

# Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

## Unapproved Summary Minutes: January 11, 2023

### Attendees

Natalie Rutzell, County 2, Chair	Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Phillip Gussman, City 1, Vice Chair	Pearlis Johnson, FAA
Nakia Savage, City 3	Shane Jackson, FAA
Bobbi Almond, City 5	Anthony Lyman, FAA
Doug Pray, County 1	Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Mark Loflin, County 6	Dan Gardon, CLT
Kurt Wiesenberger, Charlotte	Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Sayle Brown, Cornelius	Chris Poore, CLT
Matt Hamilton, Davidson	Amber Leathers, CLT
Sam Stowe, Gaston	Mike Pilarski, CLT
Preston Hagman, Huntersville	Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Walter Ballard, Lincoln	Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg	Cathy Schroeder, CSS, Inc.
Jacob Pollack, York	

### Summary Minutes

#### Open the Meeting

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:06 PM
- ❖ Rutzell: Welcome to the Airport Community Roundtable. It was established approximately 5 years ago by CLT to create a forum to address community concerns over airplane noise. The ACR mission statement is find practical solutions and recommendations for the FAA to consider.
- ❖ Gagnon: *Facilitated introductions of ACR members, CLT, FAA, AA, HMMH, and CSS.*
  - *Reviewed meeting procedures, especially for the online participants.* There is the “raise the hand” function. Please use that. Dan and Kevin will be monitoring the online participants. We will save the chat. For those in the room, there is public Wi-Fi.
  - *Handout: Went over the document.* It is large - 33 pages.
  - *Ground Rules:* Our goal is to have healthy and productive conversations, and in the end, be effective in making noise improvement in our area. Healthy means that if we have disagreements or strong points to make, let’s make sure they are focused on the goals of the group. Not make or take anything personal. Stay on task. We have a full agenda today.
- ❖ Rutzell: Do we have a motion to approve the Minutes? Do we have the Minutes in the handout?
- ❖ Gagnon: No, we provide those typically via email prior to the meeting. They were a part of the calendar invite.
- ❖ Wiesenberger: Question: Page 3 of the Minutes - There is a note that Dan Gardon will provide some air monitoring data near ACR members’ locations. Was that distributed? I did not receive that.
- ❖ Gardon: It was sent. I’ll check to make sure it was sent to you. It was a simple spreadsheet provided by HMMH based on data for each ACR member. Basically, it included the DNL range for your home address. The NA 70 metric and a number of other metrics.
- ❖ Wiesenberger: I make a motion to approve the October minutes. *Member seconded. All voted to approve.*
- ❖ Rutzell: The Motion passed.

## Receive Public Input

- ❖ Gardon: We are joined virtually by a number of residents. I did not receive any requests for addressing the ACR. However, if anyone on the call would like to address the ACR that is up to the Chair's discretion.
- ❖ Rutzell: Would anyone like to address the ACR? (*None*)
- ❖ Gagnon: Just as a reminder, just as Dan did in the calendar invite, he will put a couple of links into the chat. One is the complaints link, so anyone who wants to file a complaint has an easy access to do that. Also he'll provide a link to register to speak at these meetings. Residents are encouraged to speak, and we have had that in the past.

## Engage/Improve: Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study - Part 150/TAC Update

- ❖ Gagnon: Item #3 is an update on the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study. We have 3 different sub-agenda items. CLT will give a brief update on the Part 150 and the TAC activities, then we are going to have some broad-based discussion among the ACR members, in terms of items that the Chair and Vice Chair can bring to the TAC as well as potential brainstorming on ideas for the ACR to consider eventually submitting to the TAC as part of the 150.
- ❖ Leathers: We have been working with some of our partners to understand what came out of the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and that was some of the recommendations. We understand the recommendations that have come from the ACR, we have met with Air Traffic and American Airlines to understand what they would like to see out of the TAC. The next step is going to be a set of public meetings alongside a TAC meeting sometime in either late February to early March, depending on timing. We are currently having to observe what the Mecklenburg County rules are for COVID related to public meetings. We are on track. We had pushed it out maybe just one month to observe what the ACR was doing to avoid confusion, but we do have more information coming soon.
- ❖ Gagnon: Anything else on update on TAC?
- ❖ Rutzell: When is the next TAC meeting?
- ❖ Leathers: Next TAC meeting is in February before the public meeting.

## Engage/Improve: Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study - Part 150 Review: Questions/Considerations for ACR TAC Representatives and Recommendation Development for TAC

- ❖ Gagnon: Next agenda item deals with coming up with questions, considerations for Natalie and Phil - who are the representatives on the TAC - to bring to that group.
  - Part 150 was sent to the ACR members, via a link, a couple of times. In addition, Dan had done some research with Part 150s at other airports to give you a feel as to what types of initiatives are included in those Part 150s. What we were hoping to do is to see what thoughts or input you have. I will capture what you share.
  - Our first topic is the Part 150 - any additional questions for our representatives to bring to the TAC? Based on your review of other Part 150s, what are some ideas or questions that you all have?
- ❖ Pollack: The TAC information that Dan pulled from other airports was helpful. I am struggling with understanding what are the boundaries around what are the acceptable Part 150 measures and what is not acceptable. Things that are appropriate with Part 150 measures and things that are out of bounds. Where's that boundary?
- ❖ Gagnon: We are not looking to get those answers today necessarily, but at least to know what types of questions to ask.
- ❖ Rutzell: Are we planning to go through what is currently in the Part 150?
- ❖ Gagnon: We had planned to go through when we get to the ideation, but we can do that now if you would like.
- ❖ Rutzell: (*Asking the roundtable*) Would you like to go through what is currently in the Part 150 before we discuss potential brainstorming?
- ❖ Gagnon: Yes, seeing some nods. What Natalie is referring to starts on Page 6 in the handout. Dan, I know that you had provided this to include in the handout. Pages 6-19 are the measures that currently exist in the Part 150.
- ❖ Gardon: Quick walk through. In a Part 150 there are generally 3 types of abatement measures: (1) Noise abatement measures – these typically relate to actual flight activity. (2) Land use control measures, which relate to how the land around the airport is used. (3) Land use mitigation measures. For the purposes of this group, the most important ones to look at are the noise abatement measures, the NA measures.
  - Here at CLT there are 9 listed for continuity. You will notice going through the list that a few of them, such as NA 2 and 3, were measures that no longer exist but are kept for numerical continuity. So, there

