

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: July 13, 2022

Attendees

Kurt Wiesenberger, Charlotte	Anthony Lyman, FAA
Phillip Gussman, City 1	Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA
Nakia Savage, City 3	Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Doug Pray, County 1	Dan Gardon, CLT
Natalie Rutzell, Chair, County 2	Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Sherry Washington, County 4	Jack Christine, CLT
Mark Loflin, County 6	Ted Kaplan, CLT
Sayle Brown, Cornelius	Amber Leathers, CLT
Matt Hamilton, Davidson	Mike Pilarski, CLT
Sam Stowe, Gaston	Chris Poore, CLT
Preston Hagman, Huntersville	Melissa Treadaway, CLT
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg	Sarah Easter, CLT
Charles Soussou, Pineville	Lee Davis, CLT
Jacob Pollack, York	Rob Adams, Landrum and Brown
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)	Sarah Potter, Landrum and Brown
Pearlis Johnson, FAA	Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Reginald Davis, FAA	Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Charles Gibson, FAA	Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Summary Minutes

❖ Open the Meeting

- Meeting started at 6:10 PM
- Rutzell: Welcome to the July meeting of the Airport Community Roundtable. It was established approximately 5 years ago. The ACR's Mission Statement says that we will provide the City of Charlotte Aviation Department (Airport) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) with broad-based community input into airport-related noise impacts and to find, where possible, practical solutions and Recommendations for the FAA to consider when determining aircraft operating procedures at Charlotte Douglas International Airport.
 - To-date we have submitted a Slate of noise solution proposals, and we continue to follow them through the FAA's review, and hopefully we will see implementation in the future. Today's meeting will cover a learning session of Part 150, which we will hear more about and the FAA's guidelines for noise abatement or noise capability planning. We have a lot to cover, so we kindly ask that each of us is mindful of the time.
 - Do we have any elected officials? *None today.*
- Gagnon: We have a couple of new members. We will ask them to introduce themselves.
- Hamilton: Represent Davidson. Am taking over for Bob Cameron who served since the beginning of the ACR. Looking forward to learning and meeting all.
- Hagman: Represent Huntersville. I am a retired pilot. Live in the area and fly in the area now. Looking forward to being a part of the meetings.
- Gagnon: *Went through introductions. ACR members, CLT, FAA, AA, HMMH, and CSS.*
- Gagnon: Sharing my screen. *Went over meeting logistics.* Remote participants - please stay on mute. Please use the "raise the hand" function. Kevin is monitoring that function. For people in the room, use the microphone. In terms of handout, it was emailed to you before meeting. If you cannot see the screen hopefully you can follow along based on review of that handout.

- Ground rules: Healthy conversations, productive, and effective meetings. Have brief points - try to stay on task. Effective in making positive noise improvement in our area.
- Gussman: Approve May meeting Minutes: *Loflin moved to approve, Wright seconded. All in favor. The Minutes are approved.*
- ❖ **Update on Moving Forward – Monitor, Engage, and Improve**
 - **Monitor: Update on Status of Recommendations**
 - Gagnon: Item #3 on Agenda has 3 components. The first is requesting a status update on the Recommendation reviews by the FAA, and then we will get into the meat of the meeting, with the Part 150 overview; then we'll also get some CLT updates. I will hand it off to Pearlis and the FAA.
 - Johnson: Good evening. With me tonight I have Reginald Davis who is going to give us an update on the Recommendation that this advisory committee sent to us to understand and review. We have started working on that process.
 - Davis: I am currently the acting senior analyst for the Operations Support Group in the Eastern service center, and previously I was the Community Engagement Officer in the New England/DC and Southern regions. I am here to brief you on the 7100.41 process, which is the FAA Performance Based Navigation (PBN) Implementation Process. The 7100.41 process is basically divided into 5 Phases. I will not go over each sub-bullet, but I will give you an idea of where we are currently.
 - Slide 2: Phase 1 is the preliminary activities. The airport's request from Dan Gardon was received the end of May, and we reviewed on June 14. We are currently in the Initial Review Stage. I will go over the preliminary activities, the design activities and things like that. Next Phase is Initial Decision, which is the feasibility of the request. Some of this we have done in the past when we look at these Recommendations. We can fast forward this Phase, but we will follow the process. After the initial review, into the feasibility, we already did the baseline analysis - I think Andreesse Davis had already worked on that - so we already have that information. Then we go to a core working group, which is basically internal FAA members, to go over the intent of the request. After that we would go to Phase 2 – next slide.
 - Gagnon: Since we have some new members, can you tell us what specific Recommendation you are talking about?
 - Davis: We received a request to raise the altitude on the CHSLY STAR and other STARs that may be affected; I think it included EPAYE and CAATT waypoints, to raise them by 1000 feet.
 - Gussman: We are talking about Recommendation 3a - this is the FAA's additional solution of raising 7 waypoints going up by 1000 feet.
 - Davis: We did not put any timelines or timeframes on this presentation. Many different factors may affect the timeline. Phase 2: We have established a full working group which consists of all of our stakeholders – Air Traffic, Airport Authority, Flight Standards, Airline Industry, etc. Numerous members on the meeting. Sometimes we invite 3rd party, such as HMMH - they have attended our meetings - to go over the design of the procedures that the roundtable has requested. Once we review and design or update the procedures, we would then finalize. This is an important stage as this is where we pause and meet with the Southern Regional office, with the airport, and discuss what our solution is to the Recommendation 3a.
 - Wright: Since the PowerPoint is so small, can you go over the flow, and will we receive this document?
 - Davis: I will e-mail this to Dan. It is also available on the website, via a link.
 - Wright: Hard to see.
 - Wiesenberger: Can you read what the boxes say? That would be helpful.
 - Davis: Slide 3 of this presentation/PowerPoint – Establish FWG – Full working group – Once we establish that group which consists of all of our stakeholders, then we would go to the design Phase. If all parties concur, we would then go to the finalization of everything.
 - Pause in the finalize Phase. If all agree this is a win-win, we would contact the regional office and brief them. We will probably pull in HMMH and schedule a meeting to say “These are our findings, pencils down.” That is when the airport will go to ACR and present our findings/our final design – noting this is what we can do. You go through your processes, take a vote. Once you all vote and agree, then the airport will send correspondence to the Regional Administrator telling us to move forward. We don't redo the procedures if you don't agree. We would then probably look at it one more time, but we don't encourage to go back and forth to try to find other ways.

