year regarding the FAA 's monitoring of the open departure procedures SLAPP and OROSZ shown in Exhibit "A" to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths. The FAA further agrees to provide copies of such reports to the Associations.” (Settlement Agreement Between the Federal Aviation Administration, Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association dated March 16, 2018, ¶ I) ("Settlement Agreement") • Alternative A fails to include the stipulation that “aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off” (Settlement Agreement ¶ A). Without this item and without the monitoring to which the FAA agreed, the FAA will not have met their settlement obligations, which have at their core, to substantiate that the turn directives are occurring as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA’s analysis of air quality and climate impacts under the Clean Air Act (CAA) and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The increase in fuel burn and longer straight-out leg as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes, should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. We also reject your Procedure Design Alternative B due to the following: • This proposal states that climb gradients achieved by most Runway 15/33 departures already significantly exceed 600 feet per NM, but fails to explain why the FAA did not then propose a climb gradient in excess of 600 ft per NM and include it in the procedures. • Most older GA aircraft are not certified for RNAV SIDS and thus should not be a consideration of a noise abatement RNAV SID as there are alternative procedures in place to accommodate them. As cited, there is only about 3% expected older GA aircraft in operation at BUR. Therefore, implementing a noise abatement RNAV SID would not result in an appreciable increase in controller workload. Also, the overall benefits of a noise abatement RNAV SID, in terms of reduced noise and air pollution, align with NEPA and the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus’ intent that efficiency should not be at the expense of citizens’ rights, health, and well being. • If controller workload is a concern, the saturated airspace of the VNY/BUR area may warrant a greater separation in departures at BUR, and implementing greater separation also would relieve controller workload. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under CAA and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The lower altitudes and shift southward in air traffic over rising Santa Monica Mountains terrain as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. As a resident whose home, yard, and environmental surrounds have been severely affected by your unilateral decisions, I respectfully request the FAA’s departure procedures include the following: • A true Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) with ultimate “quiet climb” considerations to RAYVE (7000 ft) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000 ft) on OROSZ as practicable: • Maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practicable, but at a minimum until 3000 ft (climbing to higher altitudes similar to John Wayne Airport’s noise abatement procedures are preferred); • Other elements as feasible: deck angle, KIAS and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft. • The FAA must adhere to the Settlement Agreement, and needs to make clear that ATC protocol will include controller training and directives to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. The FAA needs to provide Benedict Hills petitioners and BUR -- for public dissemination — quarterly reports of monitored turn directives to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths, for one full year. • The FAA must institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. We request a steeper climb gradient be

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures to help abate noise and pollution as they are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, including Sherman Oaks residents, and on protected 4(f) resources. • Reconsider simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings, maintaining an open segment departure. It's not clear from the EA whether the FAA considered and tested different headings in the context of an open segment departure without the use of waypoints. I thank you in advance for your consideration and give full merit to our rejections and requests. Our homes and environments are being debilitated by these flight paths, and there are measure the FAA can make to rectify the matters, but are not. These concerns have been going on for over seven years now and the FAA must finally listen to our grievances, the scientific studies showing the damage these flight paths so low are causing, and the above information. Best, Jodi Caden Sherman Oaks Resident
1041	Kari Caden, Aimee Scott	Dear FAA Operations Support Group: My entire family resides in Sherman Oaks, California, the direct path flights departing and arriving from the Hollywood Burbank Airport fly over. You have released your environmental assessment of the proposed new Burbank departure procedures, which is partly the result of a settlement with Benedict Hills HOAs. The residents of Sherman Oaks, including my entire family, reject your Procedure Design Alternative A for the following reasons: • Historical departures had an open leg without waypoints that promoted dispersion. JAYTE/TEAGN will dramatically alter home environments by creating a repetitive, concentrated, and high-volume flow of air traffic with unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution for safe and peaceful living. • If Alternative A purports to be the Benedict Hills HOAs lawsuit settlement, it is inaccurate because it fails to include the stipulation of FAA's monitoring with reports to petitioners, after implementation, of the new BUR departure procedure(s) in said agreement: "The FAA agrees to provide to Bob Hope Airport, for public dissemination, quarterly reports for one (1) year regarding the FAA 's monitoring of the open departure procedures SLAPP and OROSZ shown in Exhibit "A" to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		FAA further agrees to provide copies of such reports to the Associations.” (Settlement Agreement Between the Federal Aviation Administration, Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association dated March 16, 2018, ¶ I) ("Settlement Agreement") • Alternative A fails to include the stipulation that “aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off” (Settlement Agreement ¶ A). Without this item and without the monitoring to which the FAA agreed, the FAA will not have met their settlement obligations, which have at their core, to substantiate that the turn directives are occurring as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA’s analysis of air quality and climate impacts under the Clean Air Act (CAA) and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The increase in fuel burn and longer straight-out leg as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes, should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. We also reject your Procedure Design Alternative B due to the following: • This proposal states that climb gradients achieved by most Runway 15/33 departures already significantly exceed 600 feet per NM, but fails to explain why the FAA did not then propose a climb gradient in excess of 600 ft per NM and include it in the procedures. • Most older GA aircraft are not certified for RNAV SIDS and thus should not be a consideration of a noise abatement RNAV SID as there are alternative procedures in place to accommodate them. As cited, there is only about 3% expected older GA aircraft in operation at BUR. Therefore, implementing a noise abatement RNAV SID would not result in an appreciable increase in controller workload. Also, the overall benefits of a noise abatement RNAV SID, in terms of reduced noise and air pollution, align with NEPA and the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus’ intent that efficiency should not be at the expense of citizens’ rights, health, and well being. • If controller workload is a concern, the saturated airspace of the VNY/BUR area may warrant a greater separation in departures at BUR, and implementing greater separation also would relieve controller workload. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under CAA and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The lower altitudes and shift southward in air traffic over rising Santa Monica

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Mountains terrain as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. As a resident whose home, yard, and environmental surrounds have been severely affected by your unilateral decisions, I respectfully request the FAA’s departure procedures include the following: • A true Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) with ultimate “quiet climb” considerations to RAYVE (7000 ft) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000 ft) on OROSZ as practicable: • Maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practicable, but at a minimum until 3000 ft (climbing to higher altitudes similar to John Wayne Airport’s noise abatement procedures are preferred); • Other elements as feasible: deck angle, KIAS and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft. • The FAA must adhere to the Settlement Agreement, and needs to make clear that ATC protocol will include controller training and directives to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. The FAA needs to provide Benedict Hills petitioners and BUR -- for public dissemination — quarterly reports of monitored turn directives to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths, for one full year. • The FAA must institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. We request a steeper climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures to help abate noise and pollution as they are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, including Sherman Oaks residents, and on protected 4(f) resources. • Reconsider simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings, maintaining an open segment departure. It’s not clear from the EA whether the FAA considered and tested different headings in the context of an open segment departure without the use of waypoints.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I thank you in advance for your consideration and give full merit to our rejections and requests. Our homes and environments are being debilitated by these flight paths, and there are measure the FAA can make to rectify the matters, but are not. These concerns have been going on for over seven years now and the FAA must finally listen to our grievances, the scientific studies showing the damage these flight paths so low are causing, and the above information. Best, Kari Caden Sherman Oaks Resident Aimee Scott Human Resources Manager & Special Projects hr@cadenconcepts.com Caden Concepts 13412 Ventura Blvd. #300 Sherman Oaks, CA 91423 323/651-1190 ext. 226 // cadenconcepts.com
1042	Lori Caden	Dear FAA Operations Support Group: My entire family resides in the hills of Sherman Oaks, California, the direct path flights departing and arriving from the Hollywood Burbank Airport fly over. You have released your environmental assessment of the proposed new Burbank departure procedures, which is partly the result of a settlement with Bendict Hills HOAs. The residents of Sherman Oaks, including my entire family, reject your Procedure Design Alternative A for the following reasons: • Historical departures had an open leg without waypoints that promoted dispersion. JAYTE/TEAGN will dramatically alter home environments by creating a repetitive, concentrated, and high-volume flow of air traffic with unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution for safe and peaceful living. • If Alternative A purports to be the Benedict Hills HOAs lawsuit settlement, it is inaccurate because it fails to include the stipulation of FAA’s monitoring with reports to petitioners, after implementation, of the new BUR departure procedure(s) in said agreement: “The FAA agrees to provide to Bob Hope Airport, for public dissemination, quarterly reports for one (1) year regarding the FAA 's monitoring of the open departure procedures SLAPP and OROSZ shown in Exhibit "A" to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths. The FAA further agrees to provide copies of such reports to the Associations.” (Settlement Agreement Between the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Federal Aviation Administration, Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association dated March 16, 2018, ¶ I) ("Settlement Agreement") • Alternative A fails to include the stipulation that “aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off” (Settlement Agreement ¶ A). Without this item and without the monitoring to which the FAA agreed, the FAA will not have met their settlement obligations, which have at their core, to substantiate that the turn directives are occurring as soon as practicable after take-off. • The FAA’s analysis of air quality and climate impacts under the Clean Air Act (CAA) and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The increase in fuel burn and longer straight-out leg as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes, should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. We also reject your Procedure Design Alternative B due to the following: • This proposal states that climb gradients achieved by most Runway 15/33 departures already significantly exceed 600 feet per NM, but fails to explain why the FAA did not then propose a climb gradient in excess of 600 ft per NM and include it in the procedures. • Most older GA aircraft are not certified for RNAV SIDS and thus should not be a consideration of a noise abatement RNAV SID as there are alternative procedures in place to accommodate them. As cited, there is only about 3% expected older GA aircraft in operation at BUR. Therefore, implementing a noise abatement RNAV SID would not result in an appreciable increase in controller workload. Also, the overall benefits of a noise abatement RNAV SID, in terms of reduced noise and air pollution, align with NEPA and the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus’ intent that efficiency should not be at the expense of citizens’ rights, health, and well being. • If controller workload is a concern, the saturated airspace of the VNY/BUR area may warrant a greater separation in departures at BUR, and implementing greater separation also would relieve controller workload. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under CAA and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The lower altitudes and shift southward in air traffic over rising Santa Monica Mountains terrain as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. As a resident whose home, yard, and environmental surrounds have been severely affected by your unilateral decisions, I respectfully request the FAA’s departure procedures include the following: • A true Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) with ultimate “quiet climb” considerations to RAYVE (7000 ft) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000 ft) on OROSZ as practicable: • Maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practicable, but at a minimum until 3000 ft (climbing to higher altitudes similar to John Wayne Airport’s noise abatement procedures are preferred); • Other elements as feasible: deck angle, KIAS and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft. • The FAA must adhere to the Settlement Agreement, and needs to make clear that ATC protocol will include controller training and directives to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. The FAA needs to provide Benedict Hills petitioners and BUR -- for public dissemination — quarterly reports of monitored turn directives to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths, for one full year. • The FAA must institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. We request a steeper climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures to help abate noise and pollution as they are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, including Sherman Oaks residents, and on protected 4(f) resources. • Reconsider simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings, maintaining an open segment departure. It’s not clear from the EA whether the FAA considered and tested different headings in the context of an open segment departure without the use of waypoints. I thank you in advance for your consideration and give full merit to our rejections and requests. Our homes and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environments are being debilitated by these flight paths, and there are measure the FAA can make to rectify the matters, but are not. These concerns have been going on for over seven years now and the FAA must finally listen to our grievances, the scientific studies showing the damage these flight paths so low are causing, and the above information. Best, Lori Caden Sherman Oaks Resident
1043	Martha McMahon	To Whom It May Concern: Please. Please. Please help make our lives in Studio City healthier and more livable. It’s currently unbearable. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
1044	Majid Falamaki	Dear FAA officers, As a resident of Benedict Canyon at Beverly Crest area, we are opposing the FAA report on the Environmental

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Assessment. This community needs quiet skies. We have already been hearing helicopter and Burbank airplanes noise every single days. Please do not add anymore noise over our head. To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. Sincerely Jay F. Benedict Canyon Driver resident Sent from Mail for Windows
1045	Michele Florman	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. WE ARE FED UP BEING TARGETED WITH 6 YR OLD NEW FLIGHT PATH THAT MIGRATED SOUTH WITH REPETITIVE NON-STOP LOUD POLLUTING AIRCRAFT. Save our sanity, lungs and ears from the damage You have purposely caused for profit. Sincerely Angry Neighbors, Michele and Steven Florman Sent from my iPad
1046	James Moore	Please. Please consider the community. Planes fly over my house at all times of the day and night now, waking up my young kids and and polluting the air. The noise reverberates through the canyon. I am not the NIMBY type and I am blessed to live where I do, but because of how canyons are structured — closer to planes and natural echo chambers, having flights climb at full power above one is more detrimental than over a noise corridor like the freeway which is just a mile away. We get hit by both Van Nuys and BUR. Please help us get some measure of relief. To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		“Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
1047	David Davis	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that %2??Purpose and Need%2?? does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR%2's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. I PERSONALLY HAVE HAD ENOUGH OF THESE DISGUSTING LOW FLYING JETS GOING OVER THE BEVERLY GLEN AREA BY VALLEY VISTA. TOO LOW, TOO LOUD, TOO EARLY, TOO MUCH NOISE@ DAVID DAVIS 4252 LEVITT LANE SHERMAN OAKS, CA 91403 310-625-2541
1048	Carmen Santana	To Whom It May Concern: The noise from the planes departing from(and arriving to during wind shift) Burbank airport has completely changed our home life. The noise changed our home from a place of quiet rest to nonstop whining jet noise as the jets struggle to reach altitude. The jets are within 3000 ft altitude of our home. When we go walking at tree people or any local park in the Santa Monica mountains the sound of nature which is the reason we moved here in 2013 is gone. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Carmen Santana
1049	MadCrushVintage	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1050	David and Inga	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. Noise is amplified and echoes in the mountain range, it must be included, especially considering it is now a corridor where planes pass AND turn, creating double the length of time as a flyover. Low flying jets echo and disturb wildlife in 4G federally protected park wildlife range. - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1051	BouffantVille	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. The jets fly 9 miles south of Burbank and cross right into the SM mountain range dozens of times a day. Dozens of flights sending noise, pollution and visual disturbance over protected parkland. Because the SM mountain range is in direct flight path everyday, logic denotes that this mountain range area must be specifically studied and cannot be excluded from environmental studies. It is a fact that the SM Mountain range area is a large area with miles long canyon topography that amplifies sounds and creates echoes, so any jet noise is doubled or tripled or higher in sound level. The bouncing echoes from the jets are long lasting in the mountain areas, with dozens of flights a day. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		sound trails continue after the planes have turned. It is therefore a necessity that this area be included in the environmental impact study for noise levels. Leaving this area out of a noise study is unacceptable. It must be included and the noise and sound impacts on residents nearby and the wildlife in the mountains must be taken into consideration. Again, this is 4G federally protected park land under the direct flight path of Next Gen flights, and it MUST be included in environmental impact studies. - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1052	Linda Montanti	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The noise in the canyons from these planes is horrible. It is completely unacceptable. Linda Montanti 1921 Benedict Canyon Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210 beachglass@earthlink.net
1053	Steven Taber on behalf of Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association	Dear Mr. Covalt, Attached are the comments of Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association regarding the FAA’s Draft Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport. Please note that there are two documents attached. One is a designated “Confidential” in that it contains two sections that discuss the mediation between the FAA and Benedict Hills that resulted in the Settlement Agreement that is subject of the Draft Environmental Assessment. The other document marked “Public” has the confidential information redacted. Please also note that due to the volume of the Exhibits, they will be provided by thumb drive that will be included with the hard copy of the comments. There will be two documents on the thumb drive: one is the exhibits with the confidential documents and the second is the exhibits without the confidential documents. If you have any difficulties with any of the documents, please let me know. Best regards, Steven Taber ----- <i>Editor’s Note: Two versions of the attached comments were provided; the text from the version marked “Public” has confidential information redacted by the commenter, and is the version included here.</i> March 21, 2024 Steven M. Taber staber@leechtishman.com

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		(626) 395-7300 VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND EXPEDITED MAIL Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group, Western Service Center 2200 216th Street, Des Moines, Washington 98198 Re: Comments of the Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association on the Draft Environmental Review Document for Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport; FAA-2023-27143 Dear Sir/Madam, On behalf of the Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association (collectively, “Benedict Hills”), please find attached comments from Benedict Hills regarding the Draft Environmental Review Document for Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport; FAA-2023-27143. Thank you for providing us the opportunity to comment on this important issue. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to call me or send me an email. Very truly yours, Steven M. Taber ---- PUBLIC COMMENTS OF BENEDICT HILLS ESTATES ASSOCIATION AND BENEDICT HILLS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION REGARDING THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION’S DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT DEPARTURE PROCEDURE AMENDMENTS FOR HOLLYWOOD BURBANK AIRPORT Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association (collectively, “Benedict Hills”), who have been advocating for reasonable flight procedures from Hollywood Burbank Airport (the “Airport” or “BUR”) for more than a decade, have serious issues with the Draft Environmental Assessment that purports to be pursuant to the Settlement Agreement that Benedict Hills entered into with the Federal Aviation Administration in 2018. Benedict Hills believes that neither Alternative A nor Alternative B in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport – Draft Environmental Assessment (the “Draft EA”) reflect the terms agreed to in the Settlement Agreement. Notably absent is the Settlement Agreement’s critical provision that aircraft departing the Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off. As a result of this omission, and the other reasons set forth in sections II – VI below, the environmental analysis is inadequate and does not reflect the environmental impacts of the procedures. The FAA should revise the proposed procedures to accurately reflect the terms of the Settlement Agreement and develop an environmental analysis based on those revised procedures. Because of the increase in aviation noise engendered by the FAA’s implementation of its Southern California Metroplex flight routes (OROSZ TWO and SLAPP TWO) for BUR, the FAA created widespread public opposition to all BUR departure routes. However, Benedict Hills’ opposition to noise generated from aircraft departing from BUR predates the Southern California Metroplex. Because neither the FAA nor the residents who may be affected by the new routes can make an informed decision about the new routes without a complete understanding about the provenance of the new routes, a brief history of Benedict Hills’ involvement with this issue is in order. I. Background In 2011, residents of the Los Angeles neighborhood of Benedict Canyon formed “Fight Burbank Noise,” an informal group organized to address the low-flying planes that had started flying U-turns over the canyon. Homes near Mulholland Drive were shaking because of low-flying aircraft. Residents were smelling jet fuel and finding soot and grime in their yards. The hilly topography was causing the noise to seem like it was coming from multiple directions. And so many planes were making U-turns over Benedict Canyon that many homeowners were concerned that their home values would fall dramatically. Toward the end of 2011, residents