are only 7 in effect, and those are on pages 7-10 in the handout. The Land use control and Land use mitigation measures are interesting, but I don't know if they will be of interest to this group specifically.

- NA-1 relates to monitoring procedures. In the past, we have done that with physical monitors on the ground here at CLT. We now do that virtually through the Virtual Contour Monitoring Program.
  - NA-2 and NA-3 are listed for numerical continuity.
  - NA-4 is providing monthly reports on late night runway utilization and variances. When we talk about variances, we talk about runway use, so anytime aircraft utilize the western most runway between those hours, we record that as well.
  - NA-5 designates runway 18R, now runway 18C. This Part 150 measure was written before the western most runway was built. It designates that runway as the preferred runway for takeoffs during the nighttime hours when Runway 23 or Runway 5 - which no longer exists - cannot be used.
  - NA-6 designates locations and procedures for aircraft engine run-ups. Historically, run-ups have not been a large factor for noise here at the airport.
  - NA-7 is a very important one. Departures from 36R and 36L, which became 36C. These are northbound departure aircraft, and what this says is aircraft initiate turns at 2.6 and 2.5 miles north of the VOR. This essentially means that aircraft are going to turn at the end of the runway when departing to the north.
  - NA-8 addresses construction of 3<sup>rd</sup> parallel runway, built in 2010. It is our western-most runway. This establishes an initial turn for that runway. That runway is not typically used for departures.
  - NA-9 talks about that runway and particularly runway 18C as an initial departure turn to the south at a heading of 315 degrees.
- ❖ Rutzell: Where is the runway that we are talking about removing the 2-mile restriction? I thought I saw it when I read the Part 150, and it was part of the schedule.
  - ❖ Hennessey: I think it is in the notes section under NA-8.
  - ❖ Rutzell: I remember some schedule or appendix.
  - ❖ Gardon: That is an oversight on my part; apologies.
  - ❖ Wright: The large 4 engine prop aircraft - is that a commercial or non-commercial aircraft? It is referenced in NA-8 and 9.
  - ❖ Gardon: That refers to commercial prop aircraft, which we don't often see in Charlotte. Right before the "large four-engine prop aircraft," it mentions turbojets, which is official term for jet aircraft. What that is basically saying is that all jets and large prop aircraft would adhere to that. We don't see a lot of 4-engine prop aircraft anymore.
  - ❖ Montross: You can Google that, and there are some good pictures online, and I haven't seen one in a long time.
  - ❖ Rutzell: As a reminder for the group, we did have a voluntary timing for noise and flights.
  - ❖ Gardon: That process was separate from the Part 150. It was a voluntary restraint period. Something like that could be submitted as a Part 150 recommendation, but as it stands now it is simply an ACR recommendation outside of the Part 150 process.
  - ❖ Wiesenberger: These NA measures seem to be a bit confusing. How are they incorporating – or not incorporating – the 6 recommendations that we submitted to the FAA as part of our overall purpose?
  - ❖ Gardon: The measures listed here are the current measures. They were from 1996. Nothing in this handout relates to the FAA recommendations.
  - ❖ Montross: I am confused about the notes portions. The southbound 2-mile restriction is in the notes, but it's specified that there is a 2-mile DME to the North. Why is the South language not referenced?
  - ❖ Gardon: The 2-mile restriction has a very long history, beginning around 1957. That was basically an air traffic procedure for a very long time. I think that is some background context – it was not an actual NA measure, just a comment in the background of one of them.
  - ❖ Montross: So, you are saying that the existing Part 150 does not specify the southbound 2-mile restriction as a noise abatement procedure? It is just a tower order?
  - ❖ Gardon: I am not sure that it is a tower order. I will have to get back to you on that. You'll notice in both NA-8 and NA-9 they reference specific headings. And I believe both of those headings referenced were also referenced in this long-standing procedure where the 2-mile was referenced. I will have to follow-up with you and the group as well.
  - ❖ Rutzell: I don't know if this is part of the NAs, but when they made the change for Metroplex and they changed the headings, I believe they changed the headings for departures?