- Once pencils are down, that is usually the best we can do. Once you send correspondence to the Regional Administrator, we then distribute the package to Oklahoma City, who then commences with their design procedure for publication. Then we get to Phase 3.
 - Phase 3 – Package to Oklahoma City. They will start designing, they will do their flight checks, things like that. That is when we would get a publication date. Then the Regional Administrator’s office will tell the airport to tell you all the date. All of this is running concurrently. We will keep you all in this process. We meet every month. This project is pretty important.
 - Phase 4 is the operational preparations, air traffic - doing their training.
 - Phase 5 is post-implementation Phase. This is monitoring the procedure, once it is published, we are monitoring – does the community like it, does ATC like it, do the airlines like it, etc. Once we complete the project, hopefully everyone is happy, and we are good to go.
 - Expectations: No specific timelines on each Phase. Many different factors. There are roughly 40-50 people on these meetings and getting everyone’s schedules together. These meetings are long - sometimes 8-12 hours. Other factors are safety, other projects that have priority, and our charting cycles. The average timeline for this type of work is 3-5 years.
- Wiesenberger: I understand all the checks and balances, but this Recommendation originated at the ACR requesting one waypoint to be raised 1000 feet. You came back with raising 7 waypoints to which we agreed. You do not need to get our approval any further. We realize you need to do your analysis, but let it be known that we are very much in favor of any altitude elevation that you guys can muster for the community.
 - Davis: We do have a process. We do this for all roundtables.
 - Pollack: You mentioned that you have to talk to a lot of stakeholders. If you have one who doesn’t like a particular Recommendation, does that mean the Recommendation is no good, or is there a process to determine benefits or whose interests take priority?
 - Davis: We have already conducted a BAR - Baseline Analysis Report – where we talk to the major carriers. They are aware of this Recommendation, but we will cover our bases by doing our core working group and making sure that they are still good with that altitude raise.
 - Gussman: On Phase 5, you pointed out that after initial implementation, you look at it, you track the system, is everyone still happy and safe; is there a threshold where you could pull the Recommendation and rescind that change? And what would that look like?
 - Davis: During post-implementation, sometimes we do have changes. Example: DCA, we did something that the community had wanted but they were not happy; we would then look at it again and see where it went wrong. We would not pull it back for one person. If the whole group is happy, that is good.
 - Wright: Regarding the 3-5 years timetable - we have been working on this, and the airport environment will have changed in 3-5 years; after working this hard, and I know it is a process, but there is a recognition that in 3-5 years Charlotte is a growing airport and may have 6 runways. Will it be relevant?
 - Gussman: *Adding to Wright’s question* - If this is going through the process and let’s say a runway is put in, does this process stay with the standard of what you try and create the next process after this one? Does this change precedents?
 - Davis: We always consider the safety of the NAS – National Airspace System – and efficiency. We are working hard on this. We meet at least once a month. We are working hard on a solution.
 - Johnson: I did want to add. We were given 6 Recommendations. The first 3 were arrivals, and the departures will be with Part 150.
 - Wiesenberger: Question for Pearlis or Mr. Davis - You said you are working with a number of roundtables around the country. How many Recommendations are you considering from all these roundtables?
 - Davis: I can only speak for Southern/Eastern and New England regions. We do get Recommendations from them, particularly in Boston and DCA. We have Recommendations from them and Baltimore, as well. The average that some submit, similar to you all, around 6-8. Most of them go caput because of safety. We are also doing stuff for NAS as well.
 - Johnson: We can have as many as several thousand in the pipeline across the nation being considered.
 - Rutzell: Will the departures go through the same process just described or under a different process?
 - Davis: The Part 150 is different with procedural review. We are in collaboration with the airport, and we keep eyes on it. We are in constant communication, and if it does affect the RNAV of departures, we will be involved, and it will follow that process.
 - Rutzell: It could fall under both, go through the Part 150 and then be diverted into this process?