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		discussed these concerns with a member of Rep. Henry Waxman’s staff and a member of Los Angeles Councilman Paul Koretz’s staff. Rep. Waxman’s staff arranged a meeting in January 2012 between area residents and three representatives of BUR. The BUR contingent, led by Sidney Allen, Special Projects Manager, claimed there had been no change in flight paths over the years. He theorized that inexperienced air traffic controllers based in San Diego were sending planes south over the neighborhoods as a way of building sufficient spacing between planes, and that lower-powered planes needed to fly longer at lower elevations before they gained altitude. This is now known as the “Southern Shift.” This shift of departing aircraft to the south was confirmed in Landrum & Brown’s 2018 report. See Exhibit 3. It was also the subject of the City of Los Angeles’ 2019 Petition for Review (Ninth Circuit, Case No. 19-73164). In February 2012, a month after the meeting, the FAA did a quick analysis of Burbank and Van Nuys departures. A copy of that analysis is attached as Exhibit 7. The results were presented to then-FAA Regional Administrator William Withycombe. That analysis concluded that despite the complaints of the residents, nothing had changed. Neither Benedict Hills nor Rep. Waxman’s staff were made aware of the analysis. On March 26, 2012, Benedict Hills Estates Association (“BHEA”) wrote to Michael P. Huerta, the then-Acting Administrator of the FAA, supporting the efforts to “rid our neighborhood of aggressive and dangerous flyovers from the Van Nuys and Burbank airport.” A copy of the letter is attached as Exhibit 8. About a month later, on April 30, 2012, the President of the Benedict Canyon Association (“BCA”) also wrote to Acting Administrator Huerta and Rep. Waxman. A copy of the letter is attached as Exhibit 9. The BCA reiterated that the flights from BUR were “dangerously low, as well as a constant and unbearable nuisance” to the community. The BCA’s letter also noted that “flights took off from and landed in Burbank Airport for many decades without noise pollution invading the balance of nature and the peace and quiet of the hillsides, creating a public safety issue for hillside dwellers and disrupting the wildlife in our protected wildlife corridors.” Despite the concerns expressed by the BCA and BHEA, the FAA did not respond to either letter. In May 2012, Rep. Waxman’s office contacted the FAA on behalf of his constituents . In July 2012, the FAA’s Western-Pacific Regional Administrator Withycombe agreed to meet with a few homeowners at the FAA’s regional offices in Hawthorne, California. Before the meeting could be finalized, though, Regional Administrator Withycombe retired. In late 2012, Benedict Hills began a petition drive, the goal of which was to collect testimonials to present to the FAA at the to-be-scheduled meeting. In January 2013, the BCA contacted Congressman Adam Schiff about the problem because his district includes BUR. Benedict Hills was also in touch with Rep. Schiff’s office. Rep. Schiff asked for the FAA to give him a report. It is believed that the FAA submitted the February 2012 analysis (Exhibit 7), which incorrectly showed no changes between 2008 and 2011, to Rep. Schiff’s office. Given the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		results of the February 2012 analysis, and that most of the affected areas were outside his district, Rep. Schiff closed his file on the matter in March 2013. The Benedict Canyon residents then turned back to Rep. Waxman for help. One resident began keeping a log of overhead flights, and another Canyon resident started making time-stamped videos of low-flying planes, which were later posted on YouTube. In July 2013, Rep. Waxman’s office arranged a meeting between local residents and the FAA at their Hawthorne office, with one of the Congressman’s staff in attendance. The FAA was represented by its Acting Regional Administrator David Suomi, its Acting Deputy Regional Administrator, its Special Programs Integrator Steve May, and two air traffic district managers. Also participating in the meeting by telephone were three individuals from the Operations Support Group in Seattle, and three individuals from the Southern California Terminal Radar Approach Control Office (“TRACON”) in San Diego. The BCA and Benedict Hills presented the petitions and homeowner comments to the FAA, along with the flight logs compiled by three Benedict Canyon neighbors. A copy of the materials is attached as Exhibit 10. One of the community representatives showed the FAA a cushion from her lawn furniture saturated with jet fuel soot. Benedict Hills told the FAA their firsthand experiences with low-flying and noisy planes. And they explained that residents bought their homes in Benedict Canyon because of the tranquil canyon environment. That tranquility was now being destroyed by the dramatic increase in low-flying and noisy aircraft. The FAA maintained there had been no procedural changes or significant increases in the number of flights in the last several years that would have caused an increase in noise over Benedict Canyon. At the end of the meeting the FAA said that they could do nothing about perceived growth in air traffic noise and pollution. However, they agreed to research further back in time to see what may have changed. The FAA, at the request of Benedict Hills, also agreed to investigate whether the distance the planes are flying south could be reduced before they turn to head north, and whether the planes were taking wider turns than they needed to take. A few weeks later, the BCA and Benedict Hills asked Rep. Waxman’s office to follow up with the FAA, and, in August 2013, the FAA provided the February 2012 report analyzing departures from Van Nuys Airport and Burbank Airport from 2008 – 2011, which had concluded that nothing had worsened. The FAA’s report addressed none of the other items they had agreed to research. In response, Benedict Hills prepared a letter of protest to Rep. Waxman. Shortly thereafter, the FAA announced that as part of its “Next Generation of Air Transportation System” (“NextGen”) it was undertaking a project, the Southern California Metroplex project, to make the Southern California airspace more efficient and safe. As part of that project, the FAA initiated an environmental assessment. At this point, Benedict Hills engaged legal counsel.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In February 2014, Benedict Hills sent a letter to the FAA providing comments for the environmental assessment repeating the points that had been raised with the FAA at the July 2013 meeting. Benedict Hills also engaged aviation expert Barry Yurtis to analyze the departure routes that were causing aircraft to fly over Benedict Canyon. Yurtis’ experience included 25 years at the FAA, including as Los Angeles Air Traffic Manager and Western-Pacific Regional Air Traffic Quality Assurance/Safety Manager. According to Yurtis’ analysis, planes departing on one of the Van Nuys Airport (“VNY”) runways were being instructed to fly south before the air traffic controller initiated a radar vector to the north. The same was true of aircraft departing from BUR – they were flying south over Benedict Canyon before being radar vectored to the north. Yurtis’ analysis proposed alternative routes that would substantially reduce flights over Benedict Canyon, which, he believed, could be included in the Southern California Metroplex project. The basic idea was for the FAA to institute new routes that followed the freeways as much as possible. As Yurtis explained: [T]he Client should request that the new RNAV SID should contain a course and ground track which would place the aircraft directly over the Ventura Freeway as it proceeds on its westerly course prior to proceeding north. This action would not only provide noise relief to the residents of Benedict Canyon but would also alleviate the potential issue of noise from the residents of the San Fernando Valley. Exhibit 11, p.8. Yurtis proposed that new flight routes be developed that would allow aircraft departing BUR and VNY to follow a curved departure that would keep them above the 134/101 freeway (“Ventura Freeway”) as they gained altitude and joined the stream of air traffic flowing northeast above the I-405 corridor. In August 2014, Benedict Hills’ counsel, Steven M. Taber, wrote to the FAA requesting a meeting to present Yurtis’ proposal. The FAA did not respond. With Rep. Waxman’s assistance, a meeting eventually was arranged for October 14, 2014, between Taber and Yurtis and the FAA’s new Western-Pacific Regional Administrator Glen Martin, its Special Programs Integrator Steve May (who had attended the July 2013 meeting), and the Manager of the FAA’s Safety and Evaluation Branch. A copy of the Benedict Hills presentation is attached as Exhibit 12. The request Benedict Hills made to the FAA was a simple one: Design a new RNAV Departure procedure for jet aircraft departing [BUR] Runway 15 containing a course and ground track that would position aircraft directly over the Ventura Freeway as they proceed on a westerly course prior to proceeding north. This action would not only provide noise relief to the residents of Benedict Canyon but would also alleviate the noise impact to the residents of the San Fernando Valley. Exhibit 12, p.20. The presentation also requested the FAA to make the same changes to departures from VNY. See Exhibit 12, p.21. The FAA seemed receptive to the Benedict Hills proposal to reroute the aircraft over the Ventura Freeway. The FAA confirmed that the proposal was consistent with the FAA’s noise policies and its objectives in the NextGen project. However, the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		FAA also said there could be bureaucratic and regulatory hurdles to the proposal being incorporated in the Southern California Metroplex project. About a month later, in November 2014, the FAA’s Manager of the Air Traffic Operations Support Group told Benedict Hills’ counsel that the Southern California Metroplex design team had received Benedict Hills’ proposal and would design curved departures from Van Nuys Airport and Bob Hope Airport for inclusion in the Southern California Metroplex project. In July 2015, the FAA unveiled the proposed Burbank and Van Nuys flight paths as part of the Southern California Metroplex project. The problematic Van Nuys departure was replaced with two routes that turned north of Mulholland, although not as far north as the Benedict Hills proposal had requested. However, as for Burbank, there was nothing resembling the Benedict Hills proposal. A copy of the proposed BUR and VNY procedures are attached as Exhibit 13. The FAA Manager in charge of the Southern California Metroplex project told Benedict Hills’ counsel that although the design team had recommended curved departures, The FAA headquarters overrode the recommendation. However, the manager said that the FAA, the airport, and the airlines were all interested in adopting curved departures for BUR and would continue to work on them although they were not included in the Southern California Metroplex project. According to the FAA, the airlines were interested in the proposal because the new routes would save them fuel – one of the primary goals of NextGen. In September 2015, Benedict Hills submitted to the FAA detailed comments explaining why the Benedict Hills proposal should be included in the Southern California Metroplex project. A copy of the comment letter is attached as Exhibit 14. Echoing the reasoning that had been presented to the FAA, Benedict Hills’ counsel again laid out how the curved departures for both BUR and VNY would not only reduce noise for Benedict Hills and San Fernando Valley, but also achieve the FAA’s policy goals. The comment letter concluded: Commenters are not asking for much. They simply ask that a curved departure be designed and implemented from BUR and VNY that would make use of the freeway system to minimize noise impacts not only on Commenters, but on other noise sensitive areas in the San Fernando Valley and the Hollywood Hills. This curved departure should be designed and implemented as part of the Final EA for the SoCal Metroplex. Waivers of the design standards should be granted so that the curved departures from both Van Nuys and Burbank Airports can be designed and implemented as part of the SoCal Metroplex process. In February 2016, the FAA Manager in charge of the Southern California Metroplex project informed Benedict Hills that curved departures from Burbank had been approved by all parties except Bob Hope Airport. However, when the FAA issued its Final Environmental Assessment and Record of Decision approving the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Southern California Metroplex project at the end of August 2016, the curved departure routes for VNY and BUR were absent. In response to Benedict Hills’ comments, the FAA claimed that the FAA’s current “design criteria” did not allow them to create routes that followed the freeways.¹ That decision was inconsistent with goals the FAA and Congress had established for NextGen – saving fuel and reducing noise. In October 2016, Benedict Hills filed a Petition for Review of the Southern California Metroplex project in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. A copy of the Petition for Review is attached as Exhibit 1. The Petition alleged that Benedict Hills had requested curved departures from Van Nuys Airport and Burbank Airport that would use the freeway system to reduce noise impacts, not only on Benedict Hills, but on other noise-sensitive areas of the San Fernando Valley and the Hollywood Hills, and that failing to adopt those routes was inconsistent with the goals of the NextGen program and FAA policy. Contained in the Petitioners’ comments was a request that a curved departure be designed and implemented from Bob Hope Airport and Van Nuys Airport that would make use of the freeway system to minimize noise impacts not only on Petitioners, but on other noise sensitive areas in the San Fernando Valley and the Hollywood Hills as well. ¹ Despite its claim that the “design criteria” did not allow the FAA to create the routes, changes in the design criteria had been implemented almost six months before the FAA issued its Final EA and ROD. In March 2016, the FAA promulgated FAA Order 8260.58A, <i>United States Standard for Performance Based Navigation</i>, (PBN), which included flight procedure criteria for the Open SID concept based on recommendations from the FAA Performance Based Operations Aviation Rulemaking Committee. According to the FAA, this allowed the development of the OROSZ THREE and SLAPP TWO departure procedures. Why the FAA did not use its recently changed design criteria to design curved departures from BUR and VNY as part of the Southern California Metroplex project is unknown. <i>Editor’s Note: This comment letter includes multiple sections of text in the form of graphics, where some of the text is shown in the graphics, and other sections of the text are redacted. The text in the graphics has been transcribed and is provided, and redactions are noted.</i> Exhibit 1, p.3. In November 2016, the U.S. Justice Department, representing the FAA, proposed mediating under the auspices of the District of Columbia Circuit’s Appellate Mediation Program, which required Benedict Hills and the FAA to sign a confidentiality agreement regarding the mediation. While Benedict Hills would have preferred a more transparent process, its expectation was that the mediation would achieve curved departures from VNY and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		BUR that would reduce noise impacts on Benedict Canyon and the San Fernando Valley (and reduce fuel burn by aircraft). The federal court mediation took nearly a year and a half, from January 2017 through May 2018, and resulted in a settlement agreement, pursuant to which Benedict Hills voluntarily dismissed its Petition for Review. Although Benedict Hills would relish a discussion about the mediation and the process by which the settlement agreement was reached, the FAA has refused to let Benedict Hills disclose the FAA documents that formed the basis for Benedict Hills’ decision to accept the final version of the settlement agreement. Despite that refusal, the FAA published the settlement agreement on its website in late 2018. However, the documents the FAA provided to Benedict Hills during the mediation are critical to understanding the intent and meaning of the Settlement Agreement. Since the intent and meaning of the Settlement Agreement is at issue here, the FAA should publish the rest of the documents that it prepared as part of the mediation process so the public and other decision-makers will have a complete understanding of the process by which the settlement agreement was negotiated, and what its implementation would mean [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL SECTION] <i>Editor’s Note: This section was redacted in the original comment.</i> [END CONFIDENTIAL PORTION] What is most important about the settlement is how departures would be flown in practice. At Benedict Hills’ insistence, the FAA agreed to include this language in paragraph II.A. of the Settlement Agreement: FAA will design and develop two open standard instrument departure procedures from Bob Hope Airport called SLAPP and OROSZ. Incorporated by reference and attached hereto is Exhibit “A.” which depicts the proposed initial designs for these procedures. The parties acknowledge that aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off and would deoend on the circumstances described in paragraph F. Draft EA, Appendix C, pp. 1-2 (emphasis added; see also ¶ II.G. Benedict Hills’ reason for adding this last sentence to the paragraph was to make it understood that most aircraft using the new procedures SLAPP and OROSZ would not fly the entire procedure, and that most aircraft would be radar vectored to the north soon after they reached 1,000 feet AGL.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		What Benedict Hills had been consistently asking for – curved departures from BUR and VNY that follow the Ventura Freeway – did not make it into the settlement agreement, and Benedict Hills still believes that the best solutions for canyon and valley residents are curved departures from VNY and BUR that follow the Ventura Freeway. However, radar vectoring departing planes to the north as soon as practicable would get departing flights as close to the freeways as the FAA would agree to, and would be a significant improvement over the procedures the FAA had approved as part of the Southern California Metroplex project. While Benedict Hills was negotiating with the FAA, the FAA moved forward with the implementation of those new procedures. On March 2, 2017, the FAA implemented OROSZ ONE² and SLAPP ONE from BUR. Because of the FAA’s implementation of the OROSZ ONE and TWO and SLAPP ONE departures, during the latter part of 2017 and the early part of 2018, residents in Studio City and Sherman Oaks began noticing more flights overhead and a substantial increase in aircraft noise. It is Benedict Hills’ belief that the primary factor in the increase of aircraft noise is the increase in concentration of aircraft over a narrower flight path caused by the implementation of OROSZ ONE and TWO and SLAPP ONE. In 2018, BUR’s consultant, Landrum & Brown, issued its <i>Flight Path Analysis</i>, (Exhibit 3). That report concluded: [T]he most frequently used path or concentrated path has shifted south over time partly due to an increase in Southern California regional operations, an increase in average yearly temperatures, and the implementation of Metroplex Area Navigation (RNAV) departure procedures [D]ue to the southern shift of the [BUR] departure path, there has been a greater proportional increase of flights and an increase in the frequency of flights per hour over areas south of the 101 Freeway, especially between 2016 and 2017. Exhibit 3, p.2. Using this Report as its basis, the City of Los Angeles filed a Petition for Review claiming that the FAA was responsible for this “Southern Shift” and ² It is not clear from available documentation when OROSZ TWO, the current departure procedure, replaced OROSZ ONE and was implemented. should have conducted an environmental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act to assess the environmental impact of the decisions to allow aircraft to fly further south. <i>City of Los Angeles v. FAA</i>, Case No. 19-72164 (Ninth Circuit). Benedict Hills intervened in the proceeding on the side of the City. On October 26, 2021, the Ninth Circuit denied the Petition for Review because there was no “final order” which the court could review, so the Court lacked jurisdiction. The Court made no substantive rulings in its opinion.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		On December 10, 2018, Zareh Sinanyan, President of the Burbank-Glendale- Pasadena Airport Authority sent a letter to then-Acting FAA Administrator Daniel K. Elwell requesting, under Section 175 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, that the FAA “consider the feasibility of dispersal headings or other lateral track variations to address community noise concerns.” Exhibit 4, p.1. Meanwhile, a Task Force was set up to investigate the noise issues created by BUR. The South San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force (“SSFVANTF”) took testimony, comments, and presentations. Benedict Hills’ attorney made a presentation to the Task Force summarizing Benedict Hills’ long history regarding this issue, and its desire to see noise impacts from BUR departures lessened for everyone. Exhibit 17. Bendict Hills emphasized that departure procedures where aircraft were radar vectored to the north as soon as practicable offered the best hope of achieving that goal the FAA would allow. However, because the FAA would not permit Benedict Hills to share the documentation the FAA prepared during the mediation, the SSFVANTF never saw the noise reduction projections that would result from radar vectoring departing aircraft to the north as soon as practicable. The SSFVANTF produced a series of recommendations to the FAA. Exhibit 5. The FAA responded to each recommendation. Exhibit 6. Regarding the recommendation that the FAA return to the 2007 BUR departure tracks, the FAA’s response included: Although the FAA cannot restore the BUR Runway 15 departure flight tracks as they existed in 2007, the FAA does intend to modify these departure procedures. The FAA has proposed the SLAPP THREE and OROSZ THREE departure procedures, which are discussed below. The FAA firmly believes that, once implemented, these new procedures will help address local concerns about aircraft overflights. The FAA is currently preparing an Environmental Assessment of these proposals and that document is the most appropriate vehicle to consider proposals to address a shift in departure tracks to the south. The Environmental Assessment will also provide the FAA an opportunity to more fully review requests for dispersion of flight tracks for those departures. Exhibit 6. Benedict Hills has been waiting for over five years for the FAA to finally release its Draft Environmental Assessment (“DEA”) and see the procedures contemplated by the Settlement Agreement. Unfortunately, the DEA is fundamentally flawed.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		II. None of the alternatives analyzed in the Draft EA comply with the Settlement Agreement, and therefore they do not meet the purpose and need. An Environmental Assessment must include a discussion of the Purpose and Need for the proposed action, which must “specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.13; see also, 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14; Nat'l Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. BLM, 606 F.3d 1058, 1070 (9th Cir. 2010); Westlands Water Dist. v. United States, 376 F.3d 843, 865, 867 (9th Cir. 2004). In addressing the Purpose and Need section of an EA, FAA Order 1050.1F provides that the Purpose and Need section “presents the problem being addressed and describes what the FAA is trying to achieve with the proposed action. The purpose and need for the proposed action must be clearly explained and stated in terms that are understandable to individuals who are not familiar with aviation or commercial aerospace activities.” FAA Order 1050.1F, ¶ 6-2.1c. In essence, the “need” is the problem, and the “purpose” is the proposed solution to the problem. The Purpose (<i>i.e.</i>, the Project) is supposed to resolve the Need (<i>i.e.</i>, the problem). The DEA’s Purpose and Need accomplishes none of these goals. A. “Maintaining the Safety and Efficiency of the NAS” should not be part of the Purpose and Need. In several places in the DEA’s discussion of the Purpose and Need, the FAA states that its “mission” is to “maintain the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System (“NAS”).” DEA, p. 1-1. While Benedict Hills agrees that that is part of the FAA’s mission³, it has no place as part of the Purpose and Need for this Project. Section 1.2.2 of the DEA states that: the purpose of the Proposed Action is to maintain the safety and efficiency of the NAS while designing and developing two Open SID flight procedures at BUR. The FAA completed this environmental review to comply with the terms of the Settlement Agreement. The FAA also agreed to consider the sixteen recommendations set forth by the SSVANTF in developing its alternatives, along with the No Action Alternative. DEA, p. 1-3. While the “need” for the Project is never stated in the DEA, the Background section, § 1.2.1 of the DEA, lays out that the DEA results from two events: the Settlement Agreement and the SSFVANTF report, both of which “recommended modifications to Runway 15 departure flight procedures that could mitigate noise concerns from departing aircraft overflights...” DEA, p. 1-2. The need, then, is to alleviate noise concerns from departing aircraft overflights. There is no mention in either the Settlement Agreement (DEA, Appendix C) or the SSVANTF report (Exhibit 5) about “maintaining the safety and efficiency of the NAS.” While that may be a factor in the FAA’s development of the procedures, it is not relevant to either the purpose or the need of the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Project. The purpose should be “to develop flight procedures that diminish the noise impacts of departing flights from BUR, balanced against the safety and efficiency in the NAS.” B. Compliance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement is a part of the Purpose and Need. Even if “maintaining the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System” is part of the Purpose and Need, to meet the Purpose and Need of the DEA the Project must “meet the terms of a Settlement Agreement the FAA executed with local homeowners’ associations, which required consideration of alternative procedures.” Draft EA, p. 1-1; see also, p. 1-3. However, the two “Open SID flight procedures at BUR,” i.e., “Alternative A,” do not meet the terms of the Settlement Agreement. Therefore, the Draft EA is inadequate and must be revised to develop flight procedures that comply with the Settlement Agreement. ³ Benedict Hills would argue that the FAA’s mission is to balance safety and efficiency in the airspace with the protection of people on the ground. See <i>Burbank v. Lockheed Terminal</i> 411 U.S. 624 (1973). C. The Settlement Agreement requires that flights be radar vectored as soon as practicable after departure. The Settlement Agreement, which is Appendix C to the Draft EA, states in two places that radar vectoring will be used to reduce the noise impact living below the flight paths. Sections II.A. and II.G both state that “the parties acknowledge that aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after takeoff and would depend on the circumstances described in paragraph F.” Settlement Agreement, pp.1-2. This critical phrase in the Settlement Agreement is not part of the proposed procedures, nor has the environmental impact been analyzed as part of the DEA. Instead, the DEA describes the SLAPP THREE procedure as: The new SLAPP THREE departure procedure would require aircraft departing Runway 15 to maintain the runway heading of 155° before executing a climbing right turn to intercept the 214° course to the JAYTE waypoint. Aircraft would pass JAYTE at or above 2,500 feet mean sea level (MSL) as well as at or below 240 knots indicated airspeed (KIAS). From JAYTE, aircraft would fly the 258° track to the TEAGN waypoint, which must be crossed at or above 4,000 feet MSL. Upon crossing TEAGN, aircraft would continue to fly the 258° track until receiving ATC routing to RAYVE waypoint at an altitude at or above 7,000 feet MSL and on to the assigned transition. DEA, pp. 2-3 – 2-4.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The DEA describes the OROSZ THREE procedure as: The new OROSZ THREE departure procedure would require aircraft departing Runway 15 to maintain the runway heading of 155° before executing a climbing right turn to intercept the 213° course to JAYTE waypoint. Aircraft must pass JAYTE at or above 2,500 feet MSL as well as at or below 240 KIAS. From JAYTE, aircraft would fly the 259° track to TEAGN waypoint, which must be crossed at or above 4,000 feet MSL. Upon crossing TEAGN, aircraft would fly the 258° track until receiving ATC routing to TILLR waypoint at an altitude at or above 8,000 feet MSL and on to the assigned transition. DEA, p.2-4. Neither procedure description includes any indication that the departing aircraft “will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off,” as required by the Settlement Agreement. Because of this, the DEA and “Alternative A” are inadequate and must be revised to include this in the procedure. Because the DEA and Alternative A do not comply with the Settlement Agreement, they do not meet the Purpose and Need, and therefore the DEA must be revised. This is not a distinction without a difference. It is a critical part of the procedures specifically negotiated with the FAA. Aircraft that are radar vectored to the north before they reach JAYTE, or even TEAGN, will have much different noise impact than an aircraft that completes the full procedures from departure to JAYTE and then TEAGN. In analyzing the environmental impact of Alternative A (the putative settlement procedures), the Draft EA assumes that all aircraft that flew SLAPP TWO and OROSZ TWO would fly the <i>complete</i> SLAPP THREE and OROSZ THREE. See Appendix J , pp J-9-J-11. They would follow the assigned flight path for the initial portion of the departure procedure, fly over JAYTE and fly by TEAGN at which point they would be radar vectored to waypoints TILLR or RAYVE. The so-called "northbound vectoring operations" mentioned in Appendix J (pp. J-9 -J-10) do not account for the procedures mentioned in Sections II.A and II.G of the Settlement Agreement. They represent flight operations that use neither SLAPP nor OROSZ. <i>Id</i> . The DEA, thus, fails to consider the environmental impact of aircraft that are radar vectored north soon after departing BUR Runway 15. Thus, the DEA is inadequate and must be revised to comply with the terms of the Settlement Agreement. This next section is confidential because it discusses documents that the FAA claims are confidential. To the extent necessary, Benedict Hills waives any confidentiality regarding these documents and asks the FAA to do likewise. These documents are necessary to understand the purpose and intent of the language in II.A and II. G

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the Settlement Agreement and how the Alternative A procedures do not comply with the Settlement Agreement. [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL SECTION] <i>Editor's Note: This section was redacted in the original comment.</i> [END CONFIDENTIAL SECTION] III. The FAA Did Not Consider All Reasonable Alternatives to the Proposed Procedures The FAA must consider all reasonable alternatives when it evaluates the potential environmental impacts of a proposed action such as implementing new air traffic procedures under NEPA. NEPA regulations require the FAA to "[e]valuate reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, and, for alternatives that the agency eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their elimination." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a). FAA Order 1050.1F, 7-1.1 (e) states that the Alternatives section must also "present a brief discussion of alternatives that were not considered reasonable (e.g., because they do not meet the purpose and need for the proposed action)." See 1050.1F, 7-1.1(e) ("Whether a proposed alternative is reasonable depends, in large part, upon the extent to which it meets the purpose and need for the proposed action ... However, they must meet the basic criteria for any alternative: it must be reasonable, feasible, and achieve the project's purpose"). Thus, the reason for considering alternatives is to identify and evaluate options that could achieve project "purpose and need" with fewer negative environmental impacts. For an alternative to be analyzed in full, it needs to "meet the requirements of the Purpose and Need." Draft EA, p. 2-1' see also, p. 2-3 ("a reasonable alternative is one that would accomplish the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action ... "). However, as stated above, the Purpose and Need in the Draft EA lacks any precise definition of what the Settlement Agreement was supposed to accomplish. There is no discussion of the Need, apart from the need to comply with the Settlement Agreement. The intent and purpose of the Settlement Agreement was to provide noise relief for canyon, hillside, and valley residents by routing air traffic over highways and commercial corridors instead of over residential areas. To the extent that the proposed Alternatives do not accomplish that, they do not fulfill the purpose and need and must be rejected. A. Alternative A (and Alternative B) were not sufficiently analyzed to give the public enough information to base a reasonable decision

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, the putative “settlement procedures,” is discussed at length above. However, as for the analysis of it in the DEA, there are several reasons the DEA is deficient. First, the analysis of Alternative A does not mention how often aircraft using the proposed SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will fly the full procedure (i.e., flying over JAYTE, flying by TEAGN, and then receiving a radar vector to the north after TEAGN). The environmental analysis assumes that <i>all</i> aircraft using the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will fly the full procedure, instead of just portions of it. See DEA, Appendix J. If the intent of Alternative A is to have all aircraft fly the full procedure, it does not meet the Purpose and Need because it does not comply with the terms of the Settlement Agreement. If the intent is that aircraft will be radar-vector off the proposed procedures, then the environmental analysis in the DEA and Appendix J is deficient because they do not analyze aircraft that begin the procedure and then are radar-vector off. There also are several questions left unanswered regarding both Alternative A and Alternative B. For example, why was the increase in climb gradient to 600’ per nautical mile only included in Alternative B, and not in Alternative A as well? Why was the heading in Alternative A changed to 155°, instead of maintaining the 210° heading that is present in the current flight procedures and in Alternative B? In other words, the environmental benefits of Alternative B could have been included in Alternative A. B. Relocation of JAYTE and TEAGN to the U.S. Route 101 Highway Corridor (Alternative C) is a reasonable alternative that should have been fully analyzed. Relocation of the initial waypoints of the RNAV procedures to the Ventura Freeway is the alternative on which nearly all residents can agree. It is the alternative that residents of Benedict Hills have been suggesting since 2011. While the Draft EA claims that this Alternative “would create an unacceptable level of safety compared to the No Action Alternative and could have catastrophic consequences,” it does not explain how that “unacceptable level of safety” would arise and whether a waiver would be available. One of the main reasons the FAA implemented “NextGen” was to narrow the flight corridors for aircraft – from 3 nm to 0.5 nm. It stands to reason that the separation distance between the arrival streams and the departure streams, the vast majority of which would use RNAV procedures, could be reduced to accommodate a flight path over commercial areas, especially in a densely populated urban area, like the San Fernando Valley. Moreover, the arrival stream for BUR is about 2.5 nm from the Ventura Freeway. Moving the departure stream of BUR over the 101/134 corridor would result in a significant diminution of environmental impacts, such as noise and emissions, over residential areas. This Alternative should have received further consideration to analyze whether the reduction in environmental impacts would offset the necessity of a waiver of the separation distances. Since this Alternative is supported by most of the affected communities, the FAA should give it

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		careful and complete consideration. Or, at least, explain in detail why it is impossible to implement. If there is any possibility that this Alternative is workable, the FAA should implement it, instead of giving it short shrift. C. Changing the initial departure heading for SLAPP THREE and OROSZ THREE Procedures to promote additional flight track dispersal is a reasonable alternative that should have been fully analyzed. Presented as Alternatives E and F, these Alternatives are in response to the statutory mandate that the FAA consider “dispersal headings and lateral track variations” to minimize noise impacts. Since the intent of Section 175 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 is to mitigate noise, the FAA fulfills its statutory mission by reducing the noise impacts. Section 175 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 states that: ADDRESSING COMMUNITY NOISE CONCERNS. When proposing a new area navigation departure procedure, or amending an existing procedure that would direct aircraft between the surface and 6,000 feet above ground level over noise sensitive areas, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall consider the feasibility of dispersal headings or other lateral track variations to address community noise concerns, if— (1) the affected airport operator, in consultation with the affected community, submits a request to the Administrator for such a consideration; (2) the airport operator's request would not, in the judgment of the Administrator, conflict with the safe and efficient operation of the national airspace system; and (3) the effect of a modified departure procedure would not significantly increase noise over noise sensitive areas, as determined by the Administrator. On December 10, 2018, the Burbank Glendale Pasadena Airport Authority – owner/operator of the BUR – sent a letter to the FAA requesting, after consulting with the community, that the FAA consider the feasibility of dispersal headings or other lateral track variations to address community noise concerns. Exhibit 4. To mimic the dispersal achieved by the pre-NextGen procedures, SSVANTF suggested the simultaneous use of 180°, 195°, and 210° headings. While these procedures would re-introduce some complexity into the system, they also could have a significant environmental benefit on the people on the ground. It would also meet the FAA’s goal of spreading the noise and emissions over a wider area. However, the DEA rejects this alternative out of hand, stating that the Alternative “would significantly

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		decrease efficiency and in increase airspace complexity and would potentially result in a failure to maintain safety standards.” DEA, p. 2-8. No further analysis of how the Alternative would decrease efficiency is offered. Any dispersal heading and other lateral track variation would introduce complexity into the system. But by dismissing the Alternative out of hand with no further environmental analysis, the public and the decision-maker are without relevant data to consider what the environmental impact of the Alternative would be. It would seem that Congress’ intent in the Reauthorization Act requires that the FAA give more consideration to this Alternative than it did in the DEA. This Alternative should have been further considered to see if the reduction in environmental impacts is worth the increase in workload for the Air Traffic Controllers. If there is a significant reduction in environmental impacts, then the procedures could be adjusted to reduce the workload and the safety concerns. IV. The DEA Fails to Analyze All Air Quality Impacts While the Clean Air Act specifically addresses the need for federal projects to address general conformity, which concerns “criteria pollutants,” (42 U.S.C. § 7506(c)) NEPA and its regulations require more than a conformity analysis with air quality. NEPA requires a federal agency, such as the FAA, to broadly consider whether the action has “[e]ffects that would violate Federal, State, Tribal, or local law protecting the environment.” 40 C.F.R. § 1501.3(b)(2)(iv). FAA Order 1050.1F states that “an impact on air quality or Federal, state, tribal or local air quality standards under the Clean Air Act” is an extraordinary circumstance requiring further environmental review instead of a categorical exclusion. FAA Order 1050.1F § 5-2(b)(8). Likewise, FAA Airports Desk Reference, Chapter 1, Air Quality, points out that “NEPA is more rigorous in that it may require detailed analysis where it is not needed under the Clean Air Act’s (CAA) general conformity provisions.” FAA Airports Desk Reference, Chapter 1, Air Quality, § 1a. Thus, the fact that the DEA fails to analyze <i>all</i> air quality impacts, and mentions only those covered by General Conformity or the presumed to conform standard, may violate NEPA. The DEA blithely states that “[i]ncreased emissions of criteria pollutants would not reach the <i>de minimis</i> thresholds that the EPA defines in the General Conformity Rule. As a result, implementation of either of Alternatives A or B would not have a significant impact on air quality.” DEA, p.4-1. However, the <i>de minimis</i> thresholds were promulgated specifically to satisfy the FAA obligations under the Clean Air Act, (42 U.S.C. § 7506) <i>not</i> to satisfy all air quality-related requirements of NEPA. 40 C.F.R. § 1501.3(b)(2)(iv); see also FAA Desk Reference, Chap. 1, § 1a. Since the purpose of an environmental assessment is to address and provide information regarding all environmental impacts, not just providing a showing there will be no significant impact, the DEA falls short. As the Eleventh Circuit pointed out in <i>Black Warrior Riverkeeper, Inc. v. U.S</i>