- ❖ Gardon: It is my understanding the headings changed in the actual departure procedure but not in the NA measure.
- ❖ Wright: A question about the information sent to us. In the file there are references to different airports. What is the relevance of that information? Is that something that we are to use or just as information on what other airports recommended under Part 150s?
- ❖ Gagnon: It is a bit of both. Part of the idea of sharing information on the CLT Part 150 is so you all were aware of what was included and what you may want to recommend to change. Another source of ideas for you is seeing what other airports have done. I believe that Natalie, in particular, is interested in seeing what other airports have done in their Part 150s. So, Dan looked at comparable airports. They are just trigger ideas for you - ideas that could apply to CLT as well.
- ❖ Gardon: That is correct.
- ❖ Pollack: A comment about measures from other airports. In Detroit, there was a reference about noise abatement corridors. What are those?
- ❖ Gardon: In general, a noise abatement corridor is a land use measure where the city or governing body of the airport buys out land underneath a departure or arrival procedure. I would say it is pretty comparable to our 2-mile departure restriction, simply a more robust version of that.
- ❖ Pollack: So, this is land that the planes are flown over in order to mitigate noise elsewhere rather than land to be avoided? It is property purchased by the airport or the city and flight paths are directed to go over that. Is that right?
- ❖ Hair: That is correct. To clarify, NA-8 is pretty complicated. Kevin is printing out the original documentation. So, you can see where the 2-mile restriction is referenced. It goes into background and intent, and that is where the reference to the distance that you travel off the runway heading is noted. When we discuss it, we shorten the description, and it has created some confusion as to what is actually printed in the measure. We will hand that out when Kevin prints it.
- ❖ Gardon: We will make sure to send that out after the meeting. It is worth noting that in this PowerPoint each measure is truncated to just a sentence or two, where in the actual Part 150 it can take one or two pages, explaining the background and intent and future uses of it, as well.
- ❖ Gagnon: Some of what we have talked about so far falls into a couple of different categories. We talked about (A) Headings that are utilized as part of the Part 150 so that is something to consider, and obviously some of your departure recommendations have recommendations for different headings. (B) Distance from the airport to turn. Some of the current measures have that listed, and obviously removing the 2-mile restriction in conjunction with some other recommendations is something you all have already submitted as part of the Part 150 process. (C) Aircraft types. These were noted in that, as well. In terms of categories of the types of recommendations that you could make to the TAC as part of the Part 150 process, these are some different categories.
  - Back to Thelma's point, with the document that Dan put together and we sent to the ACR, with Part 150s from other airports, there were 5 different airports. I am not going to read through the 30 or 40 different ideas, but as a refresher to see if it conjures up any thoughts for you, I will tap into 2 or 3 examples from each airport. As I bring these up, feel free to write any thoughts down about what may be considered for Natalie/Phil to ask or changes to see through the Part 150 process.
    - Phoenix: 1) Continue runway use program that equalizes departure operations to the east and to the west in both daytime and nighttime. 2) Encourage use of published procedures requiring aircraft to avoid noise sensitive land. 3) They have specific departure procedures for small piston aircraft.
    - San Diego: 1) Departure thrust cutback. I know that the ACR has done specific NADP-2 procedure recommendations. 2) Designated noise abatement takeoff or approach paths.
    - Baltimore: 1) Preference of west flow operations. Unlike Phoenix which wanted a 50/50 split, Baltimore actually prefers one flow over the other. 2) Runway use restrictions.
    - Detroit: 1) Concentrate departures in south flow. 2) Implement continuous descent approach – Dan notes that it is unclear if this actually takes place, but it is in their Part 150.
    - Seattle: 1) Restrict taxiing to and from maintenance areas during night hours. 2) Preferential runway use.
  - I just wanted to share those to see if they trigger any ideas. Questions you want Natalie and Phil, as your TAC representatives, to ask about during the Part 150 process, or potential ideas if these conjure up any recommendations at this point.
  - The next ACR meeting is April 12, and from what we understand there is not a deadline currently for when recommendations have to be submitted. Is that correct?

- ❖ Leathers: There will be a deadline, but I do not know when it is; I will make sure to get that answered and sent out to the group.
- ❖ Gagnon: Is it likely to be after the April 12 ACR meeting?
- ❖ Leathers: Yes.
- ❖ Gagnon: The ACR has 3 months before the next meeting, so there will be communications between meetings to come up with additional ideas, refine the ideas, and we are not missing a deadline before the next ACR meeting if ideas are not submitted before then. Based on what these other airports are doing, based on looking at some of the current CLT measures, are there other questions you would like Natalie or Phil to ask?
- ❖ Reindel: I want to broaden the definition of noise abatement corridor. Dan provided one example. Noise abatement corridors are exactly that - where would you like the aircraft to fly so the aircraft is less annoying or less intrusive to the population? For example, it could be under an existing industrial area to avoid adjacent residential area. That is done at Newark Liberty International Airport, right after takeoff they turn to go over industrial area. It could be a corridor where they have provided sound insulation to the residents. In Nashville, the FAA almost undid the noise abatement corridor through their NextGen implementation. This would have put planes over an area that was not sound insulated. So, the noise abatement corridor in Nashville is over one that is sound insulated. There are a number of ways to produce a noise abatement corridor. I did not want it to be limited to Dan's correct definition.
- ❖ Rutzell: It doesn't mean that the land has to be purchased by the airport?
- ❖ Reindel: That is correct. That is one way to do it, but it isn't the only way to have a noise abatement corridor.
- ❖ Leathers: To add, one of the ones related to 5/23 is Interstate 85. Interstate 85 is considered a corridor – being able to fly that corridor is existing. Before it was decommissioned, runway 5/23 used I-85 as a corridor to fly.
- ❖ Rutzell: For background, when we came up with our proposals, did we explore proposals of flying over industrial areas, preferred areas, or going down a highway?
- ❖ Wiesenberger: Thinking about history, we came up with dozens of ideas – some of which came from other airports – and boiled them down to 6 recommendations that had the best likelihood of being considered for approval. We did discuss noise abatement corridors, but we did not include them.
- ❖ Wiesenberger: Transitioning into idea generation is a good thing to do at this stage. I want to clarify that these current noise abatement procedures - they are in place since 1996. Our 6 recommendations of the ACR are going to be considered for inclusion once the FAA processes them, is that correct?
- ❖ Gardon: The 3 arrival recommendations were not to be considered by the Part 150, most likely because they fall outside the purview of the Part 150. However, the 3 departure recommendations are being considered by the TAC.
- ❖ Wiesenberger: Why are the arrival recommendations excluded?
- ❖ Gardon: For the purposes of the Part 150, any recommendation must have a measurable difference on the number of residents in the 65 DNL. So, if a recommendation does not affect the 65 DNL contour, it cannot be approved for the purposes of Part 150. When we look at the 2-mile departure procedure, that falls squarely within the 65 DNL. We expect any changes to that will have some effect, one way or another, on the contour. The arrival recommendations – a really good example is Recommendation 3A – involves altitudes over the SouthPark area, and that is well outside the 65 DNL. There is basically no way it would have an effect that would be applicable to the Part 150.
- ❖ Wiesenberger: Yes, I understand, but I disagree with it being so dogmatically tied to the 65 DNL because in the future that could change. I think the Part 150 should include some future-oriented thinking. Many of us are being affected even if we're not in the 65 DNL, and that is why we are here. Please consider that.
- ❖ Pollack: On topic of 65 DNL. Could you explain the standard again? In order to be considered it has to do what?
- ❖ Gardon: For the purposes of the Part 150, there has to be a measurable benefit to the 65 DNL.
- ❖ Reindel: I will say it in a slightly different way. First, the FAA determined that the arrivals did not need to be pushed to the Part 150, whereas the departures needed to be evaluated in the Part 150 - likely because of the issue with the 65 DNL. In Part 150 for a measure to be approved by FAA, it must show measurable benefit to the 65 DNL contour; you can recommend measures in a Part 150 that don't show benefit, but realize that it will not be approved by the FAA. Now that also does not mean that it doesn't get implemented. There are other ways to implement such procedures; they would just not be implemented through the Part 150 or be funded by Part 150 noise set aside monies.
- ❖ Pollack: When you say "benefit to 65 DNL," what do you mean?