- Davis: Yes, it possibly could. I don't want to speak for the airport.
- Montross: I sit on the DCA roundtable, and they have 24 open Recommendations. They are not making a lot of progress. The fact that you have 6 means that you are being effective and strategic in what your priorities are; it is all available on their website; it's all over the place. I want to compliment you on finding 6 that this whole group can agree on, because otherwise it can get unwieldy.
- Davis: That is true.

➤ **CLT Updates – Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Overview**

- Adams: I am with Landrum and Brown, and we were selected by the airport to prepare the Part 150 study update. We officially kicked off in May. I know that this group has been working for several years and that you have been pointed toward this 150 study. We understand that there is the desire to have answers. We are right at the very beginning of this study, so tonight I will probably not have answers for you all. This is an introduction to Part 150 – the process and what the program is so that as we go through this process, everybody is level-set. I know that you have some new members that were introduced, so that is perfect that they are here to get into what a Part 150 is and it is not, and what the expectations may be. Agenda: This is a high-level introduction into the Part 150 study. Your Recommendations are listed here. They will be put in the process. I will talk about how we evaluate alternatives within a Part 150. There are some unique aspects to this particular study that I think will be good for everybody to recognize. We will finish on what the schedule is in terms of our work.
 - Key Terms: FAA is responsible for administering the Part 150 program. They have prepared guidelines that we and the airport will use to guide the study. They serve as technical experts - air traffic controllers are stakeholders along with the airport's district office, which handles the grant and the approval process. Ultimately, they will review and approve the Recommendations that come out of the study. They will be submitted to the FAA; FAA has a very rigorous process for approval of Part 150 measures. In some cases, the FAA is the implementing body, so we just saw the process for making flight path changes, so that is the FAA implementing a recommendation.
 - To a previous question, I would expect that if there are Recommendations that come out of this study that change flight procedures, they will go through that 5 Phase process. They might start earlier than the end of the Part 150, or it may have to wait for approval. Pretty much everywhere we've seen flight procedure changes come out of Recommendations, they have gone through that process. FAA provides funding for these studies as well as implementation of approved Recommendations.
 - DNL – Day-Night Average Sound level. This is a way of describing average noise from aircraft around an airport. It puts extra emphasis on aircraft that operate at nighttime from 10p-7a. From a policy standpoint, the FAA has established 65 dB DNL as where residential land uses are considered incompatible. That becomes really important because in these Part 150 studies we have to demonstrate that any of the Recommendations that you are putting forth will reduce noise within 65 DNL over the noise sensitive land uses. That will guide how we evaluate measures.
 - The airport just received environmental approval for 4th North/South runway - expected to be opened and commissioned by 2027. We will include that in our future analysis of conditions for this study.
 - Part 150s are planning studies - similar process to a master plan. First step is to identify where there are problems, issues, concerns. We will identify where there is noise and land use incompatibility according to FAA guidance. The FAA has a land use compatibility table that looks at every type of land use imaginable, and it has where on the DNL scale these land uses become incompatible. Once we have that, that identifies where we have work to do - where we need to develop solutions. The FAA has specific process for that. Once there are Recommendations, the City Council will vote to endorse those measures. Then they go to FAA for review and approval. These are the steps.
 - Part 150s can open funding sources. Once a measure is approved for Part 150, it may be eligible for grants to help implement. All airports across the country are vying for money to implement these types of measures. Congress has put aside money in the funding for FAA for these things.
 - What a Part 150 does not do? It does not recommend closing an airport or recommend implementing mandatory restrictions. It does not give environmental approval for implementing measures. They do not get you out of doing NEPA or any other environmental stuff.
 - Key elements of a Part 150 study: First is Noise Exposure Maps (NEMs). These are official maps for the airport. They describe noise levels for existing conditions and future case. We will look at the last 12 months of activity - we are gathering that information right now. For future conditions, we will be looking at 2028 as our year to project out to; will take into account any physical and operational changes that will occur including the new runway and other operational changes. We

work with airline partners. How is the fleet going to change, what about the schedule? The noise exposure maps show where there are land use incompatibilities.

