

Solution Score Card

| | Facts | Advantages | Disadvantages | Commentary |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| BSUR | <p>Followed the BSUR ground track.</p> <p>Used a stair-step descent, but was designed to encourage idle-power flight.</p> <p>Had minimal impact everywhere.</p> | <p>Known to be good.</p> <p>No complaints from Santa Cruz county, relatively few from Santa Clara county.</p> | <p>Stair-stepping is not ideal.</p> <p>Depends on pilot skill to “tweak” the stair-steps to account for weather and other factors.</p> | <p>The score is “by definition”. If we could have a “full revert”, everyone would accept that.</p> <p><u>This is the “gold standard” - other solutions are compared to BSUR.</u></p> |
| DAVYJ | <p>Follows the BSUR ground track.</p> <p>Uses an OPD approach.</p> | <p>OPD is designed to use idle-power flight more often than BSUR did.</p> <p>OPD is Optimized for current fleet of airplanes.</p> <p>Avoids flying over high-elevation communities.</p> <p>Makes best use of the Stanford Industrial Park.</p> <p>Follows original ground track.</p> <p>Studied in depth by the FAA and deemed “feasible”.</p> | <p>Slightly lower than BSUR.</p> <p>No guarantee for the real-life performance of OPD.</p> | <p>DAVYJ is either a little bit better or a little bit worse than BSUR, and flies over the same track.</p> <p>In other words, it is comparable to BSUR. It is most certainly nothing like SERFR, since it is designed with the sole purpose of fixing SERFR.</p> <p><u>DAVYJ is the NextGen equivalent of “return to BSUR”.</u></p> |
| Fix-in-place (FIP) | <p>Follows the SERFR ground track.</p> <p>Uses an OPD approach.</p> | <p>OPD is designed to use idle-power flight more often than BSUR did.</p> <p>OPD is Optimized for current fleet of airplanes.</p> | <p>Slightly lower than BSUR.</p> <p>No guarantee for the real-life performance of OPD.</p> <p>Flies over high-elevation communities.</p> <p>Does not follow the original ground track.</p> <p>Makes Fixing BRIXX more difficult.</p> <p>Increases vectoring exposure to Scotts Valley.</p> | <p>The descent profile is the same as DAVYJ, but the ground track is A) shifted, and B) flies over the summit communities.</p> <p>FIP immortalized the track movement of SERFR, which is recognized as a mistake, but offers no advantages that DAVYJ doesn’t already provide.</p> <p><u>With DAVYJ as an existing feasible solution, FIP is simply unacceptable.</u></p> |
| SERFR | <p>Follows the SERFR ground track.</p> <p>Conflicts with Class B.</p> <p>Overridden by ATC so does not use OPD and instead flies level with power. (“Dive and Drive”)</p> | <p>Cool name.</p> | <p>Shifted the noise away from the BSUR track onto new communities.</p> <p>Flies over high-elevation communities.</p> <p>Noisy flight practices and low de-facto altitudes.</p> <p>Makes Fixing BRIXX more difficult.</p> <p>Increases vectoring exposure to Scotts Valley.</p> | <p>10 points for the name, and besides, it could always be worse, so I have to leave some room at the bottom.</p> <p><u>SERFR is the “original sin”. It is what we want to, and can, undo.</u></p> |