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		<i>Army Corps of Eng'rs</i>, 833 F.3d 1274, 1278 (11th Cir. 2016) NEPA informs agency decisionmakers of the environmental effects of proposed federal actions and ensures that relevant information is provided to members of the public so they may also play a role in both the decision-making process and the implementation of that decision. An EA should provide information about the environmental impacts of a federal project, not just to determine if there will be significant effects. Toward that end, the FAA has published the <i>Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook</i>, a handbook whose purpose is: To provide guidance, procedures, and methodologies appropriate for use in carrying out air quality assessments prepared in association with FAA supported projects/actions; To help ensure that these air quality assessments meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), and other relevant laws and regulations. Emissions Handbook, p.i. Noticeably absent from the DEA is any discussion of Hazardous Air Pollutants. Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) are pollutants for which there are no National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), but are still regulated under the federal Clean Air Act because of their potentially adverse effects on human health and the environment. 42 U.S.C. § 7412. These pollutants, such as formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, benzene, toluene, acrolein, 1,3-butadiene, xylene, lead, naphthalene and propionaldehyde, are present in the exhaust of aircraft. <i>Aviation Emissions Handbook</i>, p. 44. Since 2003, the FAA has been providing guidance to preparers of environmental assessments and environmental impact statements on how to address hazardous air pollutants. In 2003 the FAA issued <i>Select Resource Material and Annotated Bibliography on the Topic of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) Associated With Aircraft, Airports and Aviation</i>. <i>Aviation Emissions Handbook</i>, p.45, AR 200, p. 54).⁴ Among the key findings from this initial publication was the need for a more unified approach and technical guidelines for evaluating HAPs emissions for aviation-related sources. Twice in 2009, the FAA issued guidance related to hazardous air pollutants. First, in May 2009, the EPA and the FAA jointly published the <i>Recommended Best Practice for Quantifying Speciated Organic Gas Emissions from Aircraft Equipped with Turbofan, Turbojet, and Turboprop Engines</i>⁵ document. This document contained organic gas speciation profiles and best practices for hazardous air pollutant emission inventories of aircraft equipped with turbofan, turbojet, and turboprop engines fueled with kerosene-based jet-A fuel. <i>Id.</i> Also, in September 2009, the FAA issued its <i>Guidance for Quantifying Speciated Organic Emissions from Airport Sources</i>.⁶ This document offers guidance

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		⁴ FAA, Select Resource Material and Annotated Bibliography on the Topic of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) Associated With Aircraft, Airports and Aviation, Technical Directive Memorandum D01-010, July 1, 2003, https://www.faa.gov/regulations/policies/policy_guidance/envir_policy/media/HAPs_rpt.pdf ⁵ FAA and EPA, Recommended Best Practice for Quantifying Speciated Organic Gas Emissions from Aircraft Equipped with Turbofan, Turbojet, and Turboprop Engines, May 2009 [EPA-420-R-09-0901]. https://www.faa.gov/regulations/policies/policy_guidance/envir_policy/media/FAAEPARBP_Speciated%20OG_Aircraft_052709.pdf ⁶ FAA, Guidance for Quantifying Speciated Organic Gas Emissions from Airport Sources, Version 1, September 2, 2009, on how to prepare HAPs inventories supporting EAs and EISs prepared by, or on behalf of, the FAA under NEPA. <i>Aviation Emissions Handbook</i>, p.46. When a HAPs inventory is prepared, the inventory must be prepared following this guidance and using EDMS/AEDT. <i>Id.</i> Included in the guidance is a flow chart to determine when a HAPs emission inventory must be prepared. <i>Id.</i>; see also <i>Guidance for Quantifying</i>, Figure 3, p.14. Figure 3 Determining if an Emissions Inventory is Warranted <i>Editor's Note: The comment letter includes graphics with comments, which could not be included here due to formatting issues. The original comment is available upon request in the format in which it was received.</i> Speciated Organic Gas Emissions Guidance, figure 3, p.14. http://www.faa.gov/regulations/policies/policy_guidance/envir_policy/media/Guidance%20for%20Quantifying%20Speciated%20Organic%20Gas%20Emissions%20from%20Airport%20Sources.pdf Following the above flow chart, a HAPs inventory should have been created in this matter. <i>Editor's Note: the flow chart provided in this comment is provided in a textual format. The original comment is available upon request in the format in which it was received.</i>

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Flow Chart Question Answer Regarding DEA Answer Regarding DEA
		Is Project/Action being assessed as an EIS or EA? EA.
		Is this a Major Project/Action? Yes
		Is a Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Inventory Being Prepared? Yes. See DEA, pp.3-9, 4-4.
		Conclusion: Compute HAP Emission Inventory for Each Alternative (but only report project-related HAPs in NEPA documentation).
		Alternatively, if one believes this Project is not a “major project/action,” which it is due to the high public interest, one still arrives at the same conclusion: a HAP inventory for each alternative must be computed.
		Flow Chart Question Answer Regarding DEA Answer Regarding DEA
		Is Project/Action being assessed as an EIS or EA? EA.
		Is this a Major Project/Action? No.
		Is the Project/Action at Commercial Airport located in Non-Attainment or Maintenance Area? Yes, BUR and all of the Affected Environment is located in Non-Attainment and Maintenance Areas. See DEA, pp.3-9 – 3-10.
		Is a Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Inventory Being Prepared? Yes. See DEA, pp.3-9, 4-4.
		Conclusion: Compute HAP Emission Inventory for Each Alternative (but only report project-related HAPs in NEPA documentation).
		Because the Project will cause flights for residential areas at low altitudes, the full impact of the emissions from the aircraft flying above them must be analyzed. Coupled with the many complaints to the FAA and the Airport

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		about emissions from aircraft from the SSVANTF meetings makes it unreasonable for the FAA to rely exclusively on the presumed to conform list as a basis for compliance with NEPA. Without further analysis of the air quality impacts, the DEA is inadequate and not in compliance with NEPA. V. Aircraft Noise Has Increased the Community’s Annoyance with Environmental Noise. NEPA requires that federal agencies “ensure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussion and analysis in an environmental document.” 49 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(D); see also, 40 C.F.R. § 1502.23 (mandating that federal agencies “ensure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses in environmental documents. Agencies shall make use of reliable existing data and resources.”). The FAA’s methodology for determining aircraft noise impacts dates back to the 1970’s, and is no longer reliable. The methodology has even been questioned by the FAA’s own studies and research. The FAA can no longer ignore the fact that its aviation noise methodology no longer has scientific integrity. Because of this, the DEA is inadequate. A. Community annoyance from aircraft noise is increasing. In 2017, the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority undertook a survey of “noise attitudes.” The study examined evidence on attitudes to aircraft noise around airports in England, including the effects of aircraft noise on annoyance, well-being, and health. It found that the level of noise exposure that leads to significant community annoyance has fallen from 57 dB LAeq (in a previous survey) to 54 dB LAeq. In 2016, the long-term German study entitled, “Noise-Related Annoyance, Cognition, and Health” (NORAH) concluded there has been a change in annoyance responses: people are now more highly annoyed by aircraft noise than 30 years ago.⁷ The NORAH study examined noise responses following the opening of a new runway, and implementation of a night curfew. The NORAH study mentions that ⁷ Schreckenber, D. et al. Effects of aircraft noise on annoyance and sleep disturbances before and after the expansion of Frankfurt Airport – results of the NORAH Study WP1 ‘Annoyance and Quality of Life’, Internoise Congress, Hamburg (2016). several attempts are being made at trying to explain the variance within the annoyance response, using modelling to calculate the weight of non-acoustic factors. The NORAH study concluded that more people were “highly annoyed” when they experienced an increase in aircraft noise and that annoyance remains through the years. That is, people do not habituate to aircraft noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Moreover, annoyance with aircraft noise amongst the affected population is increasing, not decreasing. The authors of 2011 report looked at datasets from separate airports in various parts of the world, including the U.S. from 1967 until 2005.⁸ The results suggested there has been a significant increase in annoyance over the years. Instead of a gradual increase, the study showed increased levels of annoyance from 1996 onward. This is despite the FAA’s self-congratulatory declarations that aircraft noise is decreasing.⁹ 1. The FAA’s recent Neighborhood Environmental Survey underscores growing community annoyance with aircraft noise. The method for representing the community response to noise is known as the “Schultz Curve,” which is a dose-response curve developed in the 1970’s. The noise thresholds used for current FAA noise policy are informed by the “Schultz Curve.” While the “Schultz Curve” remains the accepted standard for describing transportation noise exposure-annoyance relationships, its original supporting scientific evidence and social survey data were based on information available in the 1970s. The last in-depth review and revalidation of the Schultz Curve was conducted in 1992 by the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (“FICON Report”). More recent analyses have shown that aviation noise results in annoyance levels higher than other modes of transportation. Recent international social surveys have also generally shown higher annoyance than predicted by the Schultz Curve. These analyses and survey data indicate that the Schultz Curve may not reflect the current U.S. public perception of aviation noise. In 2015 and 2016, the FAA conducted a nationwide survey to measure the relationship between aircraft noise exposure and annoyance in communities ⁸ Janssen, S. et al., Trends in aircraft noise annoyance: the role of study and sample characteristics, 129 J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 1953 (2011). ⁹ “By one measure, it has been a success: over the last four decades, the number of people in the U.S. exposed to aviation noise has dropped substantially, even as the number of flights has soared.” https://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/policy_guidance/noise/ (last accessed December 23, 2020). underneath flight paths. This survey, known as the “Neighborhood Environmental Survey” (“NES,” Exhibit 18), captured the community response to a modern fleet of aircraft as they are being flown today, and it used best practices in terms of noise analysis and data collection.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		For the NES, the FAA surveyed over 10,000 residents living near 20 representative airports via a mailed questionnaire. The questionnaire asked the recipients about various environmental concerns that bothered, disturbed, or annoyed them. Noise from aircraft was one of the thirteen environmental concerns that the survey covered, and recipients were not told this was an airport community noise survey. It was the largest survey of this type undertaken at one time. The data from the survey was used to calculate the new “National Curve” to replace the “updated Schultz Curve” in use by the FAA and provides a contemporary picture of community response to aircraft noise exposure. A follow-up phone survey was also offered to the 10,000 mail survey respondents, and just over 2,000 elected to participate. The phone survey provided more insights on how the mail survey respondents felt about aircraft noise. The results of the NES survey showed that the updated Schultz Curve, as used in the FICON Report, was very outdated and no longer reflected the public’s response to aircraft noise exposure. Comparison of the FICON Report prepared using the updated Schultz Curve and NES prepared using the National Curve showed the following percentage of population highly annoyed by exposure to transportation noise: • At a noise exposure level of DNL 65 dB, the FICON Report indicated 12.3% of people were highly annoyed, compared to between 60.1% & 70.9% from the NES. • At a noise exposure level of DNL 60 dB, the FICON Report indicated that 6.5% of people were highly annoyed, compared to between 43.8% & 53.7% from the NES. • At a noise exposure level of DNL 55 dB, the FICON Report indicated that 3.3% of people were highly annoyed, compared to between 27.8% & 36.8% from the NES. • At a noise exposure level of DNL 50 dB, the FICON Report indicated that 1.7% of people were highly annoyed, compared to between 15.4% & 23.4% from the NES. Extrapolating from the FAA’s current “thresholds of significance,” one concludes that the new “threshold of significance” should be around DNL 45 dB. 2. WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for European Region (October 2018) establish new, science-based thresholds of significance. In October 2018, the World Health Organization (WHO) Regional Office for Europe published its Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region (“WHO Guidelines,” Exhibit 19). Those Guidelines

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		found that aviation noise was connected to higher incidence of ischemic heart disease, hypertension, “prevalence of ‘highly annoyed’” population, and a delay in reading skills and oral comprehension in children. WHO Guidelines. WHO made the strong recommendation that average noise exposure noise levels produced by aircraft be reduced below 45 dB DNL, as aircraft noise above this level is associated with adverse health effects. WHO Guidelines, pp. xvii, 61. WHO also made the strong recommendation that noise levels produced by aircraft be reduced during nighttime below 40 dB DNL, as aircraft noise above this level is associated with adverse effects on sleep. WHO strongly recommended that to reduce health effects policymakers implement “suitable measures to reduce noise exposure from aircraft in the population exposed to levels above the guideline values for average and night noise exposure.” WHO Guidelines, pp. xvii, 61. B. The FAA must maintain its “scientific integrity” by acknowledging these updated scientific considerations. 1. NEPA requires the FAA to use scientifically sound methods based on current research or explain how the older methods are still reliable. As indicated above, NEPA requires that federal agencies “ensure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussion and analysis in an environmental document.” 49 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(D). With that in mind, “[a]n agency has discretion to choose a methodology, so long as it explains why it is reliable.” <i>Hillsdale Env't Loss Prevention, Inc. v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng'rs</i>, 702 F.3d 1156, 1178 (10th Cir. 2012), citing <i>Lands Council v. McNair</i>, 629 F.3d 1070, 1078 (9th Cir.2010). The FAA’s antiquated methodology of determining aircraft noise impacts has been questioned by its own studies and research. The NES forcefully points out that the methodology used by the FAA lacks scientific integrity. The FAA may claim that its methodology for assessing noise is the long accepted, judicially-approved standard, and that the FAA’s NES and the WHO Guidelines do not change the FAA’s rules and regulations about aircraft noise. However, those facts do not relieve the FAA of the burden of explaining how its outdated methodology is still reliable. <i>Hillsdale</i>, 702 F.3d at 1178. Faced with evidence that the basis for its “long accepted” methodology is no longer pertinent, the FAA has a duty under NEPA to explain how that methodology is reliable and can produce results with integrity. To phrase it another way, in the Draft EA, the FAA has not addressed opposing viewpoints on the impacts of the Project, including those reached by its own sources. Either way, the FAA has failed to “ensure scientific integrity,” 44 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(D). At the very least, NEPA and CEQ Regulations state that the public is owed an explanation as to why the FAA’s obsolete methodology still presents a valid, scientifically-sound result, despite contrary evidence presented by the NES and others.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		2. The Information or “Data” Quality Act (“IQA”) requires the FAA to use scientifically current methods. The IQA, sometimes called the Data Quality Act, was enacted in December 2000 as Section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-554). The act required the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) to issue guidance to federal agencies designed to ensure the “quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity” of information disseminated to the public. The IQA also required certain federal agencies to issue their own information quality guidelines, and to establish administrative mechanisms that let affected persons seek correction of information maintained and disseminated by the agencies that does not follow the OMB guidance. When agencies disseminate information related to the analysis of risks to human health, safety, and the environment, such as in an environmental assessment under NEPA, the OMB guidelines require agencies to “adopt or adapt” the “quality principles” that Congress established in the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 300g-1(b)(3)(A) and (B)). When basing actions under this act on science, the amendments require federal agencies to use “the best available, peerreviewed science and supporting studies conducted in accordance with sound and objective scientific practices” and to use “data collected by accepted methods or best available methods.”¹⁰ On October 1, 2002, the Department of Transportation (“DOT”) issued agency guidelines (the “Guidelines”) to ensure the quality of disseminated information under the OMB’s guidelines comply with the IQA. The Guidelines apply to certain information (both statistical and non-statistical) disseminated by DOT on or after October 1, 2002, no matter when the information was first disseminated. Section IV of the Guidelines lists the information outside the Guidelines’ scope. Environmental Assessments, FONSIIs and RODs are not covered by Section IV, and are therefore within the scope of the Guidelines. In particular, the DOT Guidelines adopted the quality principles of the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 300g-1(b)(3)(A) & (B), unless the agency adapts these principles to fit the needs and character of the analysis. These principles are: • Use the best available science and supporting studies conducted in accordance with sound and objective scientific practices, including peerreviewed studies where available.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• Use data collected by accepted methods or best available methods (if the reliability of the method and the nature of the decision justifies the use of the data). • In the dissemination of influential¹¹ scientific information about risks, ensure that the presentation of information is comprehensive, informative, and understandable. In a document made available to the public, specify, to the extent practicable: ¹⁰ Id, at CRS-6. ¹¹ “Influential” – is defined in great detail on pp.27-28 of the Guidelines. Generally, the information must have a “clear and substantial impact.” For non-rulemaking information, the DOT will consider the information’s breadth (i.e., affects a broad range of parties) and intensity (intense impact). • Each population addressed by any estimate of applicable effects. • The expected risk or central estimate of risk for the specific populations affected. • Each appropriate upper bound or lower-bound estimate of risk. • Each significant uncertainty identified in the process of the risk assessment and studies that would assist in reducing the uncertainty. • Any additional studies, including peer-reviewed studies, known to the agency that support, are directly relevant to, or fail to support the findings of the assessment and the methodology used to reconcile inconsistencies in the scientific data.¹² Since the FAA did not use scientific methods that comply with the IQA, the DEA is inadequate. It must be revised to include methods that are “the best available, peer-reviewed science and supporting studies conducted in accordance with sound and objective scientific practices.” 3. The International Organization for Standardization created Federal Government-approved standards to address elevated levels of community annoyance from aircraft noise. Community annoyance refers to the average evaluation of the disturbing aspects or nuisance of a noise situation by a “community” or group of residents, combined in a single outcome. To facilitate comparisons and data

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		pooling, a standardized annoyance question was proposed by members of the International Commission on Biological Effects of Noise,¹³ and was adopted by International Organization for ¹² Id, at p.16. Highlighting added. ¹³ Fields JM, De Jong RG, Gjestland T, Flindell IH, Job RF, Kurra S, et al., Standardized generalpurpose noise reaction questions for community noise surveys: Research and a recommendation, 242 J. Sound Vibr. 641 (2001). Standardization (“ISO”) as TS 15666.¹⁴ The percentage of highly annoyed respondents is considered the main indicator of community annoyance. Using a common question has let researchers compare studies from around the globe. Because of this step forward, in 2016, the ISO published a new standard to assess community annoyance because of environmental noise, such as aircraft noise. ISO 1996-1:2016, Acoustics – Description, measurement and assessment of environmental noise helps policymakers in predicting the potential annoyance response of a community to long-term exposure to various types of environmental noises, including aircraft noise. Because the United States has approved ISO 1996- 1:2016 as being “state of the art,” and ready for use in the United States, the FAA should implement it in assessing aircraft noise in the DEA. This would take care of the FAA’s responsibilities not only under NEPA, but under the IQA as well for the use of up-to-date scientific techniques. Use of this tool in developing flight procedures would allow the FAA to better evaluate and manage aircraft noise exposure. It is clear that NEPA and the IQA requires that the FAA use ISO 1996-1:2016 in establishing the noise impact on neighborhoods. As such, it must be included in the EA. C. The FAA must protect the communities under flight paths from aviation noise. Separate from the FAA’s duties under NEPA, the FAA has a statutory duty to protect residents and property owners from the deleterious effects of aircraft noise. Federal law establishes the absolute duty of the federal government to protect both people and property from aircraft noise. “[T]he Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to promote an environment for all Americans free from noise that jeopardizes their health or welfare.” 42 USC § 4901(b). Indeed, the Noise Control Act of 1972 requires that “Federal agencies shall, to the fullest extent consistent with their authority under Federal laws administered by them, carry out the programs within their control in such a manner as to further the policy declared in section 4901(b) of this title.” 42 U.S.C. § 4903(a). The Project is an FAA “program” that must address the issue of noise that it creates.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		¹⁴ IS Organization, ISO TS 15666: Acoustics- Assessment of Noise Annoyance by Means of Social and Socio-Acoustic Surveys (2003). In at least two other statutes, federal law puts the burden of assuring that aircraft noise does not jeopardize the public’s health, welfare, or property squarely on the FAA. 49 U.S.C. § 40103(b)(2) states that the “Administrator shall prescribe air traffic regulations on the flight of aircraft (including regulations on safe altitudes) for . . . protecting individuals and property on the ground.” Id., (emphasis added). The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit has construed this to apply to restricting aircraft noise over sensitive receptors and protecting the property over which aircraft fly. Helicopter Association International Inc. v. Federal Aviation Administration, 722 F.3d 430, 433 – 435 (D.C. Cir. 2013). Likewise, the FAA has a duty under 49 U.S.C. § 44715(a)(1)(A) to “prescribe . . . regulations to control and abate aircraft noise and sonic boom” in order “[t]o relieve and protect the public health and welfare from aircraft noise and sonic boom.” 49 U.S.C. § 44715(a)(1)(A). Further, Helicopter Association International stated that the FAA has the authority and the duty to protect people on the ground from noise from aircraft: “[u]nder the plain text of [49 U.S.C.] § 40103, the FAA has authority to ‘prescribe air traffic regulations . . . [to] protect[] individuals and property on the ground.’” In that case, the FAA changed helicopter routes along the north shore of Long Island because of noise complaints, even though the noise levels were below 45 DNL. The Court pointed out that the “FAA found that ‘residents along the north shore of Long Island emphatically agreed that helicopter overflights during the summer months are unbearable and negatively impact their quality of life.’” On this basis, the Court found, the FAA made the North Shore Helicopter route mandatory, although “[t]he FAA found that the sound levels, which were below DNL 45 dB, were ‘below levels at which homes are significantly impacted.’” Thus, the FAA has a duty and authority to protect individuals on the ground – like it did on the north shore of Long Island – who experience unbearable aircraft noise that negatively affects their quality of life. This duty extends to people and property under flight paths below which the FAA believes to not be significantly impacted. In developing the Project, the FAA has ignored its statutory and regulatory duty to control and abate “aircraft noise and sonic boom.” The FAA’s statutory duty to protect people and property on the ground from the deleterious effects of aircraft noise goes beyond its duty under NEPA to determine what it believes to be “significant” or “reportable” under FAA Order 1050.1F. Legally speaking, the FAA cannot conclude that a proposed FAA action that is purportedly not “reportable” or that purportedly does not have a “significant impact” is not subject to FAA review and regulation under 42 USC § 4901(b), 49 U.S.C. § 40103(b)(2) and 49 U.S.C. §

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		44715(a)(1)(A). These statutory obligations require that the FAA address aircraft noise separate from its duties under NEPA because the FAA’s proposed action will create aircraft noise that will have a deleterious effect on public health and welfare. D. The DEA neglects to account for Infrasound The DEA neglects to address a significant component of noise: infrasound, which are low frequency sound waves below the limit of human hearing that are experienced as vibration. Because this low frequency sound is inaudible, it is unaccounted for in FAA noise metrics. Infrasound, also known as C-weighted sound, is the result of violent air eddies created from air disruption as the planes pass overhead. The resulting vibrations penetrate buildings and human tissue. Anyone who is unlucky enough to experience this vibration in their home or school can testify to how uncomfortable and disturbing these vibrations are. Worse is the emerging data that infrasound vibrations compound the negative health impacts of typical A-weighted noise and aviation Ultra Fine Particle emissions. The DEA should have included sound studies with dual measurement including all sound, both A-weighted and C-weighted vibratory sound. E. The DEA Fails to Consider the Topography of the Area in Assessing the Environmental Impact of Aircraft Noise. Absent from the draft Environment Assessment was noise analysis that considered the topography of the area. The acoustic properties of the hills and canyons in and around Los Angeles are well-known. The sound waves generated by aircraft engines can bounce off the canyon walls and down slopes, creating an echoing effect that amplifies the noise. This phenomenon is similar to how sound echoes off walls in urban environments or in natural amphitheaters. It is wellknown that the Hollywood Hills has numerous canyons (including Benedict Canyon) that amplify the noise created by aircraft flying overhead. Despite this fact, the FAA failed to mention or account for it in the DEA. The FAA’s failure to account for the vagaries of aviation noise in the canyons and on the slopes of the Hollywood Hills makes the DEA’s noise analysis incomplete. VI. The DEA Fails to Address How the Changes in Altitude Will Exacerbate Climate Issues Through Radiative Forcing and Aviation-Induced Clouds The DEA fails to analyze how the changes in conditions above the “mixing zone” will exacerbate the creation of Aviation-Induced Clouds, which contributes to climate change. However, persistent contrails and contrail cirrus are responsible for a large part of aviation-induced radiative forcing. A considerable fraction of their warming effect could be eliminated by diverting only a small fraction of flight paths, namely those that produce