- Noise Compatibility Program. This is where we are looking at alternatives; this is where those Recommendations are born. We look at three types: (1) Noise Abatement. Dealing with the noise at its source. Where do they fly, where do they make turns, what runways do they use, do they use certain runways during the day and use them differently at night? (2) Once we hear that, we then look at land uses. Are there ways we can prevent new incompatible land uses from being developed within the 65 DNL via zoning, building codes, comprehensive planning? We call these preventive measures. (3) We also look at remedial measures. We have done everything we can do, but we still have homes inside the 65 DNL. Then we try to offer sound insulation to those; we do offer buyouts.
- Wiesenberger: My question is about the Part 150 analysis study. My question has 2 parts. Will anything be studied about other environmental pollutants, other than noise be looked at?
- Adams: Part 150 is laser focused on noise.
- Wiesenberger: Second question. Many of us are outside of 65 DNL area, and noise affects our lives. I am curious if part of your study might be to consider what the World Health Organization considers to be a problem, which I think is 60 DNL. Would you consider defining that for future considerations?
- Adams: Specifically, when we start talking about noise standards from outside of the US, the FAA has been very clear that they do not consider those. FAA policy is very US based. To your broader question outside of 65 DNL, we have 2 things that I would say. The Part 150 study is not limited in terms of analyzing outside of 65 DNL, but there are limitations on what we recommend and how we justify them and how the FAA will approve or disapprove. So, it is one thing to be able to say we are expressing what is happening outside of 65 DNL, there are more homes that are receiving noise, and I know that you have done a lot of work with single event metrics - those are things that we have commonly included in our analysis, but we cannot use it as a justification to say we recommend this measure. FAA will always revert back to 65 DNL. These types of bodies that exist are in large part a reaction and reflection of that limitation of Part 150. That is usually when these bodies get created is when Part 150 has not been able to answer some of the community's questions.
- Wiesenberger: We have recognized as a group that 65 is not a definition line for a problem and not a problem under 65. It is a continuum. A lot of us are affected below that level.
- Loflin: Land use mitigation. We are going through UDO changes and place type mapping. How do you interact with the planning department?
- Adams: We invite the local land use planners to participate. We work with them on recommendations that we think make sense. They have cycles of when they update things. I understand we may not be able to influence this round of land use planning, but it does not mean they cannot hold them for next time they go through a process.
- Pollack: I'm still unsure. What triggers the Part 150 study? Can it be triggered by things other than runway? Can it be triggered by changes in operations at the airport beyond a planned runway?
- Adams: The Part 150 program is a voluntary program. All airports can participate. There is no trigger. The airport is choosing to participate. Part of it is related to the new runway. The airport is trying to be proactive - How do we get ready for the new runway, and what potential impacts might there be? Once airports do participate in the Part 150, the FAA strongly encourages them to continue to update those noise exposure maps and their noise compatibility profiles when appropriate.
 - The airport first had a Part 150 in 1987. Since then, they have had several updates of different portions of the program. They have not done a full Part 150, but they have updated many measures. They have updated the noise exposure maps on a regular basis.
- Gussman: So, Jacob, we decided it was just time to do another Part 150 - get our Recommendations addressed through the Part 150.
- Montross: There is an insinuation that operation levels can change rather quickly. It takes a long time to build runways and gates also. The idea that we can increase our operations significantly overnight or in a year is not likely possible. We do have a plan for how we can increase operations when we get new gates or a new airfield. That is why we participate in the process - to make sure that the study has all of that forecasting data for how we plan to operate this airport in the next 5-10 years. We are ready to provide that data and give that forecast, but we are limited by the infrastructure here in terms of how much we can provide today. Now the fleet mix can change, and that is a long process, too.
- Pollack: I am more interested in gradual changes from year-to-year, but over time it's very significant.
- Wright: This may be an ACR question - On page 2, it says that the City Council will vote to endorse recommended measures, but we really don't have dedicated City Council representation on the ACR.