- ❖ Reindel: The purpose of a Part 150 is to have compatible land use. Part 150 by definition is a land use compatibility study. What you want to show is that a measure will improve land use compatibility. And how you get improvement is when there are fewer people exposed to 65 DNL.
- ❖ Pollack: So, it is measured by person? If you move noise around, you might shrink the boundary here, but you're going to grow it somewhere else unless you can get planes to take off vertically. So, it is by person?
- ❖ Reindel: The benefit is thinking about lessening the number of people or having fewer people exposed to 65 DNL. That is the target.
- ❖ Pollack: Is it a net benefit?
- ❖ Reindel: Yes, it has always been considered a net benefit. However, since Part 150 has been implemented, the FAA has a policy to not shift noise from one community to another. That will also play a role. Say you have 1,000 people in a 65 DNL with a current procedure and you want to do one that is 900 people, but it is a different 900 people, you may have a tough time getting the FAA to do that because it is shifting noise.
- ❖ Pollack: That is a tough standard. If a couple of people are going to get more even though other people are going to get less - to move things around without somebody new getting included in the boundary, it seems to be a difficult standard to meet.
- ❖ Reindel: It could be, but don't limit yourselves. Just come up with ideas and evaluate them. If the airport recommends it, even though it might shift it from one place to another, but if it is ultimately for the greater good, maybe they can still recommend it. I just want to be upfront as to how the FAA reviews these procedures.
- ❖ Pollack: The Part 150 does not happen that often, and the plane operations shift in between those periods. My understanding is that the airport operates very differently than before the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway came in. There is a peculiarity here where the airport, in between Part 150 analyses, actually moves people in and out of that boundary and then, by virtue of those moves, those boundaries become locked in under Part 150 where they cannot be put back, correct?
- ❖ Reindel: Essentially you are right. I think there are some nuances that may not be correct. You are right that the Part 150s are not done every 2-3 years. They are usually done every 10-15 or more years; the issue is whether or not the measures are still beneficial. You will update the noise exposure maps more periodically to understand how things have changed and whether the noise abatement procedures are still beneficial.
- ❖ Rutzell: Can you remind me of the analysis on the departures proposals, Gene? I believe that we did see a net benefit on 65 DNL even though our scope was beyond that?
- ❖ Reindel: We did not evaluate DNL that much but more focused on the N70 grid results. The ACR felt that they did not want to limit to the 65 DNL as most of the problems were well outside that. That may be why the FAA wanted those evaluated as part of the Part 150, because they would be evaluated on the basis of 65 DNL and how it might benefit the DNL.
- ❖ Rutzell: Just as a reminder, we came up with our own metrics on how to determine the impact, a grid.
- ❖ Reindel: The number of noise events above 70 dB.
- ❖ Gagnon: As a reminder, the reason you all chose that was because it was a combination of frequency, which hits some people more, and the level of noise, which hits other people more. It was a good compromise. I believe it was evaluated over a 60 by 40-mile grid in quarter mile increments. So, thousands and thousands of individual grid points to measure very precise areas of the community and the impact of the changes you all recommended.
- ❖ Pollack (from chat): *Ideas for Part 150 measures: (i) speed limits on approaching aircraft based on distance (I have seen significant speed differentials); (ii) during periods of fewer operations, require spreading of operations across runways to avoid concentration of operations to a single runway while leaving other runways underutilized (for example, sending all arrivals to 18R while 18L and 18C are held open for departures whenever pilots want to roll on); (iii) require balancing of N/S flow; and (iv) procedures that prevent continuous flow in one direction over many days when avoidable -- for example, require or flow "flipping" whenever reasonably possible to prevent flow in one direction for more than a set number of consecutive days to bring relief to people who have been getting a lot of noise from one type of operation for multiple days.*
- ❖ Wright: This is a question and a comment and refers to what Kurt was saying in terms of looking forward and the 65 DNL requirement and the frequency that we are disturbed by; we are disturbed by the frequency. We do not have control over where Charlotte is allowing housing to be built. Living here near the airport within a 3-mile radius and 485 and the land that was a golf course and is now houses that you can now see from 485. Traveling in other areas of Charlotte, and they are approving land development that was farmland or undeveloped land, and those planes are

flying over what is now housing - I think we have a difficult way to deal with noise because we don't have the cooperation of the planning commission and what is being approved for developers.