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the highest individual radiative forcing. Changes in the altitude that aircraft fly changes the amount and degree of contrails that form cirrus clouds. This must be discussed in the DEA. <i>Editor's Note: The comment letter includes graphics with comments, which could not be included here due to formatting issues. The original comment is available upon request in the format in which it was received.</i> There is a growing number of scientific studies showing that Aviation-Induced Clouds (AIC) impacts have similar climate impacts to CO2. Contrails are the largest contributor to climate change from the aviation sector, and a significant proportion of global warming can be directly attributed to AIC. Their effect is only set to grow over the coming decades as air traffic increases and the public and industry show little interest in reducing their effects. Decades of research has characterized the conditions and processes of formation which depend on the "Schmidt-Appleman Criterion" (which is a pure thermodynamic criterion that rules whether contrail formation is possible in a given situation or not) and the presence of activating particles in aircraft exhaust. Similarly, the effect contrails have on the climate is supported by decades of research. Experts are confident that the effects are significant and should not be overlooked. Fortunately, there are many potential mitigation strategies to reduce contrails. The most effective is aircraft diversions. By changing flight paths, aircraft can avoid the regions that generate contrails reducing the effect on the climate by over 100%. Since altitude is a contributing factor in creating AIC, the DEA should have addressed this issue. VII. Conclusion Benedict Hills thanks the FAA for this opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment. Benedict Hills believes that neither Alternative A nor Alternative B in the Draft EA reflects the terms agreed to in the Settlement Agreement. As a result, the DEA is inadequate and does not reflect the environmental impacts of the procedures. The FAA must revise the proposed procedures to accurately reflect the terms of the Settlement Agreement and develop an environmental analysis based on those revised procedures. EXHIBIT LIST 1 Benedict Hills Petition for Review challenging the Southern California Metroplex 2 Redacted in original comment 3 Landrum & Brown Flight Path Analysis 4 December 10, 2018, Letter from BUR to FAA 5 SSFVANTF Recommendations to the FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		6 FAA Response to SSFVANTF Recommendations 7 February 2012 FAA Analysis 8 Benedict Hills Estates Association, March 26, 2012, Letter to the FAA 9 Benedict Canyon Association March 26, 2012, Letter to the FAA 10 Materials sent to the FAA by Benedict Canyon Association 11 Yurtis Airspace Analysis 12 Benedict Hills Presentation to the FAA in October 2014 13 July 2015 Proposed Southern California Metroplex BUR and VNY Procedures 14 September 2015 Benedict Hills comment letter on Southern California Metroplex Proposed Procedures 15 City of Los Angeles' Petit ion for Review regarding the "Southern Shift" 16 Redacted in original comment 17 Benedict Hills Presentation to SSFVANTF 18 FAA's Neighborhood Environmental Survey 19 WHO Guidelines 20 Redacted in original comment 21 Redacted in original comment
1054	Martin Pichinson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. This is really crazy. The noise echos throughout the mountains. Martin Pichinson 2569 Benedict Canyon Beverly Hills, 90210 BETTER ideas PROVEN solutions Sherwood Partners, Inc. agencyIP, LLC Silicon Valley Los Angeles New York Please excuse typos. This email may have been electronically dictated. Martin Pichinson mdp@sherwoodpartners.com (650) 454-8001 Direct/eFax (818) 400-0009 Mobile www.sherwoodpartners.com Silicon Valley Los Angeles New York CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it, may contain confidential information that is legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this message is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by reply e-mail at info@shrwood.com or by telephone at (650) 454.8030, and destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading them or saving them to disk. Thank you.
1055	SAVE OUR SKIES LA	<i>Editor's Note: Comment included five attached comments; see comments 1055 a-e.</i>

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th St Des Moines, WA 98198 To Whom It May Concern: General Comments 1. SAVE OUR SKIES LA (SOSLA) represents thousands of impacted residents who reside and work in Studio City, Sherman Oaks, Encino, and areas near the Mulholland ridge of the Eastern Santa Monica Mountains (approximately from Wilacre Park in Studio City to San Vicente Mountain Park south of the Encino Reservoir). SOSLA questions the legal sufficiency of the Draft Environmental Assessment for Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport (BUR EA) for the following reasons: a. The current “No Action Alternative,” in which the FAA already instituted new RNAV flight procedures resulting in a shift southward of air traffic over rising terrain, caused increased noise and air pollution over protected 4(f) resources in the Santa Monica Mountains. Therefore, the "No Action Alternative" was a new action that was not the subject of environmental review. b. Alternative B does not provide a true alternative to Alternative A. It is the current “No Action Alternative,” which is not legally acceptable as noted above. Please reference attached sworn declarations from a Studio City resident, a Sherman Oaks resident, Jim Hardie of Treepeople who was the Director of Park Operations at Coldwater Canyon Park in the Santa Monica Mountains for many years, all of whom were impacted by the "No Action Alternative." This is merely a small sampling of the tens of thousands of residents and business owners who have experienced serious health and environmental impacts from the "No Action Alternative," which the FAA implemented over years from approximately 2012 to 2018 and which was a change from prior flight patterns that existed for decades prior to that time. 2. Air pollution impacts of the FAA’s actions in moving, lowering, and concentrating flight procedures over protected 4(f) resources has not been adequately studied. We attach the work of UCLA Environmental Health Sciences Professor Yifang Zhu, an expert in the field, who documented in 2019 the presence of heavy metals in black soot from Burbank and Van Nuys aircraft overflying the Santa Monica Mountains. This is a serious

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		environmental impact of the current “No Action Alternative” that the FAA fails to address. 3. The proximity of aircraft flying the RNAV flight procedures to the Santa Monica Mountains constitutes a “use” of Section 4(f) resources. As part of its environmental review, the FAA must determine that there is no feasible and prudent alternative that avoids the Section 4(f) resources and that the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the Section 4(f) resources. Please see attached the sworn declaration of Chief Ecologist Paul Edelman of the Mountains Recreation Conservation Authority attesting to the FAA's "use" of 4(f) resources by its implementation of RNAV flight procedures that created flight paths bringing the locus over the Eastern Santa Monica Mountains of jets departing BUR, arriving BUR, and making their northward turns. In particular, he states that in his considered opinion, the FAA's actions amount to a "constructive taking" of these 4(f) resources and that the FAA should be required to explain why there is no feasible and prudent alternative as the law requires. In his sworn declaration, Mr Edelman states: After having observed the concentrated flight patterns and learned about their impacts through conversations with residents and staff at Treepeople, it is my considered opinion that the current impacts of these new FAA RNAV flight procedures on the subject eastern Santa Monica Mountains parklands and protected open spaces are of such a degree and nature that they amount to a constructive taking of these lands in that they substantially impair the intended uses of these properties... In light of their constructive use of public parklands, the FAA should be required to justify: a) why the agency needs a navigational system that requires low and concentrated flight paths over scores of public natural areas in the eastern Santa Monica Mountains, b) what the agency has done to minimize the demonstrable harms of noise and air pollution, and c) why there is no feasible and prudent alternative to this use. (Edelman Declaration ¶¶ 10-11, at pp 4-5) Procedure Design - Alternative A; Communities REJECT • Impacted stakeholders reject Alternative A because historical departures had an open leg without waypoints that promoted dispersion. JAYTE/TEAGN will dramatically alter home environments by creating a repetitive, concentrated, and high volume flow of air traffic with unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution for safe and peaceful living. • If Alternative A purports to be the Benedict Hills HOAs lawsuit settlement, it is inaccurate because it fails to include the stipulation of FAA’s monitoring with reports to petitioners, after implementation, of the new BUR departure procedure(s) in said agreement: “The FAA agrees to provide to Bob Hope Airport, for public dissemination, quarterly reports for one (1) year regarding the FAA 's monitoring of the open departure

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		procedures SLAPP and OROSZ shown in Exhibit "A" to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths. The FAA further agrees to provide copies of such reports to the Associations.” (Settlement Agreement Between the Federal Aviation Administration, Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association dated March 16, 2018, ¶ I) ("Settlement Agreement") • Alternative A fails to include the stipulation that “aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off” (Settlement Agreement ¶ A) Without this item and without the monitoring to which FAA agreed, the FAA will not have met their settlement obligations which have at their core to substantiate that the turn directives are occurring as soon as practicable after take-off. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under the Clean Air Act (CAA) and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The increase in fuel burn and longer straight-out leg as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. Please see evidence and documentation of heavy metal-laden black soot from the new presence of Burbank and Van Nuys jets due to the FAA's implementation of RNAV at BUR and VNY attached in the air pollution study performed by UCLA Environmental Health Scientist Dr Yifang Zhu attached to this comment. Procedure Design - Alternative B • This proposal states that climb gradients achieved by most Runway 15/33 departures already significantly exceed 600 feet per NM, but fails to explain why the FAA did not then propose a climb gradient in excess of 600 ft per NM and include it in the procedures. • Most older GA aircraft are not certified for RNAV SIDS and thus should not be a consideration of a noise abatement RNAV SID as there are alternative procedures in place to accommodate them. As cited there is only about 3% expected older GA aircraft in operation at BUR. Therefore, implementing a noise abatement RNAV SID would not result in an appreciable increase in controller workload. Also, the overall benefits of a noise abatement RNAV SID, in terms of reduced noise and air pollution, align with NEPA and the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus’ intent that efficiency should not be at the expense of citizens’ rights, health, and well being. • If controller workload is a concern, the saturated airspace of the VNY/BUR area may warrant a greater separation in departures at BUR, and implementing greater separation also would relieve controller workload. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under CAA and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The lower altitudes and shift southward in air traffic over rising Santa Monica Mountains terrain as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Community requests re FAA’s BUR departure procedures: • A true Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) with ultimate “quiet climb” considerations to RAYVE (7000 ft) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000 ft) on OROSZ as practicable; • maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practicable, but at a minimum until 3000 ft (climbing to higher altitudes similar to John Wayne Airport’s noise abatement procedures are preferred); • other elements as feasible: deck angle, KIAS and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft. • Adhere to Settlement Agreement. FAA to make clear that ATC protocol will include controller training and directives to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. FAA to provide Benedict Hills petitioners and BUR -- for public dissemination — quarterly reports of monitored turn directives to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths, for one full year. • Institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. Can a more steep climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures (to help abate noise and pollution) that are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, and on protected 4(f) resources. • Abandon the consideration of waypoints and assess simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings under full radar vector conditions to achieve dispersion benefits and advise if such a procedure would afford more efficient and timely turns which is at the heart of the problem. ***END***
1055a	Yifang Zhu	DECLARATION OF YIFANG ZHU I, Yifang Zhu, hereby declare as follows: 1. My family and I reside at 10418 Windtree Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90077 and have lived here since June 2019. 2. I am a professor in the UCLA Department of Environmental Health Sciences. I have a PhD in Environmental Health Sciences from the Fielding School of Public Health, University of California, Los Angeles and a Bachelors of Engineering in Environmental Engineering from Tsinghua University.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		3. My research interest is primarily in the field of air pollution, environmental exposure assessment, and aerosol science and technology. Specifically, I am interested in quantitative exposure/risk assessments on ultrafine particles from various indoor and outdoor sources. My current research focuses on measuring and modeling ultrafine particle emissions, transport, and transformation on and near roadways as well as in various indoor environments. I have published about 100 peer-reviewed papers in these fields including a study conducted at LAX on aircraft emissions. 4. My work has been recognized with several national awards, including the Walter A. Rosenblith New Investigator Award from the Health Effects Institute in 2007, the Faculty Early Career Development (CAREER) Award from the National Science Foundation in 2009, and the Haagen-Smit Prize from Atmosphere Environment in 2011. I was appointed to California Air Resource Board (CARB)'s Research Screening Committee in January 2014. 5. Immediately after we moved into our home located at 10418 Windtree drive, I noticed the noise associated with many low altitude aircrafts and helicopters (sometimes lower than 1,000 feet) in my neighborhood near the Mulholland Corridor area of the Santa Monica Mountains. 6. As an environmental health scientist, I am fully aware of the adverse health effects associated with noise and emissions from aircrafts. There is compelling scientific evidence in the literature on the impact of aviationrelated activities on residential exposures and health. Increased noise around airports has been linked to increased hospitalization for cardiovascular disease. Aircraft engine also emits huge amount of ultrafine particles that are less than 100 nm in size, which is about 1% of the diameter of a human hair. Because of their extremely small sizes, these ultrafine particles can cross biological boundaries, entering the circulatory system, and are associated with inflammation biomarkers, oxidative stress, and cardiovascular disease. 7. Because of my concerns about these environmental health issues, I started to attend community meetings organized by residents who began educating and advocating with our local electeds about the flight pattern and the harms and dangers associated with them. Given my background and expertise with particulate emissions, I offered to help with documentation. 8. It was in this respect that I was asked to draw samples of leaves taken from homes in Benedict Canyon, Sherman Oaks, an area heavily impacted by the presence of low altitude overflights to and from Van Nuys and Burbank Airports.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		9. I went to four homes on September 21, 2019, to examine black substances accumulating on plants and homes in the Santa Monica Mountains. I spent several hours examining substances and cutting leaves for further examination. 10. While I was at the homes, I observed and heard many planes flying and turning over these homes, at low altitudes. I also made sure that there was no other emission source at the homes during the sample collection. 11. After examining the leaves under an electronic microscope and making slides, I came to the initial conclusion that the substance was chemical in nature and noticed that it was only appearing on the tops, not bottoms of leaves. I prepared to send the leaves for chemical analysis; however, I did reach the initial conclusion that the substance was plane soot. I was firm in my conclusion because a. the area in which I collected leaves was not near any other sort of traffic or possible source of emissions; and b. the fact that the substance only was appearing on the tops and not the bottoms of leaves meant that it was coming from above. 12. On November 6, 2019, I attended the San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force Meeting and provided public comment regarding these findings. Unfortunately, I was only given a very short period of time to present, so was unable to show the slides. 13. On January 26, 2020, I received the results of the chemical analysis of the substances on the leaves which confirmed that it is plane soot. I will note that all of the chemicals that are listed in this study are unique to airplane emissions, and that a couple substances that are not present here, namely copper and zinc, further confirms that the substance found on the leaves is plane soot, and not for example from car emissions. 14. On February 13, 2020, I attended by phone a meeting with the City Attorney’s office in which I opined that I was 100% certain that the substance showing on the leaves I collected was particulate emissions from planes. 15. Attached as Exhibit A is the study that I conducted documenting that low flying and concentrated numbers of aircraft from VNY and BUR are depositing ultra-fine and other particles contained in plane soot on homes and plants in the Santa Monica Mountains. I am informed and believe the now frequent presence of aircraft in the Benedict Canyon and other areas of the Santa Monica Mountains are the result of changes made by the FAA when they implemented new area navigation flight procedures in 2017 and 2018. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed July 17, 2020

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Yifang Zhu 10418 Windtree Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90077 <i>Editor's Note: The comment included an Exhibit A titled "Identify Soot Particles from Aircraft Emissions in Communities" with eight graphics. The graphics could not be included here due to the formatting of the original comment. The original comment is available upon request in the format in which it was received.</i>
1055b	M Yedlin	DECLARATION OF MATTHEW YEDLIN I, Matthew Yedlin, hereby declare as follows: 1 I am a resident of Studio City in Los Angeles, California. I live in a large townhouse complex called Studio Village, which consists of 342 units. My home is at an elevation of approximately 620 feet above sea level. 2 My home is located between Moorpark St. and Ventura Blvd., and slightly west of Colfax Ave. 3 I first noticed a major change in flight departures (primarily from Burbank Airport) in the summer or early fall of 2018. Masses of planes began to fly over my home, whereas previously (for at least 18 years from my personal experience) relatively few planes flew overhead. Prior to this sudden change, air traffic was not a problem. After the change, the volume and intensity of the noise totally destroyed my quality of life. Even though I live approximately six miles from Burbank Airport, it feels as if I live right next to the runway. One huge reason I moved to this area in Studio City was because it was a distance from the airport and, more importantly, not in or near the flight path. 4 Throughout the day, from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m., I get a barrage of flights (mostly departures from Burbank Airport) either directly over my home or very near. I also get many low flying helicopters above or near my home. I am awakened at night, as well, between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. with additional flights. In total, I am targeted with up to 200 flights per day, which averages out to one flight every 4 to 5 minutes during the main 15-hour period. But it's even worse than that because each plane rumbles loud well before it reaches my home and well after. And it is very common to have clusters of departures, such that I am blasted by planes every minute or two for a significant amount of time. And the airport is planning to add even more flights to the daily total. (SEE EXHIBIT A) 5 This volume of noise from the daily targeting of my home by the FAA and Burbank Airport is destroying my life. It causes me endless stress and anxiety, it has caused me to have to rearrange my daily schedule, it has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		caused me significant lack of sleep, and it has resulted in a depressed state of mind and a decline in my overall health. I'm sure the actions of the FAA and the airport have also lowered the value of my home. I know of many other people who have related similar accounts of how their lives are being destroyed by the actions of the FAA and the airports. 6 I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States of America, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on July 15, 2020 at Los Angeles, CA Matthew Yedlin 4243 Colfax Avenue, Unit B Studio City, CA 91604 Digitally signed by MATTHEW YEDLIN EXHIBIT A – Airnoise.io complaint record for March 6, 2020 from 12:39 p.m. to 1:40 p.m. (documenting 14 flyovers from KBUR at distances of 0.06 miles to 1.31 miles, and one flight from KVNy at 4.84 miles. Altitudes range from 1,309 feet above sea level to 4,309 feet. Note: Most distances are actually closer as it is difficult to time the clicking of the button to correlate with the plane at its closest point.) (Due to difficulty in formatting, I included the same Airnoise.io entry in the two sections that follow. One includes the dates, and the other includes the distance and altitude, but they are both from the same exact spreadsheet): <i>Editor's Note: The data in Exhibit A of this comment was provided in two formats, as a table and as a text list. The table could not be included here due to the formatting of the original comment. The original comment is available upon request in the format in which it was received. The text list is provided below.</i> KBUR Commercial SWA2083 N723SW Departure 0.09 / 3785 SENT KBUR Commercial SWA1936 N7863A Departure 0.28 / 3234 SENT KBUR Helicopter N668PD N668PD Unknown 0.6 / 1309 SENT KBUR Commercial SKW3605 N258SY Departure 0.39 / 3010 SENT KBUR Commercial SWA5760 N465WN Departure 0.34 / 3155 SENT KVNyGeneral Aviation N75274 Departure 4.84 / 2200 SENT KBUR Commercial SWA680 N476WN Departure 0.38 / 4010

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		SENT KBUR Commercial SKW5221 N880AS Departure 0.55 / 2930 SENT KBUR Commercial JSX181 N268JX Departure 1.31 / 4309 SENT KBUR Commercial NKS573 N535NK Departure 0.17 / 3530 SENT KBUR Commercial SWA2793 N704SW Departure 0.45 / 4180 SENT KBUR Commercial JSX105 N258JX Departure 0.56 / 3314 SENT KBUR Commercial SWA1584 N914WN Departure 0.65 / 3155 SENT KBUR Commercial SWA2040 N466WN Departure 0.06 / 3580 SENT KBUR Commercial ASH5859 N906FJ Departure 0.21 / 4005
1055c	Jim Hardie	DECLARATION OF JIM HARDIE I, Jim Hardie, declare as follows: 1) I am a resident of Sherman Oaks in Los Angeles, California. I have been the Director of Park Operations of TreePeople's Coldwater Canyon Park since 2007. I was TreePeople's Director of Forestry Programs from 1991-1993, served on its Board of Directors for 20 years following that and was one of three Staff members recruited for its Capital Campaign Steering Committee in 2008, responsible for overseeing the expenditure of nearly \$14,000,000 in improvements to the Park's facilities and grounds. 2) TreePeople is a community-driven non-profit organization with a 50-year history serving the citizens of the greater Los Angeles area, ultimately leading to the planting of millions of trees throughout our region, and with a 43-year history of managing, developing and maintaining, as its base, Coldwater Canyon Park, open to the public every day of the year and enjoyed by many tens of thousands of visitors annually. 3) Coldwater Canyon Park consists of 45 acres on a ridgetop in the Santa Monica Mountains, directly connected by hiking trails to the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority's Wilacre Park and Fryman Canyon Park, and with their Franklin Canyon Park just across a street from our main entrance. This intra-mountain network of parks amounts to nearly 1,000 acres of natural lands that provide critical habitat for many native species of plants and animals - including endangered mountain lions - and which serves as an absolutely unique oasis for hundreds of thousands of Los Angelenos right in the middle of our incredibly busy megalopolis. 4) Those citizens have been coming to Coldwater Canyon Park over the decades specifically to "escape" from that city, seeking the quiet and peace of our shaded trails, to find tranquility or meditate in a natural setting, to picnic with their family on a secluded mesa with an unobstructed 10-mile view, or to exercise in tree-scrubbed air cleaner than that down on

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		the valley floor one thousand feet below. 5) All of that has now been disrupted - shattered - shredded - day-after-day by the lowered and more concentrated flight paths from our area airports in the past couple years. The very peace, tranquility and quiet that people come to our park for are now regularly interrupted by the lower-flying jets, intrinsically altering - and degrading - the experience of the park for our users. At its worst, in some locations out on our grounds, visitors in conversation will have to either pause until a plane passes or raise their voices to be heard. And our staff educators, leading educational tours with over 10,000 LAUSD students each year brought to our park to experience an environment different from their urban neighborhoods, now feel that "the city has come to the mountains" as they, too, have to pause or raise their voices on the tours. It was never like this before. Never, over decades. 6) Other sources will confirm the deleterious effects of urban air pollution and particulates on the health of trees and other plants. And studies have demonstrated that urban noise stresses animals in a natural environment, shortening life spans and lowering birth rates. The pollution dropped by these low-flying jets hour-after-hour, and the repeated attacks of their intense, pounding noise, is clearly going to have long-term negative consequences on these public lands, and the life within them. Land that has been specifically preserved, in some cases with federal funding, to offer humans a release from the pollution, noise and stress of the city below. 7) I urge, as strongly as possible, that the FAA seek an alternative to these lower, concentrated flight paths over our park, and the Santa Monica Mountains in general, and put an end to the damage and disruption they are causing. Surely other ways can be found, with constructive input from all interested parties and communities, to serve the needs of our area airports without continuing this approach. I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States of America and the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on July 19, 2020 at Los Angeles, California. Jim Hardie 5514 Costello Avenue Sherman Oaks, California 91401 TreePeople

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Coldwater Canyon Park 12601 Mulholland Drive Beverly Hills, Ca. 90210 www.treepeople.org
1055d	Alicia Gordon	Declaration of Alicia Gordon I, Alicia Gordon, hereby declare the following: 1. I am a resident of Sherman Oaks, in Los Angeles, California. 2. My home is located in the foothills of the Santa Monica Mountains, south of Ventura Boulevard, and in the hills north of Mulholland. Our property abuts a city owned preserve, and we live in an area that has been declared a “high fire hazard zone” by the State of California. My home is approximately 850 feet above sea level. 3. When we moved into our home in 2013, we chose it expressly because we needed a peaceful quiet environment as my husband and I both work from home on a regular basis and we have an elderly parent and young son living with us. 4. We first noticed the FAA’s changed flight patterns in and out of Burbank and Van Nuys airports in 2018, and it has become increasingly horrific ever since. We are systematically bombarded by airplanes (both private and commercial) and helicopter traffic from dawn to late in the evening. At certain intervals during the day – early morning and evenings in particular, we are being buzzed by planes at an extraordinary rate, with intervals between 2 to 6 minutes, 7 days a week. We have recorded private jets as low as 1,800 feet and commercial airliners as low 2,400 feet above our home. 5. This consistent, miserable barrage of noise and pollution has significantly impacted my life and my family’s health and well-being. -My teenage son on began to have anxiety issues and has needed medication to sleep since the onslaught began. -My 91-year old mother has to wear noise-cancelling headphones if she wants to open her door and/or sit outside for any portion of the day, and has had an increase in both blood pressure and breathing issues. -I myself had to begin taking anti-depressants, because my home has become the opposite of the peaceful quiet place it once was, and all four of us have developed issues with anxiety, sleep, heart palpitations, and depression to varying degrees.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		6. We have heard from the nearby school that my son used to attend, Buckley, that the staff and students have been greatly affected by the constant barrage, and that it's having a significant impact on their learning experience, as well as their athletic experience when they're outside on the fields. 7. On top of everything, I couldn't understand why the flowers and vegetables in our garden were covered in some kind of soot that we never had before, which I now understand from a study done by a professor at UCLA, Professor Yifang Zhu, is actually a direct result of the planes flying so impossibly low over our neighborhoods. 8. The following are three random day samples of noise reports we received from Airnoise.io, and please keep in mind that it's unrealistic for me to actually hit the complaint button every time a plane flies over my home, as that would actually be a full-time job, so this is on the lower side of actual flights over our home. <i>Editor's Note: A table was provided with 69 flights from three dates (December 8, 2019, January 20, 2020, and March 8, 2020) following the above remark. The table could not be included here due to the formatting of the original comment. The original comment is available upon request in the format in which it was received.</i> 9. I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States of America, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on July 17, 2020, in Los Angeles, CA. Digitally Signed by Alicia Gordon Alicia Gordon 14252 Valley Vista Boulevard Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
1055e	Paul Edelman	DECLARATION OF PAUL EDELMAN I, Paul Edelman, hereby declare as follows: 1. I am a resident of Woodland Hills in Los Angeles, California. I have been the chief staff ecologist and planner for both the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority since 1990. The Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (Conservancy) is a State agency established by Sections 32000 - 33220 of the Public Resources Code. The Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) is a local government agency exercising the joint powers of the Conservancy and two Ventura County park districts pursuant to Government Code Section 6500. I serve as the Deputy Director of

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Natural Resources and Planning for the Conservancy and the Chief of Natural Resources and Planning for the MRCA. I have a Master of Science degree in biology. 2. The MRCA both owns and manages over a dozen discrete natural parkland units comprised of hundreds of acres on the north face of the Santa Monica Mountains from Studio City to Encino that are under the flight paths of aircraft from both Burbank Airport and Van Nuys Airport. The MRCA also owns and manages scores of properties within flight path areas on the opposing south slope of the range. These parklands include four legislatively-established scenic overlooks along the Mulholland Scenic Parkway within the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (SMMNRA). All these MRCA-managed parklands are open to the public between sunrise and sunset. Some of these MRCA-managed parklands are owned by the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (State of California) and the National Park Service. An example includes the multi-hundred-acre Franklin Canyon Park complex between Studio City and Beverly Hills a component of the SMMNRA. All these parklands, as well as others owned by the City of Los Angeles, in the subject flight path areas are Section 4(f) resources pursuant to the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. The Act generally prohibits federal agencies from using parks, recreation areas (including recreational trails), wildlife and water fowl refuges, or public and private historic properties, unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative to that use, and the action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such a use. 3. Many of these MRCA managed parklands have widely used public trails and overlook sites that are used by Los Angeles residents living on both sides of the Santa Monica Mountains and by thousands of tourists. Most of these discrete parkland units include areas along the crest of the range with altitudes much higher than the San Fernando Valley floor. Essentially every such park has some rising terrain that brings trail users at actual ground level (AGL) close to ascending aircraft at altitudes well above the floor of the San Fernando Valley. Tens of millions of public dollars have been expended to acquire these natural parklands with additional public acquisitions ongoing. Conservancy and MRCA parklands located along Laurel Canyon Boulevard can be reached by a cross-mountain Metro bus line. All the subject parklands can be visited without a user or parking fee. The current pandemic has resulted in increased usage of these parklands as people seek safe outdoor activities and connections to nature. The importance of both the natural values and emotional relief values of the subject parklands shall only increase over time. 4. These subject natural parklands were acquired for broad natural resource values and for public recreational benefit. Both the MRCA Governing Board and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy have received numerous complaints from park visitors over approximately the past two years about excessive jet noise, increased flight frequency, low altitude aircraft, and surface deposited aircraft generated residue within the subject MRCA managed parklands. I have read and viewed a broad range of materials that address flight path