- Gussman: I have thoughts on how we can be involved in that process; we can discuss at a later time.
- Adams: Slide 6. We plan to look at all of these measures in two timeframes. One before the runway opens, and then after it opens. You've already heard that changing flight procedures takes years. We might not be changing flight procedures, but there are things that can occur during Part 150. Land use mitigation - those things we might be able to look at and see if there are things we can do before and after the runway opens.
 - Part 150 - By its nature and by law, it is a very public involvement intense process – a lot of ways the public and stakeholders can participate. Technical Advisory Committee – This is a group of stakeholders affected by or having oversight responsibilities for issues covered by Part 150 Study Update. It is made up of Airport officials, Aircraft operators and airlines, land use planners, ACR representation, and Air Traffic Controllers. Having that group that has very specific type of relationship to this issue is very valuable as we go through the process.
 - The general public will be able to participate. Public Workshops – We will have several of these. Once we have draft recommendations, we will hold public workshops as well as public hearings for people to be able to make formal, on the record, comments. We will have a public project website. All materials will be loaded. There will be notices of meetings, and folks will be able to sign up for notices. We will have social media. We do intend to have hybrid meetings, as well.
 - Slide 9 – Here are your ACR Departure Recommendations. Not tonight, but at some point, I will come back to make sure that I understand all details. I think they are pretty self-evident, but I do not want to miss anything. We are aware of these, and they are included in the evaluation process. You may have other Recommendations that come up. Please submit those through your representative at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).
 - How do we evaluate alternatives and particularly noise abatement alternatives in the Part 150 process? Slide 10 is a flow/decision chart. Once we have a suggestion or alternative, the first question is - Is it safe? Is it feasible? In the aviation industry, safety is #1 priority. If it is not safe, it immediately drops down to elimination. Next question: Does it reduce impacts in 65 DNL. If the answer is yes, it moves on in the process. If the answers are no, it typically drops down to elimination. I know that several of the Recommendations have benefits outside the 65 DNL limits. We don't know yet what the impacts are. This is an area that we are going to have to make sure we are understanding. The FAA process says 65 DNL. Then we move to Operation Impacts - It might be great from a noise perspective, but the delays at the airport would go through the roof. We cannot do that. There has to be a balance to keep it going in the process. If we find pretty notable negative operational impacts, then it would drop out of the evaluation. Then we look at Implementation Considerations. Who has to implement this, how much does it cost, what are the steps? Assuming the answer is yes, it then moves to a Recommendation. That process takes 5-8 months. We will engage the TAC pretty closely during this.
 - Slide 11: Unique aspects of CLT Part 150. Not every Part 150 includes a new runway, which is a major change in the airfield. We will incorporate airfield and airspace simulation – called AirTOP – so we can get really detailed operational evaluation. Slide 12: FAA Neighborhood Environmental Survey (NES) – The FAA conducted research on annoyance response. They published the results; there were no Recommendations for policy change. You asked the question - Will FAA consider a lower threshold based off of the NES. I asked the FAA that specific question, and they said “no” - there is no policy change. They will continue to use their land use compatibility guideline of 65 DNL for this study. I do anticipate questions like these from the public, etc.
 - Last slide: Schedule. Kicked off in May 2022; the public website will be live this summer. The first public workshops will occur in the Fall. The technical work is already beginning and will go through the beginning of next year when we release the findings. Then public hearings. We anticipate final Recommendations Fall 2023. FAA has a very rigorous approval process - it usually takes 180 days to go through all the Recommendations and make an approval or disapproval. We are targeting Spring 2024 for them to make their decisions. That is the schedule - we have not done any of the work.
- Gussman: Thank you, Rob. I got a mixed signal. Yes, you gave a clear and definitive answer on what we do with 65 DNL and how it impacts the Part 150; yet earlier you had kind of stated that impacts under 65 DNL might have some consideration at other points while doing this study. Is that correct?
- Adams: I want to be clear. What I was trying to say was - from an analytical standpoint - we can report on noise levels below 65 DNL. What we cannot do is say - because of that - we are now recommending a measure that the FAA should approve. 65 DNL is what we are required to report and what they will use for their approval/disapproval process.

- Gussman: So, we might take into research and analysis some measures that are under 65 DNL, but not in the interest of driving the Recommendation. It would be formative in the discussion/debate?
- Adams: Yes. We can report noise levels under 65.
- Gussman: And if policy changes, it might be helpful to us in 5-10 years?
- Hagman: In the 150 study, does this take into account some of the other outer airports that share the STARS, etc. with Charlotte, or just Charlotte, although other airports such as Concord contribute to the noise with Allegiant Air?
- Adams: When we are looking at changes to procedures, we are looking at airspace, not airports, and that takes into account other airports. The answer is yes, where appropriate. We will work with Air Traffic Control tower. They are the experts with that. That is how we would evaluate. We are not limited in terms of geographic area. We go to wherever the alternative procedure takes us.
- Rutzell: This has been very helpful. We heard from the FAA that there are 3 departure Recommendations that they expect to be incorporated in the Part 150. Are you aware of this? Obviously, they will not meet the thresholds that you have said. I believe the analysis was on the population outside the 65 DNL.
- Adams: I am aware of the Recommendations, and I put them on the slide to acknowledge that we are aware. We will consider them as part of the Part 150 study.
- Rutzell: My impression was that our Recommendations would be considered all the way through the Part 150.
- Adams: (*Showing the process slide*) This is the process, and, yes, they will be put through the process - just like every other Recommendation that we might get. There is no predetermining of the outcome of the evaluation process. We will take all Recommendations and run them through this process. Some will make it; some will not. I have read the Recommendations, but I have not looked at any of Gene's analysis. Will do our own evaluation to understand if they can make it through the process or not.
- Wiesenberger: Maybe a point of clarification. Those 3 departures Recommendations would have a significant impact on areas outside of 65 DNL. They are 2 and 4-mile distances where we want more dispersment of departures. So, your second process step says "Does it reduce impacts on 65 DNL?" No, it probably would not have much. Would you just dismiss it at that stage?
- Adams: I do not know the answer to that.
- Wiesenberger: Do you see the conundrum that we have?
- Adams: Yes, and I share your concern as I know that you have worked on these, but again, the FAA's process of approving or disapproving will go right back to that question. It doesn't have to be a large decrease in 65 DNL. Even a small decrease in 65 DNL checks that box for them. I think we have to do the evaluation to be able to answer your question. I understand the anxiety you would have on this.
- Wiesenberger: One of the concerns the ACR has had over the last year or so is that the Part 150 Study is going to do this and that, and 3 of our Recommendations are dependent upon it. We would like to be involved as members to a greater extent than just hearing bi-monthly reports or looking at the website. Do you have thoughts on how members can volunteer and participate in your discussions?
- Adams: The Technical Advisory Committee can have one or two representatives. We can have special presentations periodically where I can come back and do some workshops. I want to do the one initially so that I understand fully your Recommendations. There are other public workshops where others can come and participate. Primarily it will be through your representatives on TAC.
- Pray: The 65 DNL standard is a logarithmic formula. It doesn't take into account single event peaks and things like that. On the FAA site, it talks about 100 events per day at 94.4 dBs would be equivalent to 65 DNL. Is there a way that we can get these contours to know what the measurement was; for example, is it 1000 events per day of 80 dB = to 65?
- Adams: So, kind of. Our model is pretty sophisticated and has a lot of reporting capabilities. There are grid point analyses where we can lay out specific receptors all over and have it report out what were the primary contributors to the noise at that point. If it is helpful, I can do that.
- Pray: I think it makes it more real. I live under a flight path, and we might have 1000 in a day then get a gap. It would be good to see those peak event levels and what they are.
- Gussman: As a reminder to the ACR, we still have Gene as a resource to use during this process.
- Adams: My firm and Gene's firm have worked together in the past in these situations. I don't anticipate any problems.
- Brown: Gene and HMMH have been a golden source of information. This is just out of curiosity...after all the work has been done, can you give me a % as to how much the FAA takes your results into consideration when forming their decision in making flight procedures?