- ❖ Gagnon: Good segue into our next agenda item, which is project teams.
- ❖ Hair: Kevin did print out copies of NA-8. We'll distribute the actual information now. We can table that conversation.
- ❖ Gagnon: Let me summarize where we are and where we are going over the next few months: We wanted to have a conversation about the Part 150 and make sure that TAC representatives have questions from you. We wanted to have a discussion to see what types of recommendations currently exist, what are other airports doing as well, and what categories of recommendations you all may want to consider. This is just a starting point. There will be communication prior to the April ACR meeting, whether it is coming up with additional questions, getting feedback from Natalie and Phil from the February TAC meeting, or developing some recommendations that could be potentially reviewed and voted on at the meeting. That is to be determined.

### **Engage/Improve: ACR Member Newsletter Feedback**

- ❖ Gagnon: Back to the handout document – Page 20. As a reminder, this group is now meeting quarterly, and one of the goals is to ensure that communications do not go stale, that you were still kept informed of what is going on. We did surveys several months back to see your interests. This is the ACR newsletter, and it is something that I have worked with Natalie and Phil to create. Dan provided updated information as well. This came out about 3-4 weeks ago. We plan to do this once between each ACR quarterly meeting to keep everyone abreast of what is going on.
  - On pages 20-23 is the e-mail, and we are including it in the handout to get your feedback. It is coming out as an e-mail, and the categories are structured in a simplified format. In the middle of Page 20, there are 8 links that you can click on, and it will take you there. Is this the type of information that you are looking for? What do you like, what do you want changed in future newsletters?
- ❖ Montross: Asking the ACR, is it okay if I am included on this distribution list? *Yes*. And, the document that Dan provided on the Part 150 – comparison of other airports – that is not in the handout that was referenced in the newsletter, can you resend it as well? *Yes*.
- ❖ Loflin: I like the format. When possible, meeting dates on project teams would be helpful.
- ❖ Gagnon: We will include schedules of project team meetings. Any other feedback? *None*.

### **Engage/Improve: Updates from Project Teams**

- ❖ Gagnon: Both the Community Engagement and Government Engagement Project Teams have met since the October meeting. The Community Engagement Team is looking to create an ACR update document. They have a draft produced. It is somewhat of a media update but something also that you could send to constituents.
- ❖ Gussman: ACR update should be finalized in a few weeks, and I will share it with everyone. If you share it with media, let Natalie or I know so that we are prepared. We need to keep clean point of contact so we don't muddy the waters. We are trying to create more stories around this that might be interesting, including utilizing some additional media stuff. Looking to move forward on that to make more interesting community and media content.
- ❖ Gagnon: From the Government Engagement team, they met and drafted a letter that we will send to ACR members after the meeting. It is a letter that you could identify an elected official and send this letter - which gives an overview of the ACR, tells about the Part 150 and lets them know that the Part 150 will eventually be voted on by government officials and will be seeking their support down the road. We will send that draft out so you can revise it and determine who you will send it to. Thelma and Sayle provided a lot of great input as to what that letter could be and the content to be included. Thelma mentioned that the letter is good but a little long. Feel free to pare it down. In the last paragraph, it suggests for you to follow-up with whomever you send it to, with a phone call or extra meeting. If you would like another ACR member to be on that call with you for support, feel free to reach out to others.
- ❖ Rutzell: Did we discuss copying Phil or myself so we have record for tracking?
- ❖ Gagnon: Yes, when you send out the letter, copy Natalie and/or Phil.

### **Monitor: CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations - ACR Apron Improvement Plans**

- ❖ Pilarski: At the previous ACR meeting, there was a comment about the new runway – needing ramp improvements for all the additional traffic coming. Page 24, slide 2, this is from our airport layout plan. This is something we put together that got finalized in 2016. What you are seeing here are a couple of concourse expansions, on B and C

concourse and way out in the future when we have a need is a satellite terminal. In purple is a means of conveyance to get passengers to that satellite terminal - something like an automated people mover.

➤ We are studying what the future would look like - how we are able to add onto the concourses in a manner that is helpful, continues to have positive net gate count. We are taking out a lot of gates along this side of C concourse. We are also adding a lot of aircraft. We call this B+ and Cx expansions. Tiny little expansion on B concourse, which gives us a couple more gates and additional ones on C concourse. We do have additional taxi lanes in different places. This is one way that we are looking at it so that we might be able to improve the airfield and ramp efficiency. We are going to have a lot of gates on the east side, so being able to get these aircraft over to the future 3 parallel runways on the west side is critical. Slide 4 is way out in the future – gets quite a bit more gates, but what we do like about this future state is full East/West taxi lanes that can help us move a lot of aircraft.