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		issues, including health concerns, over the eastern Santa Monica Mountains. To express concerns about such adverse impacts on both the visitor experience and the natural resources within lands they own, the Conservancy and the MRCA submitted letters to the FAA, dated January 28, 2019 and November 14, 2018, respectively. 5. There is a direct correlation in the diminution of a park visitor experience to both the increased frequency of low altitude aircraft flights and the reduced overhead distance between the aircraft and the visitor. I cannot cite any studies, but such increased, and constant, noise levels must have some detrimental effect on mammals and birds, particularly species most sensitive to human noise impacts, abilities to use habitats in the subject north slope areas. 6. The California Fish and Game Commission voted this year to provide Candidate status to specific subpopulations of Southern and Central California mountain lions as part of an Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESU). The sum of the mountain lion population in the Santa Monica Mountains falls within one of these subpopulations. 7. The famous lion P-22 is alive and well and tracked by NPS biologists in Griffith Park. The staff of Citizens for Los Angeles Wildlife (CLAW) a non-profit organization regularly photographs an uncollared male lion in Laurel Canyon, which is connected to the subject north and south slope parklands. The habitat blocks and the connections between them are documented in the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy's February 2020 <i>Eastern Santa Monica Mountains Habitat Linkage Planning Map</i>. In the last year an uncollared lion was also documented on local television news chasing lion P-61 in the Sepulveda Pass east of the 405. In the past year, I have also reviewed security camera footage of other lions in the area between Griffith Park and the 405 freeway that are sent to me and other interested parties. The subject north and south slope MRCA managed parklands are all habitat for a threatened mountain lion population under the California Endangered Species Act. Frequent low altitude jet flights could have a significant adverse effect both on lion health and the species ability to effectively use the subject parklands and the inter-mingled privately-owned open space. The lion's most favored prey, mule deer, may also be significantly adversely affected by frequent loud aircraft generated noise. 8. The subject north slope MRCA managed and City-owned parklands also contain some of the best California black walnut woodland habitat in the State. California black walnut woodland is considered a sensitive vegetation community by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. For reasons including drought, these native walnut trees in the eastern Santa Monica Mountains have experienced accelerated mortality at least over the last five years. In some areas--such as Wilacre Park-- up to fifty percent of the walnut trees have died with little subsequent recruitment. The walnut leaf surfaces are sticky which makes them susceptible to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		accumulation of all kinds of airborne particles including both trail dust and residues falling from low altitude jet aircraft. The numerous elements shed from jet aircraft engines and controls (fuels, lubrication, emissions, and metallic fragments from wear and tear) could have a significant adverse impact on the walnut woodlands in the subject areas. The loss of walnut trees both reduces shade/cover and food sources and contributes to erosion. The reduced soil moisture conditions from climate change make the establishment of new trees less probable. 10. The closer aircraft are to the ground as they ascend and accelerate, the greater the amount of foreign particulate matter such aircraft will deposit in local water bodies. The concentration of such flights above the eastern Santa Monica Mountains has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to water quality in upper Franklin Canyon Reservoir, lower Stone Canyon Reservoir, and Encino Reservoir. These water bodies are used extensively by wildlife and upper Franklin Canyon Reservoir is used extensively by the public including school groups. 11. After having observed the concentrated flight patterns and learned about their impacts through conversations with residents and staff at Treepeople, it is my considered opinion that the current impacts of these new FAA RNAV flight procedures on the subject eastern Santa Monica Mountains parklands and protected open spaces are of such a degree and nature that they amount to a constructive taking of these lands in that they substantially impair the intended uses of these properties. 10. In light of their constructive use of public parklands, the FAA should be required to justify: a) why the agency needs a navigational system that requires low and concentrated flight paths over scores of public natural areas in the eastern Santa Monica Mountains, b) what the agency has done to minimize the demonstrable harms of noise and air pollution, and c) why there is no feasible and prudent alternative to this use. I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States of America and the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on July 18, 2020 at Los Angeles, California Paul Edelman 5065 Catalon Avenue Woodland Hills, CA 91364
1056	Judy Miller	I concur with the letter below. I'm concerned about wildlife vegetation and air quality. Coupled with the increased chance of another air disaster causing wildfires and human trauma makes this plan intolerable. While the odds of an air disaster occurring are low, they do happen. I have personal experience. It's a matter of numbers for airlines and insurance companies.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you for considering letting our neighborhoods thrive in peace. What has been thrust upon us is unfair. Judy Miller To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1057	Robert and Terry Corbin	To Whom It May Concern: I live in Studio City, adjacent to Colfax and Ventura Boulevard. My neighbors and nearby students in multiple schools experience a disproportionate negative burden from noise from departing jets from Burbank Airport. This serious disruption must be mitigated through procedures that combine faster elevation of departing flights and a more variations of the westward to north turn from the runway. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public, especially citizens like me, my family and neighbors who suffer disproportionately from the noise burdens of flight departures from Burbank Airport. Please do something to spread the departure paths and increase the ascent of the departing airplanes to mitigate the noise. Here are my comments to - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely Robert and Terry Corbin. Sent from my iPhone
1058	Teresa	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA FAILS TO ACCURATELY EVALUATE THE "PURPOSE AND NEED" for the CHANGE to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does NOT outweigh the significant ADVERSE IMPACT TO BROADER PUBLIC IMPACT. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has NEVER been STUDIED or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		This is absolutely unacceptable and sneaky. Additionally this is causing harm to people with absolutely no care or concern for the public, just concern about money and profits!! Please do something now!!!! Regards, Teresa Sent from my iPhone
1059	Julie Bleicher	This has been going on for 5 years... NEEDS URGENT REAL HONEST ATTENTION! To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has the potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. This is UNACCEPTABLE and neighborhoods have had enough!
1060	Marilyn Davis	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. Sincerely, Marilyn Davis Kierscey
1061	Susan Tick	Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th St Des Moines, WA 98198 To Whom It May Concern: I am a longtime Sherman Oaks resident and have owned and lived in my home for nearly forty years. I chose my neighborhood, in the Eastern Santa Monica Mountains (Wilacre Park in Studio City to San Vicente Mountain Park and the Canyon Back Fire Road near Mulholland above Encino) largely for the wonderful trees and nature-filled environment and for the peace and quiet. I live about a half hour’s drive — approximately ten miles — from Burbank Airport and about eight miles from Van Nuys Airport. I live far away from both airports, not next to them. For decades, this has been a wonderful peaceful, clean, and quiet place to live. I had never noticed jets flying over my neighborhood. I did occasionally see them departing and making their turns over and near the 101

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		fwy. In about late 2018, our neighborhood environment was dramatically altered by low and loud flying jets — with attendant air and noise pollution. I believe these jets are from Burbank and Van Nuys Airports. It is my understanding that when the FAA implemented new kinds of flight procedures using satellite based navigation, it changed the location, concentration, and altitudes of jets departing, and sometimes arriving, at the airports, placing the locus of flight paths and their turns northward for the most part in the Santa Monica Mountains. I further understand that the FAA now wants to make yet another change, by placing a waypoint above Hollyline and Valley Vista near the Buckley School. I oppose Alternative A because it is very likely to bring more air traffic to our neighborhood and because it has not been adequately analyzed. Furthermore, the FAA has acted all these years without considering the true environmental impacts of their actions, as they are legally required to do under federal environmental laws and regulations. In addition to neighborhoods like mine that now are dealing with noise and air pollution from jet traffic, when we previously had none or very little, there are many impacted public parks and protected open spaces and overlooks in the Eastern Santa Monica Mountains. These precious parks and spaces are enjoyed by as many as 500,000 - 650,000 visitors each year (according to Paul Edelman, Chief Ecologist of the Mountains Recreation Conservation Authority). The parks have been impacted by the new proximity of jets and their noise and emissions, due to the FAA's actions. The FAA environmental assessment seems wholly insufficient because it does not provide any real alternative to Alternative A. Further, the environmental impacts of noise and air pollution from the FAA's actions in changing flight procedures at both airports have not been acknowledged, studied, or accounted for. I understand there was a settlement with Benedict Hills residents that was made in secret without legally required notice and environmental review when the FAA first tried to implement it in about 2017-2018. Trying to push it through now in this way in 2024 does not cure those initial defects. Why is it necessary to concentrate air traffic in a new location. Why did the FAA shift the locus of traffic in such a dramatic way, without notice to newly impacted communities. Why isn't dispersion, as it has been for decades, possible? There should be real on the ground analysis of what the changes have wrought in terms of noise and air pollution; this assessment fails to answer these questions or to provide real environmental review.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you for considering my comment. Sincerely, Susan, a resident of Sherman Oaks
1062	Maria Cano Mooradian	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. I Maria Mooradian agree with all the above. Last week it was ridiculous. This is a health issue for all the inhabitants in the area. An annoyance to all the business, schools in the area. I VOTE TO RELOCATE BURBANK AIRPORT AS FAR AWAY AS POSSIBLE. Sincerely, Maria Cano Mooradian Studio City resident.
1063	Jane Goe	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Most sincerely, Jane Goe, Studio City, Ca Having participated in every meeting of the year-long efforts of the multi-community Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force, I wholly support and agree with the above points, which lay out the uncompromising and even occasionally hostile posture of the FAA towards the citizens whose lives it has so drastically affected.
1064	Lloyd Kurtz	Start sending your outgoing flights toward Glendale and Pasadena. We all know that you are planning to expand BUR service to rival LAX. It's too much noise for us and our children. Lloyd Kurtz Studio City
1065	Nate Murphy	To Whom It May Concern: I have lived in my home in North Hollywood since 2007. Over the last 17 years of living in the neighborhood, I have noticed a marked increase in noise from Burbank airports air traffic. When repeated aircraft pass overhead, they drown out the voices of my neighbors and I can't hear my children. When my children ride their bikes in the street in front of my home, I can't hear the oncoming traffic in my residential neighborhood. I have to have two sets of eyes watching North and South on my residential street to spot speeding cars with inattentive drivers because I can't hear them anymore due to aircraft noise and frequent take offs. Aircraft routinely take off outside of the agreed curfew hours during the night. The noise wakes up my young

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		children. I have to comfort them to get them back to sleep, which makes me tired for work the next day. If there is a curfew, why do airlines routinely ignore them in a densely populated residential area? I am angry over my declining quality of life due to increased noise from Burbank Airport. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1066	Amy Schulenberg	Please add these comments to the public record for the Draft EA on the Burbank Airport flight path changes. A current, thorough and objective assesment should be done. Thank you! Amy Schulenberg To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1067	Debra Reynolds	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. How could you do so many things wrong? Those of us with working ears know that the noise produced by planes going over our heads is unacceptable. Yours, Debra Reynolds Sherman Oaks Resident and retired Burbank Public School Teacher
1068	Bobby Graham	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. I live in the Santa Monica mountains on MULHOLLAND DR in 90210 zip code and already impacted by the airplane noise. Bobby Grahm Intergram Group Real Estate Investments & Equities Bobby Grahm Managing Partner and CEO Direct: 818-849-6490 Office: 818-849-6809 This e-mail may have been sent with voice recognition software, please excuse any spelling or grammar errors as it likely was " dictated and not read " This e-mail and files transmitted with it are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you received this message in error, please immediately notify sender by e-mail, and destroy the original message. Thank You.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
1069	JO ANNA KORNGUTE	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Best Jo Anna Korngute I have lived On Deep Canyon Dr., a mile south of Mulholland and I've never had so many jets flying low over my backyard it's noisy, disruptive, stressful, dangerous, etc. stop it you have no business being in 90210 area code. Thank you. LOVE ALWAYS HURT NEVER
1070	Mary B	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. (As someone that lives in the foothills.. the echoing machine high and low pitch sounds grate my nerves ALL DAY AND NIGHT LONG!!!!) - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thank you, Mary B Ventura Canyon Ave, Sherman Oaks
1071	Studio City For Quiet Skies	To Whom It May Concern, Studio City For Quiet Skies hereby incorporates by reference and supports the attached comments by UproarLA on the draft Environmental Assessment for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope "Hollywood Burbank" Airport (BUR). Please reach out immediately if you are unable to access the attached file. Thank you, STUDIO CITY FOR QUIET SKIES ----- Buchalter 18400 Von Karman Avenue Suite 800 Irvine, CA 92612 949.760.1121 Phone 949.720.0182 Fax

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		BN 81497701v1 File Number: U5301-0002 949.224.6292 Direct blichman@buchalter.com March 20, 2024 VIA E-MAIL Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th Street Des Moines, WA 98198 9-AJO-BUR-Community-Involvement@faa.gov Re: Comments by UproarLA on Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport Draft Environmental Assessment To Whom It May Concern: The following comments are submitted on behalf of UproarLA, concerning the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport Draft Environmental Assessment (“DEA” or “Project”). UproarLA is an organization representing hundreds of thousands of citizens and homeowners associations in Los Angeles and its San Fernando Valley area, already, and increasingly, impacted by the Federal Aviation Administration’s (“FAA”) earlier-implemented SLAPP TWO and OROSZ TWO flight procedures from Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport (“Airport”). UproarLA strongly objects to FAA’s DEA for the newly proposed SLAPP THREE and OROSZ THREE procedures on the following grounds: (1) The DEA fails to accurately evaluate the Purpose and Need for the Project. While FAA admits that it “completed this environmental review to comply with the terms of the Settlement Agreement”, DEA, p. 1-3, it fails to disclose the ultimate result of Benedict Hills Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement”), which exacerbates existing noise impacts by shifting the Project’s flight paths and their environmental impacts from the settling parties, the Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners’ Association (together, “Associations”) to UproarLA and its members;

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		(2) The DEA fails to use the proper baseline for analysis. Instead, FAA uses “operational inputs” from the “baseline timeframe [Jan. 1, 2022-Dec. 31, 2022]”, DEA, p. 3-33, several years after the southward shift of the flight paths (i.e., late 2016-2017). By using a baseline after the flights have already moved south instead of the original baseline established in the region-wide NextGen environmental evaluation (i.e., 2013, per the independent Freytag Report (defined below)), FAA dramatically understates the Project’s noise impacts; (3) The DEA fails to comply with the requirement to provide mitigation for the admittedly “significant” noise impacts of the relocated flight paths; (4) The DEA further exacerbates the undisclosed environmental impacts of the Project by purporting to evaluate its noise impacts using the Day-Night Average (“DNL”) metric. DNL has been replaced in California by Cumulative Noise Equivalent Metric (“CNEL”) which would have allowed a more accurate analysis, but is missing from the DEA; (5) The DEA fails not only to adequately analyze the Project-specific impacts, but its cumulative impacts as well; and (6) The DEA fails to evaluate reasonable alternatives to the Project. In short, the DEA’s analytic failures are transparently aimed at the singular purpose of facilitating FAA’s obligations under its Settlement Agreement with the Associations, which has been a continuing legal roadblock for FAA. In pursuing that purpose, however, FAA runs full speed into another roadblock for the violation of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321, and its implementing regulations, 40 CFR 1500 et seq. I. THE DEA FAILS TO ACCURATELY STATE OR EVALUATE THE PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT FAA discloses that the Purpose and Need for the Project is to “comply with the terms of the Settlement Agreement” that it entered into with the Association in 2018. DEA, p. 1-3. That is as far as it goes, however. The DEA fails to address the way the planned new Standard Instrument Departure (SID) procedures, SLAPP THREE and OROSZ THREE, will in any way benefit the remaining communities near the Airport, or how they may serve any purpose those communities may have. The DEA sets forth to evaluate two new flight paths, seemingly for the sole and exclusive benefit of an ultra-wealthy single set of affected communities, the Associations, without even attempting to evaluate the public “Need” for the Project, or, as set forth below, the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		negative impacts it may visit on the rest of the affected public. FAA must demonstrate that the Need for the Project outweighs its adverse impacts on the public, or the DEA will remain fatally flawed. II. THE DEA RELIES ON A PATENTLY INACCURATE BASELINE FOR ANALYSIS The DEA fails to use the proper “baseline” in its analysis. At a minimum, baselines “must describe the environment of the area(s) to be affected or created by the alternatives under consideration...and shall be no longer than is necessary to understand the effects of the alternatives.” 40 C.F.R. Section 1502.15 (Affected Environment). But that is not the case here. In the July 30, 2019 Informational Briefing, FAA acknowledged that the flight paths established in the region-wide NextGen environmental evaluation had already moved south, calling it a “southern shift.” According to the DEA, p. 3-33, FAA uses flight path data from 2022 as the baseline for its noise impact analysis, several years after FAA conceded, but never studied, the “southern shift”. See “FAA acknowledges flights out of Hollywood- Burbank Airport have Moved South”, Los Angeles Times, August 2, 2019. The Airport also acknowledged prior to 2022 that “there has been a noticeable southern shift in the flight tracks of aircraft departing the Airport.” Task Force, https://www.hollywoodburbankairport.com/noise/noise-task-force/. Moving the flight path first, and then comparing current conditions to the already relocated flight path, will always result in a “false baseline” and a Finding of No Significant Impact (“FONSI”). Indeed, FAA did the exact same thing in 2018 when it published the Categorical Exclusion (“CATEX”) for the procedures in question. FAA moved the path south of the historical path in late 2016-early 2017, without providing public notice or environmental study, and prior to publishing the CATEX in 2018. Then, for purposes of the CATEX, FAA compared conditions in late 2017 (after the paths had already been moved south of the historical path) to the same already-moved paths from after the “southern shift” that began in 2016-2017. Not surprisingly, because the then-current conditions matched the path that had already been moved, FAA reached a FONSI. FAA should not have moved the flight path before completing the CATEX so that there could have been a true comparison between the historical path and the proposed path, demonstrating the significant impact on the affected areas. In short, any comparison where FAA has changed the environment by moving the path before making the comparison is invalid. FAA attempts to minimize the “southern shift” to only .33 miles, attributing it to weather and air traffic. However, based on maps produced by HMMH in consultation with FAA from between 2010 and 2018, the flight path has actually moved south of the historical path by approximately 2.3 nautical miles. Since at least 2017, the flight path has never re-shifted north on a consistent and continued basis, even, for example, when the weather changes or traffic is low (including during the COVID-19 pandemic when many flights from the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Airport and other airports in the L.A. area were canceled). Based on the false baseline that FAA used for review, “there is simply no way to determine what effect [the Project] will have on the environment and, consequently, no way to comply with NEPA.” Half Moon Bay Fisherman’s Mktg. Ass’n. v. Carlucci, 857 F.2d 505, 510 (9th Cir. 1988). III. THE DEA FAILS TO ADDRESS MITIGATION OF SIGNIFICANT NOISE IMPACTS The DEA entirely fails to comply with FAA’s own regulation requiring mitigation of the “significant” noise impacts of the DEA’s Alternative A, the alternative from the Settlement Agreement with the Associations, where it ignores FAA’s admission that “[a]s discussed in Section 4.6, Noise and Noise Compatible Land Use, Alternative A would result in Significant noise impacts”, DEA, Section 4.8.6. Where, as here, a significant impact admittedly exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”), DOT Order 5610.1D, Section 13(a), p. 22, or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact (“Mitigated FONSI”).¹ In turn, mitigation must include one or more of the following: “avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, repairing, rehabilitating, restoring the environment”, “reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation or maintenance actions during the life of the action”, or compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources. FAA Order 1050.1F, Section 4-4. None of those potential measures are mentioned in the DEA, let alone committed, despite the new and more significant noise impacts to be brought about by the Project, including increases in noise levels in “noise sensitive areas”. Those “noise sensitive areas” include a vast array of “residential, educational, health, and religious structures and sites, parks, recreational areas ...wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and cultural and historic sites.” FAA Order 1050.1F, section 11-5, sub-section (10), p. 11- 3, including, specifically, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and the residences of the community members of UproarLA and other citizens south of the airport. ¹ FAA is expressly included in the agencies covered by DOT Order 5610D, Section 3(1). Whether an EIS or FONSI is chosen, and even where an Environmental Assessment alone is justified, the environmental review disclosing “significant” impacts must include mitigation, the absence of which in this case alone renders the DEA legally insupportable.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		IV. THE PROJECT’S NOISE IMPACTS ARE FURTHER UNDERSTATED BY THE USE OF THE DNL METRIC The DEA’s transparent omissions and deficiencies are further exacerbated by the use of the DNL metric to evaluate the noise impacts in already “significantly” impacted areas such as those south of the Airport. This is true because FAA regulation explicitly calls for the use in California of the more comprehensive metric, CNEL. (See FAA Order 1051.1F Desk Reference, Section 1, p. 11-2). Not only does the use of DNL defy current guidance in California, but FAA also recognizes this, and is in the process of reevaluating the adequacy of the DNL metric. See Review of Civil Aviation Noise Policy, 88 Fed. Reg., No. 83, 2664.1 et seq. Similarly, as recently as 2021, the Government Accountability Office (“GAO”) undertook an analysis of the efficiency of various noise metrics currently in use, at the request of Congress. GAO Report to Congressional Requestors, Sept. 2021, Aircraft Noise - FAA Could Improve Outreach Through Enhanced Noise Metrics, Communication, and Support to Communities (“GAO Report”). GAO concluded in the GAO Report that “because DNL takes into account both the amount of noise from each aircraft operation, as well as the average number of annual flights per day at a given location, the same DNL may be associated with vastly different numbers above the locations.” GAO Report, p. 19. Moreover, the GAO Report reaches the conclusion that “a change in DNL of 3 dB could result from either a relatively small change or a very large change in the number of added flights per day.” GAO Report, p. 21. Thus, the DNL metric can “mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. GAO Report, p. 23; see also Review of Aircraft Noise Technical Report, by John C. Freytag, P.E., INCE Bd. Cert., Freytag & Associates, LLC, January 13, 2020 (the “Freytag Report”)². In the final analysis, despite FAA’s earlier purported loyalty to the DNL metric in the DEA, its own research and guidance conclusively demonstrate that DNL is ineffective in accurately representing the impact of aircraft noise. California has ² The Freytag Report was prepared for Save Coldwater Canyon as part of the Southern San Fernando Valley Airport Noise Task Force meetings held in 2019 and 2020 to assess aircraft noise following FAA’s “southern shift”. already long since recognized that fact, and FAA agreed as stated in its own Order 1050.1F. Thus, not only will the proposed new flight paths deliver significant noise impacts to citizens south of the airport without required

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		mitigation, but will bring even greater noise impacts than reluctantly reported by FAA, and rendering the DEA fatally flawed. V. THE DEA LACKS ANY MEANINGFUL DISCUSSION OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS As the DEA correctly states, Cumulative Impacts are “the effect on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions....Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.” 40 CFR 1508.7. Nevertheless, FAA attempts to constrain the time frame applicable to this definition by claiming that “reasonably foreseeable actions are considered projects included in planning documents that are expected to proceed...” DEA, Section 3.3.8, p. 3-41, although FAA does not specify the level of planning document to which it is referring, other than designated as “expected to proceed” based, for example, on funding allocation. Id. Thus, FAA seeks, unsuccessfully, to reduce the scope of “cumulative” projects that it must take into account. Moreover, while the DEA provides an inclusive list of “cumulative” projects, many of which include freeway and railroad construction and eventual operation, it reaches the ultimate conclusion, without legal or evidentiary support, that “significant increases in noise exposure would generally occur in heavily developed areas, where newly introduced airport noise would be part of a patchwork of ambient urban noises, making it less discernible.” DEA, Section 4.8.6. FAA consequently “ignores the effects on low ambient noise levels that epitomize the Santa Monica Mountains” as described in the Freytag Report. For this reason, The Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (“MRCA”) requested \$40 million for mitigation. See Letter from MRCA to Byron Chew, Federal Aviation Administration, re: Section 4(f) Comments on Proposed OROSZ THREE Departure (RNAV), and SLAPP THREE DEPARTURE (RNAV) at Hollywood-Burbank Airport, dated November 3, 2023, pg. 2. MRCA wrote that “if the loss of quiet is not adequately diminished by moving flights away from these mountain parklands, the only feasible alternative is to improve the experience of the public that uses these lands 365 days per year” with \$15 million from the \$40 million mitigation package for the “most adversely affected and most visited parklands – such as Wilacre Park” in Studio City. Id. The DEA does not include such mitigation, or any other mitigation for that matter. In addition, the DEA blatantly ignores the cumulative impacts of such major, noise-producing projects as the Replacement Passenger Terminal Project (“RPT”) currently under construction at the Airport, which will enable increases in operations capacity³ and require mitigation for those increases and their impacts. VI. THE DEA FAILS TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO THE

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		PROJECT An environmental assessment must “[e]valuate reasonable alternatives to the proposed action.” 40 C.F.R. Section 1502.14 (Alternatives including the proposed action). The DEA does not consider other reasonable alternatives to the Project. While the DEA lists some other alternatives considered, DEA, p. 2-7, and “briefly discuss[es] the reasons for their elimination”, 40 C.F.R. Section 1502.14, the DEA’s reasoning for elimination of several of these other reasonable alternatives does not make sense in light of the new flyover waypoint WP3 that FAA is currently preparing for Van Nuys Airport (“VNY”). According to the DEA, these modifications of the VNY departure paths are designed “to resemble the departure paths prior to implementation of the Southern California Metroplex airspace redesign” and are “scheduled for publication in 2024”. DEA, p. 3-41. New waypoint WP3 will be next to the U.S. Route 101 Highway Corridor. See FAA and VNY Presentation of Proposed Redesign of RNAV Departure Procedures for Van Nuys Airport, Community Briefing, Aug. 9, 2021. If it is technically and operationally feasible “to maintain required aircraft separation standards” between the new flyover WP3 waypoint and “any southerly deviation of those flying the Runway 8 final approach course [to the Airport]”, DEA, p. 2-7, then there are in fact other reasonable alternatives for the Airport and this Project. Instead, FAA presents the community with a Hobson’s Choice in the DEA due to the lack of any true alternatives – (1) continue the existing impacts with the No Action Alternative that UproarLA and its members have been suffering under since late 2016-2017 after FAA, without notice or environmental study, moved the flight path south of the historic path; (2) implement Alternative A from the CATEx in 2018, where FAA created a false baseline in order to find no significant impact, resulting in fierce opposition from the community and elected officials at every level of government, and which led to the Southern San Fernando Valley Airport Noise Task ³ “Airlines are our partner,” the Airport’s Executive Director Frank Miller told NBC4 Los Angeles at the groundbreaking ceremony for the RPT on January 25, 2024. “We will have availability to have more service from existing carriers.” “Burbank Airport makeover plan takes off. Here’s how it’ll look in 2 years”, NBC4 Los Angeles, January 25, 2024, https://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/burbank-airport-makeover-plan-takes-off-heres-howitll-look-in-2-years/3322245/. Force⁴ and this DEA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is essentially the same as the No Action Alternative because “[w]hen compared to the No Action Alternative, functional differences in how aircraft are