- Adams: They rely on us to provide all the technical analysis and do all the coordination with ATCs/airlines. We have to document all of that in the study to demonstrate that it is safe and feasible, etc. They are experts in the airspace, so we rely on them to provide information back. We rely on the airlines. We collect all of that and put it in a way that they can understand and can review and make their decision. The process will come out with Recommendations. We work for the airport, and they will be the ones who say, we want to recommend these measures.
 - Brown: Do you work in concert with the FAA to come up with the Recommendations?
 - Adams: We will coordinate with the FAA. We will make sure that they are on board. We don't want to surprise the FAA. They will see the Recommendation in draft form so they will be able to comment on and give us any concerns. The last thing we want to do is go through all this work and submit something and they say – You didn't do this? We coordinate with them.
 - Wright: Two questions. The acronym ATCT - what is that, and when would the Technical Advisory Committee be formed? And I am assuming everyone is volunteers?
 - Adams: Yes, ATCT is Air Traffic Control Tower. We intend the first TAC meeting would happen in the Fall sometime around the same time as the first public workshop. So, the group will be defined leading up to that. We have already started gathering names of organizations. It will probably be in the next month when we will start sending out invitations.
 - Montross: To what extent does precedent have an impact on the FAA's consideration to changes to procedure?
 - Adams: If you are talking about precedent in terms of the way that we have always operated the airport, I may not be the right one to answer - we might ask Air Traffic. But when you go through a Part 150, they are required to evaluate on its merits. Through that process is where we might get pushback. We want them to change procedure or turn at this point, and they may say, well we have never turned there. Then we ask the question – why can't you turn there? We have an advantage in some way as we have to document all the reasons why this will not work. Part 150 requires us to document non-approved measures equally as approved ones. Human nature is to cling to what we have always done, but our job is to push that question.
 - Rutzell: My question probably dovetails into Tracy's question. As you know there is a current Part 150 and under that there is a restriction to not turn until 2-miles out on departures. I would love to gain insight on how that was implemented. My question aligns with Tracy's question – just because it's in there, does that mean it stays?
 - Adams: We are doing a full Part 150 update. We will do evaluation on all existing procedures, too. We don't try to understand history so much, but we do ask “Does this still make sense? Is this still the best type of procedure for the situation?”
 - Gussman: Thank you, Rob.
 - Gagnon: Thanks to ACR members for great questions. We will now get into CLT operations.
- **CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations**
- Hair: No update on operations and initiatives. Most of the recent information has been shared with you either in past meetings and now with Rob and his update.
 - Gardon: Page 6 in handout. This Key Measures report format is about a year old - format is very much a work in progress, so if there is other information that you want to see, let me know. Key takeaways – You can see we are above our year-to-date (YTD) daily average in 2020. We are actually a little bit lower than we were this time in 2021. Another key thing to look at is percentage of flights in North Flow. This is probably the lowest it has been in four years' time. We are very close to a 50/50 split in North vs South Flow in operations, which is what we like to see. You can look at the runway data on your own.
 - Pollack: With the 50/50 split, has the airport had more late than typical, more ramp congestion than typical, or is it pretty much the same either way?
 - Gardon: That we are not sure of. For background, Jacob and I have been working on some correlated data between traffic flow and airport delay. That has been inconclusive so far. The only other thing to draw your attention to is complaint stats - last 2 rows. Complaints are at a 4-year high and complainants at a 4-year low. These numbers are not necessarily a good or bad thing. These are simply data points. Next pages are very familiar to the ACR. Take a look and see if anything jumps out. Looking at January 2022, we had a much stronger month for complaints than in the past. I'm not sure what would have led to that. Everything else is pretty similar to what we are used to seeing. A very small number of residents are responsible for the vast majority of complaints. The zip code analysis is relatively new, looking at

complainants by zip code. If you are familiar with the area and know zip codes, you can see where these complaints come from. It is a point of interest and more context for our complaints.