- ❖ Loflin: Is there a number of gates that the airport is looking to get in the future?
- ❖ Leathers: During the EA, everything is worked toward a forecast. The forecast for 2028 is 140 gates total. For 2033 it is 150 gates. We have 113 gates now and 10 more gates coming online with Concourse A Phase 2, which was previously mentioned as under construction.
- ❖ Loflin: So, basically we are saying that we only need 10 more gates?
- ❖ Leathers: We are at 113 and we intend to add 10 with Concourse A Phase 2, and it is not just about adding gates. If you look at the configuration of what the airfield is, some of these gates have to be relocated. But we are still looking at a total of 140 gates in 2028 and 150 by 2033.
- ❖ Wright: With the additional gates, I see here that 36R is next to those gates. Does that mean those additional gates are going to be departing or arriving on that particular runway?
- ❖ Leathers: That runway now is a mixed-use runway – arrivals and departures – and it would remain the same. For now, that is the only runway that we have on the east side of the airport campus.
- ❖ Wright: The question is would the additional gates be added to that runway?
- ❖ Leathers: Not just to that runway. Gates and their placement on the concourse do not determine which runway that they go to.
- ❖ Hagman: When is the satellite terminal supposed to come in?
- ❖ Leathers: What we in planning do is try to set ourselves up to know what the future next steps are going to be. In terms of the satellite concourse, it is pretty far out. It is outside of our 2033 window. In terms of building what we see here, it can take anywhere up to 15 years. So, beyond that point, we feel like we have a good plan in place with the facility that we have. We definitely see improvements with the facility that we have. But before we ask anyone to make a huge commitment to that satellite terminal because as Mike stated, there is a tunnel or people-mover involved, it is extremely expensive. We are trying to maximize what we have with our existing footprint first.
- ❖ Pollack: A lot of this is quite far out on the horizon. I know in asking folks about the flow direction, because it is a concern of mine, I've heard one justification for that recent historical preference for northern flow is that southern flow produces more ramp congestion. I'm wondering whether as part of the runway installation, as part of this installation of the 4 new gates on B concourse - is the airport planning to make any modifications to the field to address this ramp congestion? So, that after the new runway is put in, there is whatever needs to be done to eliminate the ramp congestion so that it is no longer a factor in choosing flow?
- ❖ Leathers: What is on slide 5 is improved taxi lane configuration. This is all intended to help with the capacity and efficiency of the ramp. The ramp, what you see in yellow, is improved. We only have 2 taxi lanes in some areas. We are expanding to 3 taxi lanes in some areas. The yellow here is to address that ramp congestion. When we talk about the runway being added, it was evaluated in an Environmental Assessment that looked at major capacity enhancing projects, so that included the runway and also included the concourse and ramp expansion. It is a balance for us.
- ❖ Pollack: Yellow is expansion. Would that expanded ramp be installed by 2028 or whenever the new runway goes in?
- ❖ Leathers: That is our goal. We are in preliminary design for the south ramp expansion. To gain the most efficiencies when you are adding any airfield infrastructure, you also want to have the balance of gates and the ramp congestion to be addressed. We have both issues right now, so even if we move forward with south ramp a little bit later than the runway, there is benefit to be gained for both.
- ❖ Pilarski: I have heard horror stories of people landing on west runway and then taxiing for about 45 minutes to E concourse gate. We realize it is an issue, and is not ideal right now. We would like to address it sooner than later.



- ❖ Pollack: I got the sense that the issue on southern flow is about departures stacking up on the edges of the gate area when leaving and not having a place to go.
- ❖ Pollack (from chat): *Sorry, just a question concerning the airport expansion plans -- I am wondering if the airport has conducted any sort of study or done any sort of analysis to determine how many flights per day the airport can possibly handle given its current location. I think that there is a critical issue with the airport (which is also one of its benefits) is that it is so close to downtown. This is a limiting factor from a noise perspective when the airport is not located further out, as many large airports that handle similar amounts of flights. Does Charlotte have a view of the maximum size this airport can reasonably grow before more growth is not possible?*
- ❖ Brown: How many phases is that going to take? You have a lot of construction going on and a lot of blockage for the existing gates. Is it like 5 or 6 different phases?
- ❖ Leathers: I think it is probably many more phases. When doing construction while maintaining an operation is hard. If there is no decrease in the schedule or the capacity of the airfield, it is very much a step-by-step coordination. We are able to do a lot of expansion to the airfield, rehab, reconstructions, while maintaining the operation under the same conditions. We are very good at maintaining operations. Concourse A expansion Phase 2 will allow some flights to be able to move. Those gates are needed no matter what. They are needed for the existing demand now.