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		expected to depart BUR are modest in Alternative B, as most aircraft exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations” already. DEA, p. 1-5. Please note that the Airport has expressed in a comment its support for Alternative B, but with required modifications including early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of the Airport’s Diverse Vector Areas, which could both achieve the Purpose and Need for the Associations and also bring relief to the long-suffering community, including UproarLA and its members. FAA should consider such modifications to Alternative B, with the goal of finally undoing FAA’s problematic “southern shift” and providing a fair resolution for all parties. In summary, FAA has utterly failed to produce a required environmental review with the DEA that serves the fundamental purpose of alerting the public in general, and affected populations specifically, of the impacts of a project. Without compliance with the requirements of its own laws and regulations, FAA must go back to the drawing boards and come up not only with a defensible environmental review of the current Project, but also alternatives that meet the purpose and need of all parties. Sincerely, BUCHALTER A Professional Corporation Barbara Lichman BL:ldu ⁴ The Airport states that the recommendations that the Southern San Fernando Valley Airport Noise Task Force made to FAA in 2020 were “aimed at ending the southern shift”. Task Force, https://www.hollywoodburbankairport.com/noise/noise-task-force/.
1072	Robert Odson	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION The information contained in this email may be confidential and/or legally privileged. It has been sent for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). If the reader of this message is not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please reply to the sender and destroy all copies of the message.
1073	David King Lassman	Dear Sir/Madam, I have been sent the following and am sharing them with you as a concerned resident. I am keen to ensure there is careful consideration to both environmental and health impacts of air traffic above our skies and endorse the following. Sincerely, David King Lassman Procedure Design - Alternative A; Communities REJECT • Impacted stakeholders reject Alternative A because historical departures had an open leg without waypoints that promoted dispersion. JAYTE/TEAGN will dramatically alter home environments by creating a repetitive, concentrated, and high volume flow of air traffic with unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution for safe and peaceful living.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• If Alternative A purports to be the Benedict Hills HOAs lawsuit settlement, it is inaccurate because it fails to include the stipulation of FAA’s monitoring with reports to petitioners, after implementation, of the new BUR departure procedure(s) in said agreement: “The FAA agrees to provide to Bob Hope Airport, for public dissemination, quarterly reports for one (1) year regarding the FAA 's monitoring of the open departure procedures SLAPP and OROSZ shown in Exhibit "A" to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths. The FAA further agrees to provide copies of such reports to the Associations.” (Settlement Agreement Between the Federal Aviation Administration, Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association dated March 16, 2018, ¶ I) ("Settlement Agreement") • Alternative A fails to include the stipulation that “aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off” (Settlement Agreement ¶ A) Without this item and without the monitoring to which FAA agreed, the FAA will not have met their settlement obligations which have at their core to substantiate that the turn directives are occurring as soon as practicable after take-off. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under the Clean Air Act (CAA) and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The increase in fuel burn and longer straight-out leg as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. Procedure Design - Alternative B • This proposal states that climb gradients achieved by most Runway 15/33 departures already significantly exceed 600 feet per NM, but fails to explain why the FAA did not then propose a climb gradient in excess of 600 ft per NM and include it in the procedures. • Most older GA aircraft are not certified for RNAV SIDS and thus should not be a consideration of a noise abatement RNAV SID as there are alternative procedures in place to accommodate them. As cited there is only about 3% expected older GA aircraft in operation at BUR. Therefore, implementing a noise abatement RNAV SID would not result in an appreciable increase in controller workload. Also, the overall benefits of a noise abatement RNAV SID, in terms of reduced noise and air pollution, align with NEPA and the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus’ intent that efficiency should not be at the expense of citizens’ rights, health, and well being.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• If controller workload is a concern, the saturated airspace of the VNY/BUR area may warrant a greater separation in departures at BUR, and implementing greater separation also would relieve controller workload. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under CAA and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The lower altitudes and shift southward in air traffic over rising Santa Monica Mountains terrain as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. - Community requests re FAA’s BUR departure procedures: • A true Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) with ultimate “quiet climb” considerations to RAYVE (7000 ft) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000 ft) on OROSZ as practicable: • maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practicable, but at a minimum until 3000 ft (climbing to higher altitudes similar to John Wayne Airport’s noise abatement procedures are preferred); • other elements as feasible: deck angle, KIAS and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft. • Adhere to Settlement Agreement. FAA to make clear that ATC protocol will include controller training and directives to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. FAA to provide Benedict Hills petitioners and BUR -- for public dissemination — quarterly reports of monitored turn directives to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths, for one full year. • Institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. Can a more steep climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures (to help abate noise and pollution) that are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, and on protected 4(f) resources.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• Reconsider simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings, maintaining an open segment departure. It's not clear from the EA whether the FAA considered and tested different headings in the context of an open segment departure without the use of waypoints.
1074	Barbara	I am outraged about the volume of planes that go over my house for 14 hours a day! This is NOT acceptable—the noise and air pollution is TERRIBLE!! Change the flight patterns so they give everyone a break!!8(!@!To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1075	figus	THE ONLY REAL SOLUTION TO THE NOISE AND POLLUTION AFFECTING THE EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY IS TO HAVE A PORTION OF FLIGHTS TAKE OFF NORTH ON RUNWAY 33 IF EVEN 40% OF DAILY FLIGHTS TOOK OFF NORTH, THERE WOULD BE A FUEL SAVING OF 1,460 HOURS OF FUEL PER YEAR! THIS IS ASSUMING AS AN EXAMPLE, A DAILY TOTAL OF 300 FLIGHTS TAKING OFF, SO 120 FLIGHTS TAKING OFF NORTH PROVIDING A 2 MINUTE SAVING PER FLIGHT OVER 365 DAYS. 90% OF DEPARTURES FROM BURBANK HEAD NORTH TO MEET UP WITH WAY POINTS OROSZ AND SLAPP, WHICH ARE 23 TO 28 MILES NORTH OF THE AIRPORT. SO THERE'S NO EFFICIENCY IN TAKING OFF SOUTH AND THEN MAKING A HUGE TURN NORTH.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		DEPARTING FROM RUNWAY 33 WOULD ALLOW AIRCRAFT TO JOIN UP WITH THE ABOVE WAY POINTS SOONER, THUS SAVING FUEL AND CREATING LESS POLLUTION. RUNWAY 33 IS IN FULL COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FAA DEPARTURE PROCEDURES: 1. IT'S LONG ENOUGH AT 6,880 FEET. 2. COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT SUCH AS A300'S CAN EASILY TAKEOFF FROM RUNWAY 33. 3. THE SLOPE OF THE RUNWAY IS 1.2%, WELL BELOW THE 2% MAXIMUM SLOPE ALLOWANCE FOR TAKEOFFS SET BY THE FAA. 4. THERE ARE NO MAJOR OBSTACLES NORTH OF THE RUNWAY, MAKING THIS A SAFER DEPARTURE IN CASE OF A CATASTROPHIC EVENT SUCH AS THE LOSS OF AN ENGINE. FLIGHTS ARE REGULARLY TAKING OFF NORTH DURING HIGH WINDS, SO IT'S ALREADY A PROVEN TAKE OFF ROUTE. THANK YOU
1076	Tom Materna	DEAR FAA, 5 years,late the concentration and southerly shift is worse than ever. You have promised a solution but offer none to disperse the aircraft . Procedure Design - Alternative A; Communities REJECT Impacted stakeholders reject Alternative A for the following reasons: Historical departures out of BUR were not dictated by waypoints, but rather carried an “open leg” and therefore implementing waypoints will not, holistically or practically, better restore historical exposures; JAYTE/TEAGN will dramatically alter home environments by intensifying and directing with consistency repetitive air traffic over select areas, including homes farther west of the waypoints which would be new to the exposure, and by the intensity of the increased volume of traffic;

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		JAYTE/TEAGN will disproportionately pollute in more concentrated levels over targeted areas; JAYTE/TEAGN will effectively eliminate any opportunity for dispersion. Communities do not agree that this proposed Open SID will provide for variability in the tracks of departing aircraft in a manner that will benefit impacted communities. If Alternative A purports to be the Benedict Hills HOAs lawsuit settlement, it is inaccurate because it fails to include the stipulation of FAA’s monitoring with reports to petitioners, after implementation, of the new BUR departure procedure(s) in said agreement: “The FAA agrees to provide to Bob Hope Airport, for public dissemination, quarterly reports for one (1) year regarding the FAA 's monitoring of the open departure procedures SLAPP and OROSZ shown in Exhibit "A" to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths. The FAA further agrees to provide copies of such reports to the Associations.” (Settlement Agreement Between the Federal Aviation Administration, Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association dated March 16, 2018, ¶ I) ("Settlement Agreement") Alternative A also fails to include the stipulation that “aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off” (Settlement Agreement ¶ A) Without this item and without the monitoring to which FAA agreed, the FAA will not have met their settlement obligations which have at their core to substantiate that the turn directives are occurring as soon as practicable after take-off. Procedure Design - Alternative B This proposal states that climb gradients achieved by most Runway 15/33 departures already significantly exceed 600 feet per NM, but fails to explain why the FAA did not then propose a climb gradient in excess of 600 ft per NM and include it in the procedures. Older GA aircraft should not be a consideration of a noise abatement RNAV SID as there are alternative procedures in place to accommodate them. As cited there is only about 3% expected older GA aircraft in operation at BUR. Therefore, implementing a noise abatement RNAV SID would not result in an appreciable increase in controller workload. Also, the overall benefits of a noise abatement RNAV SID, in terms of reduced noise and air pollution, align with NEPA and the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus’ intent that efficiency should not be at the expense of citizens’ rights, health, and well being.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		If controller workload is a concern, the saturated airspace of the VNY/BUR area may warrant a greater separation in departures at BUR, and implementing greater separation also would relieve controller workload. Community requests re FAA’s BUR departure procedures: A true Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) with ultimate “quiet climb” considerations to RAYVE (7000 ft) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000 ft) on OROSZ as practicable: maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practicable, but at a minimum until 3000 ft (climbing to higher altitudes similar to John Wayne Airport’s noise abatement procedures are preferred); Other elements as feasible: deck angle, KIAS and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft. Adhere to “Settlement Agreement.” FAA to make clear that ATC protocol will include controller training and directives to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. FAA to provide lawsuit petitioners and BUR -- for public dissemination — quarterly reports of monitored turn directives to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths, for one full year. Institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. Can a more steep climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures (to help abate noise and pollution) that are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, and on protected 4(f) properties. Reconsider simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings, maintaining an open segment departure. It’s not clear from the EA whether the FAA considered and tested different headings in the context of an open segment departure without the use of waypoints. ***END***

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you, Tom Materna
1077	Linda Clarke	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Also, on a personal note... the significant adverse impacts (e.g. extreme, abrasive noise intrusion and unhealthful toxic pollution exposure) continues despite years of community, as well as city and state outreach (including the Task Force Report). This is all relevant; we are still waiting for meaningful, appropriate relief. Thank you for your attention Linda Clarke 47 year resident, Sherman Oaks
1078	UproarLA team	Attached please find comments from UproarLA on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope "Hollywood Burbank" Airport southern departures. Please contact me immediately if you have any technical issues accessing the attached file.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Thank you. UproarLA team ----- Buchalter 18400 Von Karman Avenue Suite 800 Irvine, CA 92612 949.760.1121 Phone 949.720.0182 Fax BN 81497701v1 File Number: U5301-0002 949.224.6292 Direct blichman@buchalter.com March 20, 2024 VIA E-MAIL Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th Street Des Moines, WA 98198 9-AJO-BUR-Community-Involvement@faa.gov Re: Comments by UproarLA on Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport Draft Environmental Assessment To Whom It May Concern: The following comments are submitted on behalf of UproarLA, concerning the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport Draft Environmental Assessment (“DEA” or “Project”). UproarLA is an organization representing hundreds of thousands of citizens

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and homeowners associations in Los Angeles and its San Fernando Valley area, already, and increasingly, impacted by the Federal Aviation Administration’s (“FAA”) earlier-implemented SLAPP TWO and OROSZ TWO flight procedures from Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport (“Airport”). UproarLA strongly objects to FAA’s DEA for the newly proposed SLAPP THREE and OROSZ THREE procedures on the following grounds: (1) The DEA fails to accurately evaluate the Purpose and Need for the Project. While FAA admits that it “completed this environmental review to comply with the terms of the Settlement Agreement”, DEA, p. 1-3, it fails to disclose the ultimate result of Benedict Hills Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement”), which exacerbates existing noise impacts by shifting the Project’s flight paths and their environmental impacts from the settling parties, the Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners’ Association (together, “Associations”) to UproarLA and its members; (2) The DEA fails to use the proper baseline for analysis. Instead, FAA uses “operational inputs” from the “baseline timeframe [Jan. 1, 2022-Dec. 31, 2022]”, DEA, p. 3-33, several years after the southward shift of the flight paths (i.e., late 2016-2017). By using a baseline after the flights have already moved south instead of the original baseline established in the region-wide NextGen environmental evaluation (i.e., 2013, per the independent Freytag Report (defined below)), FAA dramatically understates the Project’s noise impacts; (3) The DEA fails to comply with the requirement to provide mitigation for the admittedly “significant” noise impacts of the relocated flight paths; (4) The DEA further exacerbates the undisclosed environmental impacts of the Project by purporting to evaluate its noise impacts using the Day-Night Average (“DNL”) metric. DNL has been replaced in California by Cumulative Noise Equivalent Metric (“CNEL”) which would have allowed a more accurate analysis, but is missing from the DEA; (5) The DEA fails not only to adequately analyze the Project-specific impacts, but its cumulative impacts as well; and (6) The DEA fails to evaluate reasonable alternatives to the Project. In short, the DEA’s analytic failures are transparently aimed at the singular purpose of facilitating FAA’s obligations under its Settlement Agreement with the Associations, which has been a continuing legal roadblock

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		for FAA. In pursuing that purpose, however, FAA runs full speed into another roadblock for the violation of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321, and its implementing regulations, 40 CFR 1500 et seq. I. THE DEA FAILS TO ACCURATELY STATE OR EVALUATE THE PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT FAA discloses that the Purpose and Need for the Project is to “comply with the terms of the Settlement Agreement” that it entered into with the Association in 2018. DEA, p. 1-3. That is as far as it goes, however. The DEA fails to address the way the planned new Standard Instrument Departure (SID) procedures, SLAPP THREE and OROSZ THREE, will in any way benefit the remaining communities near the Airport, or how they may serve any purpose those communities may have. The DEA sets forth to evaluate two new flight paths, seemingly for the sole and exclusive benefit of an ultra-wealthy single set of affected communities, the Associations, without even attempting to evaluate the public “Need” for the Project, or, as set forth below, the negative impacts it may visit on the rest of the affected public. FAA must demonstrate that the Need for the Project outweighs its adverse impacts on the public, or the DEA will remain fatally flawed. II. THE DEA RELIES ON A PATENTLY INACCURATE BASELINE FOR ANALYSIS The DEA fails to use the proper “baseline” in its analysis. At a minimum, baselines “must describe the environment of the area(s) to be affected or created by the alternatives under consideration...and shall be no longer than is necessary to understand the effects of the alternatives.” 40 C.F.R. Section 1502.15 (Affected Environment). But that is not the case here. In the July 30, 2019 Informational Briefing, FAA acknowledged that the flight paths established in the region-wide NextGen environmental evaluation had already moved south, calling it a “southern shift.” According to the DEA, p. 3-33, FAA uses flight path data from 2022 as the baseline for its noise impact analysis, several years after FAA conceded, but never studied, the “southern shift”. See “FAA acknowledges flights out of Hollywood- Burbank Airport have Moved South”, Los Angeles Times, August 2, 2019. The Airport also acknowledged prior to 2022 that “there has been a noticeable southern shift in the flight tracks of aircraft departing the Airport.” Task Force, https://www.hollywoodburbankairport.com/noise/noise-task-force/. Moving the flight path first, and then comparing current conditions to the already relocated flight path, will always result in a “false baseline” and a Finding of No Significant Impact (“FONSI”). Indeed, FAA did the exact same thing in 2018 when it published the Categorical Exclusion (“CATEX”) for the procedures in question. FAA moved the path south of the historical path in late 2016-early 2017, without providing public notice or environmental study, and prior to publishing the CATEX in 2018. Then, for

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		purposes of the CATEX, FAA compared conditions in late 2017 (after the paths had already been moved south of the historical path) to the same already-moved paths from after the “southern shift” that began in 2016-2017. Not surprisingly, because the then-current conditions matched the path that had already been moved, FAA reached a FONSI. FAA should not have moved the flight path before completing the CATEX so that there could have been a true comparison between the historical path and the proposed path, demonstrating the significant impact on the affected areas. In short, any comparison where FAA has changed the environment by moving the path before making the comparison is invalid. FAA attempts to minimize the “southern shift” to only .33 miles, attributing it to weather and air traffic. However, based on maps produced by HMMH in consultation with FAA from between 2010 and 2018, the flight path has actually moved south of the historical path by approximately 2.3 nautical miles. Since at least 2017, the flight path has never re-shifted north on a consistent and continued basis, even, for example, when the weather changes or traffic is low (including during the COVID-19 pandemic when many flights from the Airport and other airports in the L.A. area were canceled). Based on the false baseline that FAA used for review, “there is simply no way to determine what effect [the Project] will have on the environment and, consequently, no way to comply with NEPA.” Half Moon Bay Fisherman’s Mktg. Ass’n. v. Carlucci, 857 F.2d 505, 510 (9th Cir. 1988). III. THE DEA FAILS TO ADDRESS MITIGATION OF SIGNIFICANT NOISE IMPACTS The DEA entirely fails to comply with FAA’s own regulation requiring mitigation of the “significant” noise impacts of the DEA’s Alternative A, the alternative from the Settlement Agreement with the Associations, where it ignores FAA’s admission that “[a]s discussed in Section 4.6, Noise and Noise Compatible Land Use, Alternative A would result in Significant noise impacts”, DEA, Section 4.8.6. Where, as here, a significant impact admittedly exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”), DOT Order 5610.1D, Section 13(a), p. 22, or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact (“Mitigated FONSI”).¹ In turn, mitigation must include one or more of the following: “avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, repairing, rehabilitating, restoring the environment”, “reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation or maintenance actions during the life of the action”, or compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources. FAA Order 1050.1F, Section 4-4.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		None of those potential measures are mentioned in the DEA, let alone committed, despite the new and more significant noise impacts to be brought about by the Project, including increases in noise levels in “noise sensitive areas”. Those “noise sensitive areas” include a vast array of “residential, educational, health, and religious structures and sites, parks, recreational areas ...wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and cultural and historic sites.” FAA Order 1050.1F, section 11-5, sub-section (10), p. 11- 3, including, specifically, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and the residences of the community members of UproarLA and other citizens south of the airport. ¹ FAA is expressly included in the agencies covered by DOT Order 5610D, Section 3(1). Whether an EIS or FONSI is chosen, and even where an Environmental Assessment alone is justified, the environmental review disclosing “significant” impacts must include mitigation, the absence of which in this case alone renders the DEA legally insupportable. IV. THE PROJECT’S NOISE IMPACTS ARE FURTHER UNDERSTATED BY THE USE OF THE DNL METRIC The DEA’s transparent omissions and deficiencies are further exacerbated by the use of the DNL metric to evaluate the noise impacts in already “significantly” impacted areas such as those south of the Airport. This is true because FAA regulation explicitly calls for the use in California of the more comprehensive metric, CNEL. (See FAA Order 1051.1F Desk Reference, Section 1, p. 11-2). Not only does the use of DNL defy current guidance in California, but FAA also recognizes this, and is in the process of reevaluating the adequacy of the DNL metric. See Review of Civil Aviation Noise Policy, 88 Fed. Reg., No. 83, 2664.1 et seq. Similarly, as recently as 2021, the Government Accountability Office (“GAO”) undertook an analysis of the efficiency of various noise metrics currently in use, at the request of Congress. GAO Report to Congressional Requestors, Sept. 2021, Aircraft Noise - FAA Could Improve Outreach Through Enhanced Noise Metrics, Communication, and Support to Communities (“GAO Report”). GAO concluded in the GAO Report that “because DNL takes into account both the amount of noise from each aircraft operation, as well as the average number of annual flights per day at a given location, the same DNL may be associated with vastly different numbers above the locations.” GAO Report, p. 19. Moreover, the GAO Report reaches the conclusion that “a change in DNL of 3 dB could result from either a relatively small change or a very large change in the number of added flights per day.” GAO Report, p. 21. Thus, the DNL metric can “mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. GAO Report, p.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		23; see also Review of Aircraft Noise Technical Report, by John C. Freytag, P.E., INCE Bd. Cert., Freytag & Associates, LLC, January 13, 2020 (the “Freytag Report”)². In the final analysis, despite FAA’s earlier purported loyalty to the DNL metric in the DEA, its own research and guidance conclusively demonstrate that DNL is ineffective in accurately representing the impact of aircraft noise. California has ² The Freytag Report was prepared for Save Coldwater Canyon as part of the Southern San Fernando Valley Airport Noise Task Force meetings held in 2019 and 2020 to assess aircraft noise following FAA’s “southern shift”. already long since recognized that fact, and FAA agreed as stated in its own Order 1050.1F. Thus, not only will the proposed new flight paths deliver significant noise impacts to citizens south of the airport without required mitigation, but will bring even greater noise impacts than reluctantly reported by FAA, and rendering the DEA fatally flawed. V. THE DEA LACKS ANY MEANINGFUL DISCUSSION OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS As the DEA correctly states, Cumulative Impacts are “the effect on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions....Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.” 40 CFR 1508.7. Nevertheless, FAA attempts to constrain the time frame applicable to this definition by claiming that “reasonably foreseeable actions are considered projects included in planning documents that are expected to proceed...” DEA, Section 3.3.8, p. 3-41, although FAA does not specify the level of planning document to which it is referring, other than designated as “expected to proceed” based, for example, on funding allocation. Id. Thus, FAA seeks, unsuccessfully, to reduce the scope of “cumulative” projects that it must take into account. Moreover, while the DEA provides an inclusive list of “cumulative” projects, many of which include freeway and railroad construction and eventual operation, it reaches the ultimate conclusion, without legal or evidentiary support, that “significant increases in noise exposure would generally occur in heavily developed areas, where newly introduced airport noise would be part of a patchwork of ambient urban noises, making it less discernible.” DEA, Section 4.8.6. FAA consequently “ignores the effects on low ambient noise levels that epitomize the Santa Monica Mountains” as described in the Freytag Report. For this reason, The Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (“MRCA”) requested \$40 million for mitigation. See Letter from

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		MRCA to Byron Chew, Federal Aviation Administration, re: Section 4(f) Comments on Proposed OROSZ THREE Departure (RNAV), and SLAPP THREE DEPARTURE (RNAV) at Hollywood-Burbank Airport, dated November 3, 2023, pg. 2. MRCA wrote that “if the loss of quiet is not adequately diminished by moving flights away from these mountain parklands, the only feasible alternative is to improve the experience of the public that uses these lands 365 days per year” with \$15 million from the \$40 million mitigation package for the “most adversely affected and most visited parklands – such as Wilacre Park” in Studio City. Id. The DEA does not include such mitigation, or any other mitigation for that matter. In addition, the DEA blatantly ignores the cumulative impacts of such major, noise-producing projects as the Replacement Passenger Terminal Project (“RPT”) currently under construction at the Airport, which will enable increases in operations capacity³ and require mitigation for those increases and their impacts. VI. THE DEA FAILS TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT An environmental assessment must “[e]valuate reasonable alternatives to the proposed action.” 40 C.F.R. Section 1502.14 (Alternatives including the proposed action). The DEA does not consider other reasonable alternatives to the Project. While the DEA lists some other alternatives considered, DEA, p. 2-7, and “briefly discuss[es] the reasons for their elimination”, 40 C.F.R. Section 1502.14, the DEA’s reasoning for elimination of several of these other reasonable alternatives does not make sense in light of the new flyover waypoint WP3 that FAA is currently preparing for Van Nuys Airport (“VNY”). According to the DEA, these modifications of the VNY departure paths are designed “to resemble the departure paths prior to implementation of the Southern California Metroplex airspace redesign” and are “scheduled for publication in 2024”. DEA, p. 3-41. New waypoint WP3 will be next to the U.S. Route 101 Highway Corridor. See FAA and VNY Presentation of Proposed Redesign of RNAV Departure Procedures for Van Nuys Airport, Community Briefing, Aug. 9, 2021. If it is technically and operationally feasible “to maintain required aircraft separation standards” between the new flyover WP3 waypoint and “any southerly deviation of those flying the Runway 8 final approach course [to the Airport]”, DEA, p. 2-7, then there are in fact other reasonable alternatives for the Airport and this Project. Instead, FAA presents the community with a Hobson’s Choice in the DEA due to the lack of any true alternatives – (1) continue the existing impacts with the No Action Alternative that UproarLA and its members have been suffering under since late 2016-2017 after FAA, without notice or environmental study, moved the flight path south of the historic path; (2) implement Alternative A from the CATEX in 2018, where FAA created a false baseline in order to find no significant impact, resulting in fierce opposition from the community