- Wiesenberger: In speaking to my neighbors (28216), they tell me that they cannot log on to file a complaint before they have another plane overhead. The process for listing a complaint is tiring. So, they give up. Have heard that 25 times from neighbors. I don't think these complaints stats are valid. Other option is using a device, which a number of people in some neighborhoods have, which is a 3rd party app. Those citizens that don't have that device cannot make a complaint in a reasonable timeframe. It is frustrating. While these statistics are thorough and well-coordinated, what are we actually measuring?
- Gardon: So, when we are looking at these measures on page 6, of course 64K jumps out at you. We are all aware that is not the important number. The number that is important is the complainant number. So, if anyone makes a complaint, that is counted in that complainant number.
 - Yes, complaint fatigue is valid. Your argument that this data is invalid is a valid argument. I am not sure there is a better way if people do not submit a complaint. If they don't do it somehow, somehow, there is not a way to report on it.
- Rutzell: What jumps out at me with those numbers is that the people that are complaining are screaming *Help*. Look at how the number of complaints increased, and the number of complainants decreased. I think there is a story being told here. Those who are really impacted are trying to communicate with us.
- Gagnon: I know you had been working on the complaint process, Dan. Is there any update?
- Gardon: Earlier in the year, request was made to make our complaint process more user-friendly. That is still a work in progress. Our developer is gung ho here at the airport. We are very supportive of it. To my understanding there are some technical issues. It is underway, and hopefully it will be rolled out soon.
- Wright: I am not sure where zip code 28278 is, but 28214 is where I live, and it is 3 miles from the airport. Naturally we get noise. Just a comment. It is the reality.
- Montross: In the Part 150, one of the abatement and mitigation strategies is updating the website, funding for noise monitors, better software and tools for measurement. That is another positive from the Part 150 – Federal funding to help some of those gaps.

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

- Rutzell: We have 3 Project Teams – Government Engagement, Community Engagement and Local Operations. We are looking for someone to lead the Government Engagement Team following Bob Cameron's departure. If you are interested, please reach out. Since our last meeting, all three Teams came together to talk about our initiatives. We have some creative ideas, such as putting together a marketing video to capture our concerns and work, reaching out and partnering with other Charlotte groups, and we would like to continue to reach out to our Charlotte officials to create awareness and get them involved in our cause. We are thinking of a form letter where each of us can contact our representatives. We have some great ideas, but we need help in executing them. We are a community of 20 members, and I would like for everyone to find time to get involved. Think about which Team you would like to join, and we welcome you to start participating.

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

➤ **Unfinished Business - Note written updates on Motions/Requests for Support**

- Gagnon: Page 9: These are the main requests that came out of the May meeting. We create one of these after every meeting. We received the Part 150 overview today. This is a reminder that if the ACR had any additional ideas on Recommendation #1, the FAA would be open to reviewing those.
 - Page 10: No new written updates. These have been on here for a while.

➤ **New Business – Noise Modeling and NADP-1 v. NADP-2**

- Wiesenberger: We discussed on one of the calls about written updates could include or describe the percentage of flights that are operating under NADP-1 or NADP-2 procedures and what happens when they do not. I'd like to get an update on that.
 - A lot of us are not comfortable with noise modeling, determining decibel levels. It is a very computer-based system. People wonder what the decibel level is right now. We know that there are devices and phone applications that can do that. Are there some resources that the airport and FAA would recognize as legitimate data so we can understand what the noise climate is for our lives?
- Loflin: Regarding the video that we were going to put together, we were trying to figure out how we can go "live" from somewhere and really make an impact to show what the decibel level is right now. We want something accurate. We were wondering if CLT could help us with that.

- Gagnon: Would it be more beneficial to get that advice now, or are you seeking, for example, if CLT and maybe HMMH can come back and say here are some things that ACR members can consider? *Yes – come back with recommendations.*
- Hair: We are glad to help you consider that. I don't have anything off the top of my head.
- Montross: What is your NADP question?
- Wiesenberger: This goes back 2 years or so when we were discussing procedures that aircraft could implement. We had a NADP-1 and 2 procedure. At some point, I think Dan and others said they would begin monitoring how frequently those procedures are used – and why they were used or why not.
- Montross: American uses NADP-2 regularly.
- Hair: I don't know how we are going to track that. I need to take that under consideration because I do not know an answer.
- Montross: Just for reference, the DCA roundtable has requested that we switch from NADP-2 to NADP-1. American is going to comply - evidence that we do listen and want to be good partners. Other carriers are still evaluating its impact on DC airspace, which is very complex. They have decided on NADP-1 because they are willing to increase noise closer to the airport rather than far away.
- Brown: Tracy, you might want to describe NADP-1 and 2 for our newer members.
- Montross: We have some content, graphs, we've used in the past.
- Brown: Basically, it is a high-power setting to get higher quicker closer to the airport. You leave the power up longer to get a higher altitude v. reducing your power setting closer to the airport to having a slower climb rate. That's it in a nutshell.
- Reindel: The difference is between NADP-1 and 2 is how aggressively and when you do the power cutback. The power cutback gives you reduction in noise. NADP-1 is intended to have that reduction closer to the airport. NADP-2 has power cutback further from the airport. With power cutback you stop climbing at a climb rate that is typical for departures, and you delay that until they reapply power. Where you reapply power you get a noise increase because you are lower and you need to apply power again.
- Gagnon: One historical point, NADP-2 was one of the original 8 Slate items that got reduced to the 6 submitted. Instead of it being part of the Slate, it was sent to the airlines as a voluntary request.
- Reindel: NADP-2 is actually kind of a win-win because you get less noise close to the airport, and it is also a fuel savings for the airlines - which is why they prefer NADP-2 over NADP-1 because NADP-1 is actually an increase in fuel consumption over a standard departure.
- Montross: We have Montgomery County in Maryland fighting with Palisades DC over who would get the benefit. More people would benefit with NADP-1. You are just moving the noise.