### **Monitor: CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations**

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 28 - Year-end Key Measures document.
- ❖ Gardon: Key Measures document detailing some of the key metrics of the airport, including operations per day, the percentage of North vs. South flow, average number of cargo flights and runway use. If anything jumps out, let me know. There is a side note. I think it was in the October meeting, we added the line of early turn violations. This relates to aircraft that turn prior to 2-miles as recorded by our system. You will notice a couple of asterisks. Our system is not entirely accurate on that. Next pages – 29-30 – we have a breakdown of some complaint stats for the year. Page 30 is the breakdown by location, including county and zip code within Mecklenburg County. This is simply a data point. These numbers reflect complaints that we receive, and there have been no changes to the airspace in the last 6 years, so these numbers do not reflect any changes in operations.
- ❖ Wiesenberger: I have brought this up at other meetings, but the complaint process is an onerous process for a public citizen to go online, make a phone call, and record their data repeatedly. You had suggested that there are different ways of expediting this so that it was more user-friendly for people to let you know noise is bothering them. Can you give an update?
- ❖ Gardon: Unfortunately, I do not have a good update at this time. We have been in contact with our developer pretty constantly. I think it is close to a year that we have been having this conversation about a website cookie, so you don't have to type in certain fields every time, as well as an update to the Captcha on this form. That is still being worked on. It is an ongoing improvement.
- ❖ Rutzell: Is there any consideration to doing something like an Air Noise button? We pay for that. You just have to press a button, and it files a complaint. There is technology out there that makes it very simple.
- ❖ Hair: My understanding is that that button was developed by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party developer, and we don't have any relationship to that technology.
- ❖ Wiesenberger: We understand that. It seems we are at two ends of the continuum in terms of complaint technology. Big distance between usability regarding complaints and filing them. I think it is useless data - you don't even report this except to us. What value is it to you?
- ❖ Hair: It is a data point. It is input on the impact of the airport on the community. The biggest use for it is identifying new complainants. The specific example that is legendary around the department was that we were not aware of a change in operational flight procedures until we started getting noise complaints from a new geography. We investigated and figured out that there had been a change, and we were able to make adjustments on those procedures. The call-to-action for us is what the ACR is. Noise complaints are not a call-to-action; they are a new source of information/data points. The reason that we convened the ACR is to figure out how to mitigate noise impacts across the community. This is the forum, the ACR. The noise complaints are information.
- ❖ Rutzell: I don't think that is communicated to our community. They believe that the only way to be heard is through the complaints process.
- ❖ Brown: You said there is an increase with complaints. Is there a culprit like with a new airline?

- ❖ Hair: I don't think I've seen it with a new airline. We get noise complaints about flights into Concord airport. They fly over our house. Concord does not have a complaint number.
- ❖ Gardon: At other airports around the country, that is a factor. Certain airlines fly certain aircraft types that may be louder. We don't see that here at CLT.
- ❖ Wright: 311 - I know that is City/County, but maybe there is another number you can call about airport complaints. Like when you call 911, they know your phone number and address. Not everyone wants to go online and sign into a website.
- ❖ Gardon: To that point, we do have a hotline. That number is 704-359-HEAR. It records your phone number as soon as you call.
- ❖ Gagnon: Good points. Getting back to what Natalie was saying, maybe it is a matter of - from the complaints side - Community Engagement Project Team, making sure that phone number 359-HEAR is promoted more. If complaints are useful but a data point, and the ACR is the place to drive change, if residents want change, they need to be more engaged with ACR members. Some ideas for Project Teams.
- ❖ Hamilton: When do you think we will get information on the flight paths that will be established with the 4<sup>th</sup> parallel runway?
- ❖ Leathers: When we did the Environmental Assessment, we took that into consideration. Everything is that forecast demand, forecasted flights, and what it does is it takes into consideration the existing flight procedures and being able to identify the ratio of flights going off of the 4<sup>th</sup> parallel runway and how that would change the use of the other runways. All of that is evaluated in the EA process.
- ❖ Hamilton: Is there a map or something that would show what areas would be affected that weren't affected before the new runway?
- ❖ Leathers: In the documentation of the EA, it will show you what those changes look like through the noise exposure contours. That is something that we can show you. In terms of flights going beyond the point of the 65 DNL, there were some simulations done, but in terms of where they are actually going, it could be very different than the simulation.
- ❖ Hamilton: So, there is not any information outside of the 65 DNL?
- ❖ Leathers: There is some. Let me share the information about the website and all the documentations and hopefully that will meet what you are asking.

### **FAA Update and Action on ACR Slate's Arrival Recommendations - Status of Alternative Recommendation #3a**

- ❖ Johnson: Thank you for patience and professionalism as we evaluated this option. I am happy to report that we are moving forward with designing this procedure, and we hope to bring Recommendation 3a to execution by end of 2024 or beginning of 2025. I know it was not exactly your recommendation. We modified and showed what we could do. We think it will do what you wanted - which is to raise the altitude around the airport 1,000 feet.
- ❖ Gagnon: As a reminder, you all submitted a recommendation to raise the altitudes at 2 waypoints by 1,000 feet. The FAA came back and said we want to do it at 7 waypoints.
- ❖ Johnson: We are moving forward with that, and the next working group meeting is in July. It is a group of about 45 people that sits down and makes it happen. It is a slow process. *Applause from ACR members.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Thank you for that positive update.

### **Update and Action on ACR Slate's Arrival Recommendations - Develop Recommendation #1a Alternatives**

- ❖ Gagnon: Back to the handout - Page 31. Recommendation #1a is still in the works. As a reminder, this recommendation was that arrivals would come in in a continuous descent, gradual descent, rather than maintaining a certain altitude with more thrust, more noise at a much lower altitude. You all submitted that in July 2020. In September 2021, the FAA came back and said they could not implement that as designed. They said they would look for possible procedural opportunities. They then said they had not found any good alternatives but were willing to work with the ACR to develop an alternative.