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		and elected officials at every level of government, and which led to the Southern San Fernando Valley Airport Noise Task ³ “Airlines are our partner,” the Airport’s Executive Director Frank Miller told NBC4 Los Angeles at the groundbreaking ceremony for the RPT on January 25, 2024. “We will have availability to have more service from existing carriers.” “Burbank Airport makeover plan takes off. Here’s how it’ll look in 2 years”, NBC4 Los Angeles, January 25, 2024, https://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/burbank-airport-makeover-plan-takes-off-heres-howitll-look-in-2-years/3322245/. Force⁴ and this DEA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is essentially the same as the No Action Alternative because “[w]hen compared to the No Action Alternative, functional differences in how aircraft are expected to depart BUR are modest in Alternative B, as most aircraft exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations” already. DEA, p. 1-5. Please note that the Airport has expressed in a comment its support for Alternative B, but with required modifications including early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of the Airport’s Diverse Vector Areas, which could both achieve the Purpose and Need for the Associations and also bring relief to the long-suffering community, including UproarLA and its members. FAA should consider such modifications to Alternative B, with the goal of finally undoing FAA’s problematic “southern shift” and providing a fair resolution for all parties. In summary, FAA has utterly failed to produce a required environmental review with the DEA that serves the fundamental purpose of alerting the public in general, and affected populations specifically, of the impacts of a project. Without compliance with the requirements of its own laws and regulations, FAA must go back to the drawing boards and come up not only with a defensible environmental review of the current Project, but also alternatives that meet the purpose and need of all parties. Sincerely, BUCHALTER A Professional Corporation Barbara Lichman BL:ldu

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		⁴ The Airport states that the recommendations that the Southern San Fernando Valley Airport Noise Task Force made to FAA in 2020 were “aimed at ending the southern shift”. Task Force, https://www.hollywoodburbankairport.com/noise/noise-task-force/ .
1079	Lisa Keen	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.
1080	Hunter Phillips	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). I suffer from continuous and loud noise pollution from constant low aircraft flying directly over my house at low altitudes. In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need”

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Hunter Phillips (via mobile) 310.210.2345 hunterphillips@earthlink.net
1081	Urias, Laura	Attached please find comments from UproarLA on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the Bob Hope "Hollywood Burbank" Airport southern departures. Please contact me immediately if you have any technical issues accessing the attached file. Thank you. Buchalter Laura Urias Legal Assistant to Mark Scott, Matthew Seror and Barbara Lichman. T (949) 224-6237 lurias@Buchalter.com 18400 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 800 Irvine, CA 92612-0514 www.buchalter.com Notice To Recipient: This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message and any and all duplicates of this message from your system. Thank you

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		in advance for your cooperation. For additional policies governing this e-mail, please see http://www.buchalter.com/about/firm-policies/. ----- Buchalter 18400 Von Karman Avenue Suite 800 Irvine, CA 92612 949.760.1121 Phone 949.720.0182 Fax BN 81497701v1 File Number: U5301-0002 949.224.6292 Direct blichman@buchalter.com March 20, 2024 VIA E-MAIL Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th Street Des Moines, WA 98198 9-AJO-BUR-Community-Involvement@faa.gov Re: Comments by UproarLA on Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport Draft Environmental Assessment To Whom It May Concern: The following comments are submitted on behalf of UproarLA, concerning the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport Draft Environmental Assessment (“DEA” or “Project”). UproarLA is an organization representing hundreds of thousands of citizens and homeowners associations in Los Angeles and its San Fernando Valley area, already, and increasingly,

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		impacted by the Federal Aviation Administration’s (“FAA”) earlier-implemented SLAPP TWO and OROSZ TWO flight procedures from Bob Hope “Hollywood Burbank” Airport (“Airport”). UproarLA strongly objects to FAA’s DEA for the newly proposed SLAPP THREE and OROSZ THREE procedures on the following grounds: (1) The DEA fails to accurately evaluate the Purpose and Need for the Project. While FAA admits that it “completed this environmental review to comply with the terms of the Settlement Agreement”, DEA, p. 1-3, it fails to disclose the ultimate result of Benedict Hills Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement”), which exacerbates existing noise impacts by shifting the Project’s flight paths and their environmental impacts from the settling parties, the Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners’ Association (together, “Associations”) to UproarLA and its members; (2) The DEA fails to use the proper baseline for analysis. Instead, FAA uses “operational inputs” from the “baseline timeframe [Jan. 1, 2022-Dec. 31, 2022]”, DEA, p. 3-33, several years after the southward shift of the flight paths (i.e., late 2016-2017). By using a baseline after the flights have already moved south instead of the original baseline established in the region-wide NextGen environmental evaluation (i.e., 2013, per the independent Freytag Report (defined below)), FAA dramatically understates the Project’s noise impacts; (3) The DEA fails to comply with the requirement to provide mitigation for the admittedly “significant” noise impacts of the relocated flight paths; (4) The DEA further exacerbates the undisclosed environmental impacts of the Project by purporting to evaluate its noise impacts using the Day-Night Average (“DNL”) metric. DNL has been replaced in California by Cumulative Noise Equivalent Metric (“CNEL”) which would have allowed a more accurate analysis, but is missing from the DEA; (5) The DEA fails not only to adequately analyze the Project-specific impacts, but its cumulative impacts as well; and (6) The DEA fails to evaluate reasonable alternatives to the Project. In short, the DEA’s analytic failures are transparently aimed at the singular purpose of facilitating FAA’s obligations under its Settlement Agreement with the Associations, which has been a continuing legal roadblock for FAA. In pursuing that purpose, however, FAA runs full speed into another roadblock for the violation of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321, and its implementing regulations, 40 CFR 1500 et seq.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I. THE DEA FAILS TO ACCURATELY STATE OR EVALUATE THE PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT FAA discloses that the Purpose and Need for the Project is to “comply with the terms of the Settlement Agreement” that it entered into with the Association in 2018. DEA, p. 1-3. That is as far as it goes, however. The DEA fails to address the way the planned new Standard Instrument Departure (SID) procedures, SLAPP THREE and OROSZ THREE, will in any way benefit the remaining communities near the Airport, or how they may serve any purpose those communities may have. The DEA sets forth to evaluate two new flight paths, seemingly for the sole and exclusive benefit of an ultra-wealthy single set of affected communities, the Associations, without even attempting to evaluate the public “Need” for the Project, or, as set forth below, the negative impacts it may visit on the rest of the affected public. FAA must demonstrate that the Need for the Project outweighs its adverse impacts on the public, or the DEA will remain fatally flawed. II. THE DEA RELIES ON A PATENTLY INACCURATE BASELINE FOR ANALYSIS The DEA fails to use the proper “baseline” in its analysis. At a minimum, baselines “must describe the environment of the area(s) to be affected or created by the alternatives under consideration...and shall be no longer than is necessary to understand the effects of the alternatives.” 40 C.F.R. Section 1502.15 (Affected Environment). But that is not the case here. In the July 30, 2019 Informational Briefing, FAA acknowledged that the flight paths established in the region-wide NextGen environmental evaluation had already moved south, calling it a “southern shift.” According to the DEA, p. 3-33, FAA uses flight path data from 2022 as the baseline for its noise impact analysis, several years after FAA conceded, but never studied, the “southern shift”. See “FAA acknowledges flights out of Hollywood- Burbank Airport have Moved South”, Los Angeles Times, August 2, 2019. The Airport also acknowledged prior to 2022 that “there has been a noticeable southern shift in the flight tracks of aircraft departing the Airport.” Task Force, https://www.hollywoodburbankairport.com/noise/noise-task-force/. Moving the flight path first, and then comparing current conditions to the already relocated flight path, will always result in a “false baseline” and a Finding of No Significant Impact (“FONSI”). Indeed, FAA did the exact same thing in 2018 when it published the Categorical Exclusion (“CATEX”) for the procedures in question. FAA moved the path south of the historical path in late 2016-early 2017, without providing public notice or environmental study, and prior to publishing the CATEX in 2018. Then, for purposes of the CATEX, FAA compared conditions in late 2017 (after the paths had already been moved south of the historical path) to the same already-moved paths from after the “southern shift” that began in 2016-2017.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Not surprisingly, because the then-current conditions matched the path that had already been moved, FAA reached a FONSI. FAA should not have moved the flight path before completing the CATEX so that there could have been a true comparison between the historical path and the proposed path, demonstrating the significant impact on the affected areas. In short, any comparison where FAA has changed the environment by moving the path before making the comparison is invalid. FAA attempts to minimize the “southern shift” to only .33 miles, attributing it to weather and air traffic. However, based on maps produced by HMMH in consultation with FAA from between 2010 and 2018, the flight path has actually moved south of the historical path by approximately 2.3 nautical miles. Since at least 2017, the flight path has never re-shifted north on a consistent and continued basis, even, for example, when the weather changes or traffic is low (including during the COVID-19 pandemic when many flights from the Airport and other airports in the L.A. area were canceled). Based on the false baseline that FAA used for review, “there is simply no way to determine what effect [the Project] will have on the environment and, consequently, no way to comply with NEPA.” Half Moon Bay Fisherman’s Mktg. Ass’n. v. Carlucci, 857 F.2d 505, 510 (9th Cir. 1988). III. THE DEA FAILS TO ADDRESS MITIGATION OF SIGNIFICANT NOISE IMPACTS The DEA entirely fails to comply with FAA’s own regulation requiring mitigation of the “significant” noise impacts of the DEA’s Alternative A, the alternative from the Settlement Agreement with the Associations, where it ignores FAA’s admission that “[a]s discussed in Section 4.6, Noise and Noise Compatible Land Use, Alternative A would result in Significant noise impacts”, DEA, Section 4.8.6. Where, as here, a significant impact admittedly exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”), DOT Order 5610.1D, Section 13(a), p. 22, or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact (“Mitigated FONSI”).¹ In turn, mitigation must include one or more of the following: “avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, repairing, rehabilitating, restoring the environment”, “reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation or maintenance actions during the life of the action”, or compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources. FAA Order 1050.1F, Section 4-4. None of those potential measures are mentioned in the DEA, let alone committed, despite the new and more significant noise impacts to be brought about by the Project, including increases in noise levels in “noise sensitive areas”. Those “noise sensitive areas” include a vast array of “residential, educational, health, and

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		religious structures and sites, parks, recreational areas ...wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and cultural and historic sites.” FAA Order 1050.1F, section 11-5, sub-section (10), p. 11- 3, including, specifically, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and the residences of the community members of UproarLA and other citizens south of the airport. ¹ FAA is expressly included in the agencies covered by DOT Order 5610D, Section 3(1). Whether an EIS or FONSI is chosen, and even where an Environmental Assessment alone is justified, the environmental review disclosing “significant” impacts must include mitigation, the absence of which in this case alone renders the DEA legally insupportable. IV. THE PROJECT’S NOISE IMPACTS ARE FURTHER UNDERSTATED BY THE USE OF THE DNL METRIC The DEA’s transparent omissions and deficiencies are further exacerbated by the use of the DNL metric to evaluate the noise impacts in already “significantly” impacted areas such as those south of the Airport. This is true because FAA regulation explicitly calls for the use in California of the more comprehensive metric, CNEL. (See FAA Order 1051.1F Desk Reference, Section 1, p. 11-2). Not only does the use of DNL defy current guidance in California, but FAA also recognizes this, and is in the process of reevaluating the adequacy of the DNL metric. See Review of Civil Aviation Noise Policy, 88 Fed. Reg., No. 83, 2664.1 et seq. Similarly, as recently as 2021, the Government Accountability Office (“GAO”) undertook an analysis of the efficiency of various noise metrics currently in use, at the request of Congress. GAO Report to Congressional Requestors, Sept. 2021, Aircraft Noise - FAA Could Improve Outreach Through Enhanced Noise Metrics, Communication, and Support to Communities (“GAO Report”). GAO concluded in the GAO Report that “because DNL takes into account both the amount of noise from each aircraft operation, as well as the average number of annual flights per day at a given location, the same DNL may be associated with vastly different numbers above the locations.” GAO Report, p. 19. Moreover, the GAO Report reaches the conclusion that “a change in DNL of 3 dB could result from either a relatively small change or a very large change in the number of added flights per day.” GAO Report, p. 21. Thus, the DNL metric can “mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. GAO Report, p. 23; see also Review of Aircraft Noise Technical Report, by John C. Freytag, P.E., INCE Bd. Cert., Freytag & Associates, LLC, January 13, 2020 (the “Freytag Report”)².

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In the final analysis, despite FAA’s earlier purported loyalty to the DNL metric in the DEA, its own research and guidance conclusively demonstrate that DNL is ineffective in accurately representing the impact of aircraft noise. California has ² The Freytag Report was prepared for Save Coldwater Canyon as part of the Southern San Fernando Valley Airport Noise Task Force meetings held in 2019 and 2020 to assess aircraft noise following FAA’s “southern shift”. already long since recognized that fact, and FAA agreed as stated in its own Order 1050.1F. Thus, not only will the proposed new flight paths deliver significant noise impacts to citizens south of the airport without required mitigation, but will bring even greater noise impacts than reluctantly reported by FAA, and rendering the DEA fatally flawed. V. THE DEA LACKS ANY MEANINGFUL DISCUSSION OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS As the DEA correctly states, Cumulative Impacts are “the effect on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions....Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.” 40 CFR 1508.7. Nevertheless, FAA attempts to constrain the time frame applicable to this definition by claiming that “reasonably foreseeable actions are considered projects included in planning documents that are expected to proceed...” DEA, Section 3.3.8, p. 3-41, although FAA does not specify the level of planning document to which it is referring, other than designated as “expected to proceed” based, for example, on funding allocation. Id. Thus, FAA seeks, unsuccessfully, to reduce the scope of “cumulative” projects that it must take into account. Moreover, while the DEA provides an inclusive list of “cumulative” projects, many of which include freeway and railroad construction and eventual operation, it reaches the ultimate conclusion, without legal or evidentiary support, that “significant increases in noise exposure would generally occur in heavily developed areas, where newly introduced airport noise would be part of a patchwork of ambient urban noises, making it less discernible.” DEA, Section 4.8.6. FAA consequently “ignores the effects on low ambient noise levels that epitomize the Santa Monica Mountains” as described in the Freytag Report. For this reason, The Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (“MRCA”) requested \$40 million for mitigation. See Letter from MRCA to Byron Chew, Federal Aviation Administration, re: Section 4(f) Comments on Proposed OROSZ THREE Departure (RNAV), and SLAPP THREE DEPARTURE (RNAV) at Hollywood-Burbank Airport, dated November 3, 2023, pg. 2. MRCA wrote that “if the loss of quiet is not adequately diminished by moving

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		flights away from these mountain parklands, the only feasible alternative is to improve the experience of the public that uses these lands 365 days per year” with \$15 million from the \$40 million mitigation package for the “most adversely affected and most visited parklands – such as Wilacre Park” in Studio City. Id. The DEA does not include such mitigation, or any other mitigation for that matter. In addition, the DEA blatantly ignores the cumulative impacts of such major, noise-producing projects as the Replacement Passenger Terminal Project (“RPT”) currently under construction at the Airport, which will enable increases in operations capacity³ and require mitigation for those increases and their impacts. VI. THE DEA FAILS TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT An environmental assessment must “[e]valuate reasonable alternatives to the proposed action.” 40 C.F.R. Section 1502.14 (Alternatives including the proposed action). The DEA does not consider other reasonable alternatives to the Project. While the DEA lists some other alternatives considered, DEA, p. 2-7, and “briefly discuss[es] the reasons for their elimination”, 40 C.F.R. Section 1502.14, the DEA’s reasoning for elimination of several of these other reasonable alternatives does not make sense in light of the new flyover waypoint WP3 that FAA is currently preparing for Van Nuys Airport (“VNY”). According to the DEA, these modifications of the VNY departure paths are designed “to resemble the departure paths prior to implementation of the Southern California Metroplex airspace redesign” and are “scheduled for publication in 2024”. DEA, p. 3-41. New waypoint WP3 will be next to the U.S. Route 101 Highway Corridor. See FAA and VNY Presentation of Proposed Redesign of RNAV Departure Procedures for Van Nuys Airport, Community Briefing, Aug. 9, 2021. If it is technically and operationally feasible “to maintain required aircraft separation standards” between the new flyover WP3 waypoint and “any southerly deviation of those flying the Runway 8 final approach course [to the Airport]”, DEA, p. 2-7, then there are in fact other reasonable alternatives for the Airport and this Project. Instead, FAA presents the community with a Hobson’s Choice in the DEA due to the lack of any true alternatives – (1) continue the existing impacts with the No Action Alternative that UproarLA and its members have been suffering under since late 2016-2017 after FAA, without notice or environmental study, moved the flight path south of the historic path; (2) implement Alternative A from the CATEx in 2018, where FAA created a false baseline in order to find no significant impact, resulting in fierce opposition from the community and elected officials at every level of government, and which led to the Southern San Fernando Valley Airport Noise Task

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		³ “Airlines are our partner,” the Airport’s Executive Director Frank Miller told NBC4 Los Angeles at the groundbreaking ceremony for the RPT on January 25, 2024. “We will have availability to have more service from existing carriers.” “Burbank Airport makeover plan takes off. Here’s how it’ll look in 2 years”, NBC4 Los Angeles, January 25, 2024, https://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/burbank-airport-makeover-plan-takes-off-heres-howitll-look-in-2-years/3322245/. Force⁴ and this DEA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is essentially the same as the No Action Alternative because “[w]hen compared to the No Action Alternative, functional differences in how aircraft are expected to depart BUR are modest in Alternative B, as most aircraft exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations” already. DEA, p. 1-5. Please note that the Airport has expressed in a comment its support for Alternative B, but with required modifications including early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of the Airport’s Diverse Vector Areas, which could both achieve the Purpose and Need for the Associations and also bring relief to the long-suffering community, including UproarLA and its members. FAA should consider such modifications to Alternative B, with the goal of finally undoing FAA’s problematic “southern shift” and providing a fair resolution for all parties. In summary, FAA has utterly failed to produce a required environmental review with the DEA that serves the fundamental purpose of alerting the public in general, and affected populations specifically, of the impacts of a project. Without compliance with the requirements of its own laws and regulations, FAA must go back to the drawing boards and come up not only with a defensible environmental review of the current Project, but also alternatives that meet the purpose and need of all parties. Sincerely, BUCHALTER A Professional Corporation Barbara Lichman BL:ldu ⁴ The Airport states that the recommendations that the Southern San Fernando Valley Airport Noise Task Force made to FAA in 2020 were “aimed at ending the southern shift”. Task Force, https://www.hollywoodburbankairport.com/noise/noise-task-force/.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
1082	Kathleen Kramer Michael Kramer	To Whom it May Concern: Please find below our community requests involving the effect of Burbank Airport jet noise on our community. Kathleen Kramer Michael Kramer Sherman Oaks Re:Community requests re FAA’s BUR departure procedures: • A true Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) with ultimate “quiet climb” considerations to RAYVE (7000 ft) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000 ft) on OROSZ as practicable: • maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practicable, but at a minimum until 3000 ft (climbing to higher altitudes similar to John Wayne Airport’s noise abatement procedures are preferred); • other elements as feasible: deck angle, KIAS and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft. • Adhere to Settlement Agreement. FAA to make clear that ATC protocol will include controller training and directives to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. FAA to provide Benedict Hills petitioners and BUR -- for public dissemination — quarterly reports of monitored turn directives to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths, for one full year. • Institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. Can a more steep climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures (to help abate noise and pollution) that are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, and on protected 4(f) resources. • Reconsider simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings, maintaining an open segment departure. It’s not

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		clear from the EA whether the FAA considered and tested different headings in the context of an open segment departure without the use of waypoints. -Kathy
1083	Harry Pallenberg	To Whom It May Concern: These neighborhoods used to be quite... not anymore. What about the many schools right along the flight path. Noise and jet pollution can't be good for young bodies. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thanks, Harry Pallenberg
1084	LINDSAY NESMITH	As a resident of the Studio City Sunshine Hill community, my family is not in favor of Alternative A. Alt A fails to include critical features of the Benedict Hills HOA settlement agreement. A modified Alternative B with noise reducing mechanisms and noise reducing climbs and greater separation between departures might be acceptable. John Wayne Airport's Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. Can a more steep climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures (to help abate noise and pollution
1085	Martha McMahon	To Whom It May Concern: Because a peaceful, healthy life in Colfax Meadows is impossible with constant flights overhead day and night (well before 7:00 am and after 10:00pm and every time in between), I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
1086	Victoria Miller & Henry Eshelman	To Whom It May Concern: I am writing as a native Angeleno who has lived in my home in Encino, CA for almost 30 years, and has lived through the changes in the flight paths over my home from both BUR and VNY. As a matter of fact, because of the increased air traffic noise and pollution over my home I ended up co-charing the reformed Encino Neighborhood Council Airport Committee. With that in mind, and as part of an overall neighborhood group effort for substantive change in flight procedures that will improve the quality of life for thousands of West San Fernando Valley residents including in Encino, I fully support the following bullet points:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Procedure Design - Alternative A; Communities REJECT • Impacted stakeholders reject Alternative A because historical departures had an open leg without waypoints that promoted dispersion. JAYTE/TEAGN will dramatically alter home environments by creating a repetitive, concentrated, and high volume flow of air traffic with unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution for safe and peaceful living. • If Alternative A purports to be the Benedict Hills HOAs lawsuit settlement, it is inaccurate because it fails to include the stipulation of FAA’s monitoring with reports to petitioners, after implementation, of the new BUR departure procedure(s) in said agreement: “The FAA agrees to provide to Bob Hope Airport, for public dissemination, quarterly reports for one (1) year regarding the FAA 's monitoring of the open departure procedures SLAPP and OROSZ shown in Exhibit "A" to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths. The FAA further agrees to provide copies of such reports to the Associations.” (Settlement Agreement Between the Federal Aviation Administration, Benedict Hills Estates Association and Benedict Hills Homeowners Association dated March 16, 2018, ¶ I) ("Settlement Agreement") • Alternative A fails to include the stipulation that “aircraft departing Bob Hope Airport utilizing the SLAPP and OROSZ procedures will be radar vectored by air traffic control north as soon as practicable after take-off” (Settlement Agreement ¶ A) Without this item and without the monitoring to which FAA agreed, the FAA will not have met their settlement obligations which have at their core to substantiate that the turn directives are occurring as soon as practicable after take-off. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under the Clean Air Act (CAA) and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The increase in fuel burn and longer straight-out leg as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. Procedure Design - Alternative B • This proposal states that climb gradients achieved by most Runway 15/33 departures already significantly exceed 600 feet per NM, but fails to explain why the FAA did not then propose a climb gradient in excess of 600 ft per NM and include it in the procedures.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• Most older GA aircraft are not certified for RNAV SIDS and thus should not be a consideration of a noise abatement RNAV SID as there are alternative procedures in place to accommodate them. As cited there is only about 3% expected older GA aircraft in operation at BUR. Therefore, implementing a noise abatement RNAV SID would not result in an appreciable increase in controller workload. Also, the overall benefits of a noise abatement RNAV SID, in terms of reduced noise and air pollution, align with NEPA and the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus’ intent that efficiency should not be at the expense of citizens’ rights, health, and well being. • If controller workload is a concern, the saturated airspace of the VNY/BUR area may warrant a greater separation in departures at BUR, and implementing greater separation also would relieve controller workload. • Analysis of air quality and climate impacts under CAA and other applicable environmental regulations and laws is legally insufficient. The lower altitudes and shift southward in air traffic over rising Santa Monica Mountains terrain as compared with the no action alternative — combined with the expected greater amount of air traffic over a narrower area, at lower than current altitudes — should require actual emissions testing over the impacted geographic area rather than just software modeling. Community requests re FAA’s BUR departure procedures: • A true Noise Abatement Climb (NADP 2) with ultimate “quiet climb” considerations to RAYVE (7000 ft) on SLAPP and TLLIR (8000 ft) on OROSZ as practicable: • maintain takeoff flaps/slats configuration while reducing power considerably below normal climb power until reaching highest altitude practicable, but at a minimum until 3000 ft (climbing to higher altitudes similar to John Wayne Airport’s noise abatement procedures are preferred); • other elements as feasible: deck angle, KIAS and FPM (speed restriction) considerations, maintaining reduced power setting until at least 5+ miles from runway, and/or lower vertical speed instructions up to 8,000 - 10,000 ft. • Adhere to Settlement Agreement. FAA to make clear that ATC protocol will include controller training and directives to radar vector aircraft north as soon as practicable. FAA to provide Benedict Hills petitioners and BUR -- for public dissemination — quarterly reports of monitored turn directives to evaluate deviations from expected flight paths, for one full year.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		• Institute noise abatement procedure(s) such as John Wayne Airport’s Noise Abatement procedure(s), or state why it is not feasible for BUR departures. We note that in Alt B, the FAA increased the climb gradient from 460 ft per nm to 600 ft per nm, and also note, per the FAA, that many aircraft are exceeding this climb gradient, some even climbing at 1000 ft per nm. Can a more steep climb gradient be formally incorporated into the BUR departure procedures (to help abate noise and pollution) that are causing serious detrimental environmental impacts on newly impacted communities, including those in the Santa Monica Mountains, and on protected 4(f) resources. • Reconsider simultaneous use of 180° and 210° headings, maintaining an open segment departure. It’s not clear from the EA whether the FAA considered and tested different headings in the context of an open segment departure without the use of waypoints. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Victoria Miller & Henry Eshelman
1087	Craig Plestis	To Whom It May Concern: Stop the airplane noise and pollution above my house! I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
1088	Jacuzzi 25	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION Sent from Mail for Windows
1089	Harry Pallenberg	To Whom It May Concern: WTF??? These neighborhoods used to be quite... not anymore. What about all the many schools right along the flight path. Noise and jet pollution can't be good for young bodies. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Thanks, Harry Pallenberg
1090	Michael Laren	To Whom It May Concern: The flight path over my home makes our once quiet Studio City neighborhood a noise polluted, hearing damaging urban nightmare. Move takeoffs North like they used to be. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Mike Landale Street, Studio City
1091	Steven Gullett	I have lived in the same place for 16 years and it feels like I live closer to the airport more than ever. I just would like other communities to share the burden of the flight paths instead of what seems like most of them banking on Vineland by Moorpark/Aqua Vista/LA River. To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Steven Gullett Studio City CA
1092	Eric Lieberman and family	To Whom It May Concern: I have lived in Studio City for 36 years and the airplane flights and noise have been getting progressively worse. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Eric Lieberman and family
1093	Bshore	To Whom It May Concern: I had to leave my home of 20 years because of your disregard of our community. I hope you pay attention to the following. You are ruining lives! Shame on you! I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sent from my iPhone
1094	Jo Anna Hall	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Stop the wrong flight paths over my home in 90210 !!!! South of Mulholland, On Deep Canyon Dr. I've lived here 33 years and no airplanes Best Jo Anna Hall LOVE ALWAYS HURT NEVER
1095	Dr. Steven and Mrs. Michele Florman, Drs. Carol and Terry	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
	Becker, and Brian and Jodi Weiner	all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. WE ARE FED UP WITH THE NON-STOP LOW FLYING AIR TRAFFIC THAT WAS SHIFTED TO OUR RESIDENTIAL AREAS WITHOUT OUR CONSENT AND A VIOLATION OF EXISTING FEDERAL LAWS. Sincerely, Dr. Steven and Mrs. Michele Florman Drs. Carol and Terry Becker Brian and Jodi Weiner And the Rest of Roblar Place Residents. Sent from my iPad
1096	KATALINA	We need your help! Don't dismiss our concerns ... incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR’s Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1097	Terri Larronde	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Terri Larronde Please listen to the people who actually have to live with this horrendous noise on a daily basis. I've lived in this area for 40 years and it has never been this bad (as in the last 5 years). The repetitive landings and departures over the same routes incessantly. The arrivals over a major population using "wind" as an excuse. So unfair.
1098	Louis Milito	To Whom It May Concern: Why are the good citizens of the SF valley and surrounds having to fight this fight? Where is the humanity and common decency in this decision? Low flying airplanes dumping fuel and sound pollution on tightly packed communities with pre-schools, elementary schools, JH and High schools, parks, and backyards is doing great harm to the health of all who live under this constant barrage (as the 7th flight has just dusted my house - 6 miles away I can see the screws in the body panels). Why?? When there are other plans to implement that would lessen the impact where is the human concern? Why not implement them? (4 more planes). This should