➤ **New Business – Meeting Scheduling**

- Rutzell: In conversations with CLT, there was a recommendation to move our meetings to coincide with their internal meetings and the updates on Part 150. We thought that was reasonable.
- Gussman: This is the best way to proceed for now. We can send around a quick information survey inquiring where everyone is on this topic, unless we are ready to shift to quarterly meetings.
- Hair: The 2nd Wednesday of the month - October 12 and then January 11 - these would be our next 2 meeting times.
- Gussman: Because it aligns with the FAA and the Part 150, and for the last month we have heard that seems to be the frequency. I know that there are other things to work on, and that reinforces our request for the Project Teams to be more active and for members to really be a part of the Project Teams.
- Rutzell: If we go to quarterly, we could have more active Project Team participation.
- Gussman: We could vote on it now; we still have a quorum in the room and online. We would still send out an e-mail.
- Wright: Would we still be meeting the same amount of time? 2 hours?
- Gussman: Yes.
- Loflin: Motion to go to quarterly meeting schedule, starting in October.
- Wright: Second. *All in favor except for 2 No's in the room.*
- Gussman: The vote carries. We will be moving our meetings to quarterly starting in October.
- Loflin: Question. Makeup of Technical Advisory Committee. How are we going to decide who is on it?
- Gussman: Natalie and I will make that call in August.
- Washington: He said in the Fall that people would receive invitations. What if they sign you for Project Teams, and they don't want to take on all that, as well?

- Gussman: The Project Teams are just us working together. The TAC is being put together, and invites are going to go out this summer.
- Washington: I'm thinking of an overlap.
- Gagnon: Are you concerned that the ACR's representatives on the TAC might be involved in the Project Teams, and it will take up a lot of time?
- Washington: Yes.
- Wiesenberger: They are going to select 2 representatives from the ACR. You could decline.
- Hair: Since you all have a nominated Chairperson and Vice Chair, it seemed most straightforward to invite those two as part of the technical advisory group. Of course, if Natalie or Phil cannot, then we would have someone else involved in it. We do want 2 folks from the ACR on that group.
- Gussman: I think that the October meeting does not conflict with when that starts.
- Brown: When is our next meeting?
- Hair: October 12, then January 11. Dan will send out meeting invitations for the next meetings so you can get them on your calendar.
- Wright: We can always change our meeting cycles. We were already concerned about engagement.
- Gagnon: The mix of engagement is going to change - a lot more small group work than in the past.
- Wiesenberger: This is why I said No to the motion. The group's level of engagement has waned since I joined 4 years ago, when we met monthly. There was a lot more discussion and more education. Going to quarterly frequency is going to decrease that unless the Project Teams increase their level, frequency, and participation of meetings. I would like to see leadership of the ACR help set a schedule and enable them to have conference calls, etc. Let's set a schedule that the Teams can rely upon.
- Gussman: Very good point.
- Loflin: I am now not comfortable with the quarterly meetings.
- Gussman: The Part 150 is going to have multiple opportunities for us to attend public events. We need to attend these en masse. There are a lot of meetings, and we need to go to those. The quarterly meetings will hopefully free up your time to do that.
- Loflin: Then I would like to ask if the Part 150 has relevant information, then maybe we can have an additional meeting.
- Gussman: Since we have the flexibility to reschedule our meetings going forward, that is a good point. If the FAA says they don't need to wait a whole quarter to say Yes on something. I think we, as a body, would be more than willing to get a meeting scheduled.
- Washington: We need an ACR calendar for all these meetings.
- Reindel: I have been involved in a number of these, and I can tell you that meeting monthly was essential. It got the problems on the table, and it got to solutions. My experience has been when you continue meeting monthly and not making monthly progress, that is when people stop attending the meetings. By going to less frequent meetings, people tend to come and get more engaged. I think you are at the point that bi-monthly or quarterly makes sense, and if it is aligning with the Part 150, you can always vote to change it, but it does make sense at this point to go to quarterly.

❖ **Adjourn**

- Wiesenberger motioned to adjourn. Savage seconded; all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 8:19 pm