- In talking with Natalie/Phil prior to the meeting, we created this concept of a Technical Working Group to discuss with the group and other stakeholders here. The idea is to come up with alternatives to recommendations such as this.
- The purpose of having this Technical Working Group is to Utilize technically knowledgeable representatives from key stakeholder groups, like the FAA, CLT, AA, and HMMH, to identify potential alternatives/options to reduce airplane noise effects on the population. So, having a technical conversation to refine or build recommendations before the ACR makes recommendations. 2 primary goals: (1) Ensure that key stakeholder experiences, perspectives, and expertise are taken into account, and (2) Uncover alternatives that have a high probability of being technically feasible so that the ACR does not submit recommendations that may not work.
- For an example, uncovering alternatives to #1a - a subgroup of the ACR or this Technical Working Group could look at Recommendation #1a which is:
  - The ACR would like the FAA to examine other methods of implementing continuous descent approaches in lieu of having aircraft hold at low altitudes for miles on the downwind phase of flight.
  - The FAA, when looking at alternatives, was interested in looking at possible amendments to existing instrument flight procedures that would meet the ACR's intent during night operations, during midnight shift hours or times of low traffic.
- So, a technical discussion group would address the spirit of ACR recommendation of having more continuous descent and maybe do it by working with key stakeholder groups identifying alternatives.
- Another example: TSAS update request. This group could have discussion/brainstorming. What are some concerns and what are some procedural or technical ways to address this? A group or discussion like this could look at other technical options.
- This is something that relates to #1a. Essentially what this conversation is about is determining the best way to have this type of forum or technical conversation so that you all feel comfortable that your recommendations are technically feasible. Natalie/Phil, is there anything you want to add to this topic?
- ❖ Rutzell: I think this topic is for the key stakeholders outside of the ACR. Would there be appetite to have this independent working group, and would you be willing to participate in them outside of ACR meetings?
- ❖ Johnson: I don't see FAA having an issue with that. We will be happy to engage in that conversation.
- ❖ Hair: Sure. We want to be sure that we are doing things in alignment with NC Open Meetings Laws. Needs to be planned ahead of time and in accordance with public meetings. The idea behind the quarterly ACR meetings is that we would have these working groups and extra meetings.
- ❖ Gussman: Just to reinforce that when this idea came up, we saw it as a technical group that could work on some of these issues. Kind of hone the membership and make sure that we have the people on it who are most effective at having this technical discussion. Then we can bring things to the full ACR already vetted to some level. I think it will help to work through some of the more difficult issues ahead of us.
- ❖ Rutzell: Next step would be to identify the individual members who would be involved in that?
- ❖ Gagnon: I don't think we have to do that right now. It would be beneficial to have a formal motion to form a technical team.
- ❖ Rutzell: So, the next step would be to request a motion.
- ❖ Gussman: I will make a motion: To form an ACR Technical Working Group that includes technically knowledgeable representatives from key stakeholder groups to identify potential alternatives and options to reduce the airplane noise effects on the population.
- ❖ Loflin: I second it.
- ❖ Ballard: When I read this, it talks about specifically alternatives to #1a. The motion was extremely general in nature. Do we want to focus on #1a?
- ❖ Gagnon: Recommendation #1a is what precipitated this concept. The reason the motion is more generalized is that this group could address other opportunities, as well. Is that correct, Phil?
- ❖ Gussman: While #1a has a particular technical component, we have also encountered many other options that might fall outside of things we have discussed. I think, for example, on the Local Ops side, that Project Team might want that technical level of participation. I'd like a group that would not be too limited in its topics.
- ❖ Ballard: I'm fine with that. I'd like to ask that initially the focus should be on #1a. I have a personal issue with 1a.

- ❖ Gussman: I accept that as an Amendment to the motion, that the initial focus is on 1a.
- ❖ Loflin: I second.
- ❖ Pollack: What does this amendment accomplish?
- ❖ Gagnon: The amendment clarifies that the initial focus is definitely on Recommendation #1a.
- ❖ Pollack: I express my support for this; what I am understanding is the technical group purpose is to create a group of technically savvy people who can help the committee to frame alternatives to have a better chance of being successful.
- ❖ Rutzell: All in favor say Yes. *All said Yes.* Opposed? *None.* The motion passes.
- ❖ Gagnon: I will talk with Natalie and Phil about next steps. Thank you all.

### **Request/Address Additional Business - Unfinished Business**

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 32 includes the motions from the prior meeting. These have all been addressed in various forms. Dan sent out a tremendous amount of information. There were a couple of requests made for the ACR to review the Part 150, which we discussed today, and then we did get information from CLT as to future plans.
  - Page 33. No new updates.

### **Request/Address Additional Business - New Business: Discuss ACR Membership Composition**

- ❖ Rutzell: There has been a proposal to add another seat for York County or change a seat to an at-large seat.
- ❖ Pollack: (*Sharing his screen*) This is a map – I put this together probably in 2021, and it represents people on the ACR at that time. York County has 2 slots. There is one that I am sitting in, and one is York Central. This is a slot that is vacant, and I can understand why because there is not a lot of traffic. But York County as you can see just south of the runway is just me. There is considerable amount of traffic and noise now for folks in York County, south of the airport. The representation in York is not adequate. I have had a running dialogue with Dan and Ed to expand the representation down here. Suggestion is to add another slot or convert it to an at-large slot to get a second voice south of the airport - experience of people down here that have a considerable amount of traffic. Modify the eligibility for a slot down here.
- ❖ Wright: If you want to make a motion to change the slot to York County at large, I will second that.
- ❖ Pollack: Motion: *To change the eligibility of the York Central position so it is a York County At-large position.*
- ❖ Wright: I second the motion.
- ❖ Rutzell: Any discussion?
- ❖ Hair: Adding additional representation to the ACR seems appropriate; it's not a concern. We have changed the membership before, added positions. We don't have any concerns or questions.
- ❖ Rutzell: Any other discussion? *None.*
  - *All Yes.* Motion passes.
- ❖ Gagnon: Any other new business? *None.*

### **Adjourn**

- ❖ Loflin motioned to adjourn. Wright seconded, all in favor.
- ❖ Meeting adjourned at 8:08 pm