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		not be a fight... I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. — Louis Milito 818.823.6623 lmilito@me.com
1099	Kasi Ryan	To Whom It May Concern: Would you want to live directly under this flight path as proposed? 7AM on a Sunday, no possibility of sleeping in as 5 flights rapidly cruise directly overhead. No new air quality monitoring? No financial support to the many small apartments in the new path for sound proofing? I have lived in North Hollywood, not in a wealthy neighborhood, in a rent controlled apartment for 20 years, and have always been tolerant of the occasional airplane flying overhead, but the marked increase of flights, one after the other, has significantly impacted my neighborhood. No additional air monitoring that I could find in the area of planes flying below 3,000 feet. No additional noise monitoring in the area directly under the flight path. How do you measure the effect on the community if air and noise monitoring is not conducted under the redesigned flight path? The wording below was suggested by an organization I support:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1100	figus	To Whom It May Concern: One alternative is to allow 30/40% of flights to take off north on runway 33, rather than south on 15. This alternative is already in place for high wind days, with winds exceeding 10 knots. Planes would save fuel by reaching way points SLAPP and OROSZ faster. Runway 15/33 is perfectly suited for takeoffs north even when winds are less than 10 mph, with a downward slope of only 1.2%, well within the 2% limit imposed by the FAA, and a long enough runway at approximately 6,800 yards. I also incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1101	Matthew Yedlin	To Whom It May Concern: I live in the large Studio Village complex in Studio City, located on Colfax Ave. between Moorpark St. and Ventura Blvd. With the southern shift of the flight path, the planes fly low and loud directly over me... 15 hours per day, 7 days a week. It is unbearable. I have to wear noise cancelling head phones and even those don't work. I have to keep all windows closed, and the noise still blares through my house. I feel like a prisoner in my own home. It is torturous. Please go back to the more northern flight path, or at least spread out the flight paths so they don't target the same residents over and over.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in the Studio Village complex, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, especially targeting the Studio Village complex, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1102	Jo Anna Korngute	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I have lived one mile south of Mulholland for 33 years and now planes are coming over my 90210 postal code Home one after the next and so low flying I can see what airline it is I will not have it anymore. You have no business being south of Mulholland in Beverly hills post office box BURBANK is BURBANK fly across the valley as you always did before. Thank you. Jo Anna Korngute LOVE ALWAYS HURT NEVER
1103	Jon Gordon	Constant jet airliner noise and exhaust pollution is unfair to us who live here with plane after plane flying right overhead. Change flight paths, so that takeoff and landings are fairly distributed across the area and all planes do not... repeat, all planes do not fly directly over the/our same houses again and again, and again and again. You know it's possible to alter/update flight paths of these airliners, but you refuse to do it. Year after year you BURBANK AIRPORT and those who control it, refuse to do it. If only you lived here and add to experience what we must endure day after day hour after hour week after week month after month year after year. YOU CAN CHANGE THE FLIGHT PATHS OF THESE COMMERCIAL JETS. IT IS UNFAIR, UNCARING AND INHUMAN NOT TO DO SO !! Everything contained in the following paragraphs I totally support. Jon Gordon, Cantura Street, Studio City To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1104	Elizabeth Keener	Hello- I am a neighbor of the Burbank airport, in North Hollywood. My family's quality of life has been directly, negatively impacted by the consolidated takeoffs directly over my home, often as many as 7 takeoffs in 10 minutes during peak times. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Elizabeth Keener 5513 Cartwright Ave North Hollywood, CA 91601

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
1105	Julie Bleicher	To Whom It May Concern: This has been going on for years! Jul 14, 2019, 3:29 PM [UproarLA has discovered the truth of how our community was sacrificed by the FAA and Burbank Airport in the name of efficiency and NextGen technology. And after callously betraying our once quiet community, and ruining tens of thousands of lives, the cover-up to keep us in the dark and under the path began. The FAA lied to our Congressmen, Senators, LA City Officials, Burbank Officials as well as all of us. Help UproarLA hold them all accountable and demand this path that is decimating our community be changed, NOW, away from our homes, schools and protected parks.] I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1106	Judy Miller	To Whom It May Concern: With all of the airplane mishaps these days, there is an increase in probability that some sort of incident could happen. Don't give me probabilities, as my parents were victims of the largest airplane disaster in US history. When plants start dying, wildlife is threatened and internet and Bluetooth are intermittently interrupted as planes go over head are just a few more reasons to reconsider what you are trying to keep in place. I invite you

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		to come to studio city during nightly active takeoffs and landings and assess if you personally would put up with the problem. I concur with the letter below. Thank you for believing in humanity and doing what’s right while not a difficult remedy. Judy Miller I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1107	Rand Wetherwx and family	To Whom It May Concern: PLEASE REGULATE AND CONTROL NOISE POLLUTION from Burbank air traffic!!! Which has been getting worse and worse in Valley & Hollywood Hills these last few years! The thought you might open Burbank Airport to MORE traffic sounds like a nightmare! I ALSO agree with all of the following! : I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that “Purpose and Need” does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. Sincerely, Rand Wetherwx and family 8460 Brier Dr. Los Angeles, CA 90046
1108	laura	To Whom It May Concern: I live near the intersection of Auckland and Cumpston. I bought the house in 2010 and the flights overhead were a non issue. Since 2018 I have planes flying much lower roaring directly overhead, at times once a minute, making me feel like I'm living on a runway. Windows closed it's still loud inside. Earplugs I still hear it. Why can't you disperse the path between takeoffs? Even a block away makes a big difference. Continually flying over the same houses is just unfair. I've heard nothing about offering soundproofing. I have a friend who lives near LAX who has been given soundproof windows and the planes don't even fly over her house. There are ways to operate that don't completely disregard and even punish the people below. I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		"southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA.
1109	Jason P	Hello, While I do support some of the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA), THEIRS IS NOT THE ONLY POINT OF VIEW OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE San Fernando VALLEY. Those who claim to be impacted by the ‘southern shift’ of flights are not the only one who have been suffering. I empathize with those who live on the hillside, but we who live only a couple miles north of them are subject to the same negative impacts. It may be slightly louder if you live higher up in the hills, but I assure you it is more than loud enough over our homes to wake us up, prevent us from having conversations, and negatively impact our ability to work from home. Airplanes and their flight paths negatively impact the quality of life for everyone who lives in the San Fernando Valley. Because of this, the only fair solution is to consistently and equitably disperse flights across all available, safe options over the valley. Moving all flight traffic north is simple not a fair solution. The ‘historic’ flight paths don’t apply any more because there are hundreds of thousands more flights per year than there were before. We must all share the noise and pollution equally. It seems that such a solution would not require any significant changes beside additional planning and oversight. The flight paths are already being utilized - we can track them online and see them with our own eyes. The solvable problem is the lack of fair, equitable dispersion. Ultimately, if the concerns, health, and quality of life of over half a million people has any impact on the FAA, flight paths, flight frequency, expansion, etc., then it should be guided by utilitarian principles - the best option is the one that does the most good for the most people.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The answer is obviously not to move flight paths over more densely populated areas! Areas that have more families, more schools, more parks, more voting majority, more contribution to taxes & the economy, more people! If anything, we should move more flights over the hills, where there are far fewer people. This would have a great net benefit on the entire community. However, as a resident and homeowner of Sherman Oaks who lives north of the 101 freeway, I am not even supporting this idea. I believe a fair solution is possible - disperse the flights equitably and consistently. If this is done, then no single neighborhood will be subject to more negative impacts than any other. Thank you, Jason P Sherman Oaks, Ca 91401
1110	Andrea Gladstone	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. PLEASE TAKE THE ABOVE INTO CONSIDERATION. THE AIR NOISE ISSUE AND RELATED

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		HAZARDS ARE IMPORTANT TO THE RESIDENTS. THANK YOU. Andrea Gladstone
1111	Musician	To Whom It May Concern: We are a family hugely stressed out by the unavoidable “fight or flight” response to the barrage of each BUR outgoing jet’s noise. I incorporate by reference and support some of the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - IMPACTS OF NOISE TYPES. This is completely ignored in the reports. The volume of noise is not the only measurement that should be taken into account. There have been conclusive studies that show the negative health impacts of airplane noise vs. other types of noise. Music at 70db does not have the same negative impacts as repeated airplane noise at 70db.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies say that Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should NOT consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. This option may provide relief for one impacted community, but it will create more of a negative impact on more residents of the valley! Earlier turns mean that more people will be subject to more noise and pollution from lower, and more frequent aircraft. THE ONLY SOLUTION IS TO DISPERSE FLIGHTS EQUITABLY ACROSS ALL SAFE OPTIONS OVER THE San Fernando VALLEY. WE MUST ALL SHARE THE NOISE AND POLLUTION EQUALLY. Thank you for your time and consideration.
1112	Jay Popeski	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support some of the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - IMPACTS OF NOISE TYPES. This is completely ignored in the reports. The volume of noise is not the only measurement that should be taken into account. There have been conclusive studies that show the negative health impacts of airplane noise vs. other types of noise. Music at 70db does not have the same negative impacts as repeated airplane noise at 70db. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies say that Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should NOT consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. This option may provide relief for one impacted community, but it will create more of a negative impact on more residents of the valley! Earlier turns mean that more people will be subject to more noise and pollution

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		from lower, and more frequent aircraft. THE ONLY SOLUTION IS TO DISPERSE FLIGHTS EQUITABLY ACROSS ALL SAFE OPTIONS OVER THE San Fernando VALLEY. WE MUST ALL SHARE THE NOISE AND POLLUTION EQUALLY. Thank you for your time and consideration.
1113	Gary Ball	Dear UproarLA, I have offered to you my patent pending solution to solve your chronic airport noise problem. I cannot get anyone at UproarLA to communicate with me on this practical solution. Please respond to my Email to set up a telephone call. Attached is a short overview. To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise. - CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. ----- A Replacement for the current NAS Air Traffic Control Protocol VSAT Several years ago my VSAT (patent pending) was introduced to Joe De Balzo, retired head of the FAA. Joe had formed a first class consulting firm in WDC. Joe was interested in VSAT, he authorized 5 of his top Air Traffic Control Experts to look into VSAT and give him their opinion. The group unanimously agreed it would never be accepted by the FAA because it was too disruptive, and could not be phased into the NAS without turmoil. Joe agreed with his staff, but added one earth shattering comment. He said, "If the benefits claimed by the inventor are true. It might be worth the turmoil?" Joe checked with his good sources at the FAA and ruled out the FAA initiating a new program for all the wrong reason. I have conceived a path forward that avoids the disruptive element. My unique approach is to "open" for VSAT airports that are closed because of disruptive aircraft noise. And receive Operational approval through an RNAV. The opening of the airport benefits everyone as long as the community remains unaffected by aircraft noise and the restricted airspace need does not interfere with nearby airports. .

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		I am offering FedEx an opportunity to make aviation history. Please contact me for exploratory discussions about a collaborative effort. See attachments. Gary Ball Tel: Gary Ball
1114	Maria Cano Mooradian	To Whom It May Concern: I incorporate by reference and support the comments of UproarLA and Studio City For Quiet Skies opposing all of the Alternatives presented in the Proposed Settlement Agreement Departure Procedure Amendments for Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). In particular: - PURPOSE AND NEED: This EA fails to accurately evaluate the "Purpose and Need" for the changes to the departure procedures. While it may benefit the parties to the Settlement Agreement, that "Purpose and Need" does not outweigh the significant adverse impacts to the broader public. - FALSE BASELINE: Before this EA was released in 2023, the FAA admitted in 2019 that an inexplicable "southern shift" of the BUR paths had occurred. This EA studied flights from calendar year 2022, long after the "southern shift" of the paths in late 2016-2017, which moved departing BUR flights over 2 nautical miles south of the historic paths, but which has never been studied or rectified. The FAA is required to study all changes to flight paths BEFORE making the changes. FAA's comparison in the EA between the proposed path and historical path is invalid because it fails to take into account the "southern shift" of the paths that the FAA has conceded, thereby creating a false baseline. - LACK OF REQUIRED MITIGATION: The FAA found that Alternative A would generate "Significant noise impacts", but fails to provide any mitigation for those impacts. Where a significant impact exists, FAA must prepare either a full Environmental Impact Statement or a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Impact. FAA must consider "noise sensitive areas", including the protected parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains. - USE OF CNEL METRIC REQUIRED: The EA uses the wrong noise metric with DNL and should have used the CNEL metric. The use of the DNL metric to evaluate noise impacts has been questioned by the FAA itself and FAA's own regulations call for the use in California of the more comprehensive CNEL metric. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in 2021 that found that the DNL metric can mask large swings in daily flight operations and associated noise.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: The DEA glosses over the cumulative impacts, ignoring the effects of low ambient noise levels in foothill and mountain areas, and failing to take into account important cumulative projects such as the Replacement Passenger Terminal project at BUR that will increase operations capacity. - FAILURE TO EVALUATE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES: FAA is required to evaluate reasonable alternatives, but refuses to offer the community any real alternatives in the DEA. The options are (1) the No Action Alternative, which would make permanent the existing impacts we have been suffering under since the "southern shift" occurred in late 2016-2017; (2) make the existing impacts even worse by implementing Alternative A, which FAA presented previously in a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) in 2018 with waypoints concentrating traffic over the heart of the community, and which received such fervent opposition across the board that an Airport Noise Task Force involving all stakeholders was formed and the FAA was forced to prepare this EA; or (3) implement Alternative B, which is functionally the same as the No Action Alternative because most aircraft already exceed the proposed increased climb gradient in current operations. Alternative B has potential to achieve "Purpose and Need" and provide relief to the impacted community, but only with required modifications for early turns directly off the runway below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude by use of BUR's Diverse Vector Areas. Please note that BUR, in its comment, supports Alternative B with these required modifications. FAA should consider modifying Alternative B to include these required changes. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all of the Alternatives in the EA and demand that the FAA prepare an environmental review of the BUR departure paths that identifies solutions to both achieve the "Purpose and Need" and to finally correct the "southern shift" that ultimately led to this EA. I Maria Cano Mooradian agreed with all the above, and strongly request the withdrawal of the flight path over our studio City neighborhood and the adjacent to this area. On this morning 3/18/2024 More that 25 flights have flown over my home, making my work imposible, at a decibelios sound beyond any human tolerance, plus a danger to my health. This has to stop, it has been over 5 years of a constant attack on our well being. Sincerely Maria Cano Mooradian Studio City 91604 Phone: 818 5050050
1115	Beverly Glen Canyon	Beverly Glen Canyon Los Angeles 90077

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		CA Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th St. Des Moines, WA 98198 Re: COMMENT BUR DRAFT (EA) Re: Comment on Burbank (BUR) Environmental Assessment 1. YES to Alternative A! FAA has the legal and ethical obligation to implement Alternative A. Benedict Hills Estates and Benedict Hills Homeowners Associations legally challenged the FAA-BUR southerly shift of flights in the time frame allowed by FAA. The Settlement Agreement was signed by all parties during February-March, 2018, including FAA, Acting Director, Maurice Hoffman, March 12, 2018 and Lane McFadden of the U.S. Department of Justice on March 16, 2018. FAA agreed to implement a new open SID procedure and create new turn points JAYTE and TEAGN, if they were proven safe and efficient. The EA has proven JAYTE-TEAGN turn points are safe and efficient. EA Section 2.2.1: "The new procedures meet the "Purpose and Need" of the project as they provide (a) additional operational flexibility needed to manage air traffic in the area, and (b) are consistent with Exhibit "A" of the Settlement Agreement regarding departures at the Airport." 2. NO to No Action Alternative The EA states in 2.1: "The 'No Action Alternative' does not meet the "Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action."

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		Translation: The No Action Alternative is tantamount to the FAA and U.S. Justice Department breaching a legal Settlement Agreement for no reason, because the EA has proven Alternative A to be safe and efficient. The EA states, "BUR is considered a local airport for the San Fernando Valley area of Los Angeles." BUR's Wiki reads:"The airport serves Burbank, Hollywood, and the northern Greater Los Angeles area, which includes Glendale, Pasadena, The San Fernando Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley. West Los Angeles, south of Muiholland Drive, is not in any of the above-cited communities. It has its own airport. FAA-BUR have created low-altitude turn points more than a mile south of Muiholland Drive in L.A. 90077, far southwest of BUR, to turn jets north and east. These low altitude turns are typically at between 2,000-4,000 feet (factoring in the hills' 1020 feet+ altitude). They occur over dense-brush, residential canyon neighborhoods and wildlife habitats. The complexity of the hills and the canyon's microclimate render overflights here more perilous as evidenced by the April 29. 2023 fatality plane crash into a canyon wall during dense fog. Alternative A rightly curbs FAA-BUR's southerly turn points. 3. NO to Alternative B Increase of Climb Gradient EA 2.2.2 reads: "FAA analysis of departure climb data at BUR indicates that Boeing 737s achieve an average climb gradient of 1019 feet per nmi while Airbus A 320s achieve an average climb gradient of 1075 feet per nmi. These two aircraft ... comprise a considerable proportion of activity at BUR and indicate that the vast majority of aircraft utilizing BUR are already achieving the higher climb gradient included in this alternative. Since most aircraft departing BUR already exceed this rate of climb, vertical and lateral profiles are not expected to materially change from current operations for most aircraft, as a result of this alternative." Essentially, Alternative B is no change at all.

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		4. Environmental Consequences All of the sections in EA 4.1 indicate implementation of Alternative A would not have any significant impact on Air Quality, Climate, or Fuel Usage. 5. Noise Residents of West L.A.90077 south of Mulholland live nowhere near BUR. They did not buy homes under BUR flight tracks. They do not reside in BUR communities. They have their own airport. The BUR noise problem requires a San Fernando Valley solution. 6. Conclusion FAA is legally, contractually, and ethically obligated to implement Alternative A. cc: Vice President Kamala Harris Michael Whitaker, Administrator, FAA
1116	Capt. Douglas Wiley Airline Pilots Association, International	March 25, 2024 Federal Aviation Administration Operations Support Group Western Service Center 2200 216th Street Des Moines, WA 98198 Subject: Burbank Draft Environmental Assessment To Whom it May Concern:

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		The Airline Pilots Association, Int'l (ALPA), representing more than 75,000 pilots at 43 United States (U.S.) and Canadian airlines, has reviewed the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed amendments to the SLAPP TWO and OROSZ TWO Standard Instrument Departure (SID) procedures for the Bob Hope Hollywood Burbank (BUR) airport southern departures. ALPA appreciates the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) efforts to mitigate noise impacts to communities surrounding airports that provide air carrier service. However, ALPA is concerned that excessive increases in climb gradients solely for noise mitigation purposes can potentially reduce safety levels. The new SLAPP THREE departure procedure would require aircraft departing Runway 15 to maintain the runway heading of 155° before executing a climbing right turn to intercept the 214° radial to the JAYTE waypoint. Aircraft must pass JAYTE at or above 2,500 feet above Mean Sea Level (MSL) as well as at or below 240 knots indicated airspeed (KIAS). From JAYTE, aircraft will fly the 258° track to the TEAGN waypoint, which must be crossed at or above 4,000 feet MSL. Upon crossing TEAGN, aircraft will continue to fly the 258° track until receiving Air Traffic Control (ATC) vectors to the RAYVE waypoint and into the enroute airspace structure at an altitude at or above 7,000 feet MSL. The segment from TEAGN to RAYVE represents the open leg of the departure procedure. The new OROSZ THREE departure procedure would require aircraft departing Runway 15 to maintain the runway heading of 155° before executing a climbing right turn to intercept the 213° radial to the JAYTE waypoint. Aircraft must pass JAYTE at or above 2,500 feet MSL as well as at or below 240 KIAS. From JAYTE, aircraft will fly the 259° track to the TEAGN waypoint, which must be crossed at or above 4,000 feet MSL. Upon crossing TEAGN, aircraft will fly the 258° track until receiving ATC vectors to the TILLR waypoint into the enroute airspace structure at an altitude at or above 8,000 feet MSL. The segment from TEAGN to TILLR represents the open leg of the departure procedure. Runway 15 departures using the current SLAPP TWO and OROSZ TWO procedures must meet a minimum climb gradient of 340 feet/nautical mile (nm) on the initial departure segment. The proposed SLAPP THREE and OROSZ THREE will require a higher minimum climb gradient of 460 feet/nm. The proposed alternative is to increase the required minimum climb gradient from 340 feet/nm to 600 feet/nm to promote aircraft climbing out of the Airport as rapidly as possible to limit the exposure of sites on the ground to extended periods of aircraft noise. Section 2.1.3 of the EA stated a 600 feet/nm climb gradient is well below observed climb gradients achieved by most Runway 15 departures. The FAA analysis of departure climb data at the Airport indicates that Boeing

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		737s achieve an average climb gradient of 1,019 feet/nm, while Airbus A320s achieve an average climb gradient of 1,075 feet/nm. These two aircraft (along with derivatives with similar climb performance), comprise a considerable proportion of activity at the Airport and indicate that most aircraft utilizing the airport will have no issues reaching the higher climb gradient included in this alternative. However, the data used in the analysis was not provided with the EA for review. Unlike balanced runway and takeoff engine failure computations, air carriers are not required by the FAA to provide flight crews with performance data to determine whether a normally operating aircraft can make good the climb gradient specified on an instrument departure procedure. Not only do crews need these data in a form that can easily be used just prior to departure, the crews need to know the optimum flight profile to be used to ensure that the presumed performance is achieved during the departure procedure. In many cases, air carrier aircraft performance is sufficiently robust as to implicitly assure that specified climb gradients are exceeded simply by flying the nominal departure profile. But this assumption is not valid at terrain-critical locales, where steep gradients must be maintained for several thousand vertical feet. Unless the FAA mandates an objective, valid performance-calculation program for air carriers, sooner or later, a CFIT accident will occur at an airport surrounded by mountainous terrain are numerous man-made obstacles, which could have been prevented had a requirement been in place to assure compliance with the specified climb gradient under actual density altitude and aircraft takeoff weight conditions. 14 CFR, Parts 121.189 and 135.379, require FAR 121 and 135 operators, dispatch departments, and pilots to calculate the aircraft's performance capabilities to comply with a narrow, hypothetical takeoff flight path which is 600 feet wide and extends to the point where the aircraft reaches 1,500 feet above departure end runway elevation. Pilots are provided with the necessary aircraft performance data to compute this takeoff flight path, which terminates once the aircraft has reached 1,500 feet of altitude. This calculation serves to determine whether sufficient runway is available for takeoff, whether the aircraft can safely abort the takeoff in the event of an engine failure below the critical engine failure speed, and whether the aircraft can make good the 14 CFR 25-defined takeoff flight path to 1,500 feet, in the event of an engine failure. Further, flight crews are trained at every recurrent and proficiency training session on the correct power settings and flight profile to be used to ensure that the assumed performance data will assure compliance with the 14 CFR25- defined takeoff flight path to 1,500 feet of altitude gain. There is not, however, any FAA regulatory requirement or other FAA air-carrier-oversight function requirement that operators, dispatch departments, or pilots determine whether aircraft performance capabilities exist to comply with sustained climb gradients well above a 1,500-foot altitude gain, even with the normal operating condition of all engines operating. Further, there is no training or instruction given to flight crews

Appendix N – Compilation of Public Comments

Comment Number	Name of Submitter	Comment
		about the required power settings and vertical flight profiles required to achieve climb gradients for several thousands of vertical feet. ALPA maintains a policy position that the regulatory authority (in this case, the FAA) must require air carriers (Part 121 and 135 in the U.S.) verify that normal (all engine) operations comply with published SID climb gradients. ALPA also maintains a policy that aircraft noise should be reduced by engineering and design and not by marginally safe flying techniques such as artificial climb gradients where the presence of terrain or obstacles does not affect the climb gradients. ALPA is also opposed to operational workarounds such as the premature reduction of power on takeoff climb that is earlier or to a greater extent than safe operating practice would dictate. ALPA also has concerns with departures and climbs at airspeeds less than maneuvering speeds for the existing flap configuration. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Darrell Pennington, Engineering and Air Safety Department, at 703-689-4333 or Darrell.pennington@alpa.org. Capt. Douglas Willey Air Traffic Services Technical Group Chair Air Safety Organization Air Line Pilots Association, Int.