

# Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

## Unapproved Summary Minutes: July 8, 2020

### Attendees

Sara Nomellini, Chair, County 2  
Kurt Wiesenberger, Vice Chair, Charlotte  
Phillip Gussman, City 1  
Darren Crosby, City 2  
Bobbi Almond, City 5  
Alan Sauber, City 7  
Sherry Washington, County 4  
John Garrett, County 5  
Mark Loflin, County 6  
Sayle Brown, Cornelius  
Bob Cameron, Davidson  
Bob Lemon, Huntersville  
Walter Ballard, Lincoln  
Ben Miley, Mint Hill  
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg  
Kevin Vesely, York

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)  
Reggie Davis, FAA  
Jose Colon, FAA  
Pearlis Johnson, FAA  
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)  
Dan Gardon, CLT  
Kevin Hennessey, CLT  
Haley Gentry, CLT  
Chris Poore, CLT  
Terrence Jones, CLT  
Tracy Montross, American Airlines  
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)  
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

## Summary Minutes

### ❖ Open the Meeting

- Meeting started at 6:00 PM - *Sara Nomellini called meeting to order.*
  - Gagnon: Going over the meeting approach. Keep muted unless talking. Chat ability - Try to not use a lot. Use “Raise the hand” function to be recognized to speak. State your name when talking. The meeting will be recorded. Any questions regarding WebEx? The entire handout will be shared on the screen. If you cannot see the screen, you have the complete handout that I emailed yesterday.
  - Review Ground Rules by Gagnon. Healthy conversation/discussion, be productive, and be effective – making positive outcomes related to the noise situation in the community.
- Approve Minutes: Loflin moved to approve. Almond seconded. Minutes approved.
- Review Meeting Packet Information by Gagnon. Majority of our time will be spent on reviewing the submittal package and voting on it.
  - Please focus on the numbers at the top of the Pages. Most of the packet is the submittal package. There are other documents that I will address after the vote, and that review will be done quickly.

### ❖ Review Submittal Package – Dan Gardon, Noise Abatement Specialist, CLT

- Gardon: Submittal Document - brief introduction: This document is the culmination of 3+ years of ACR work. You should be proud. First Page – an introduction, mentions the background of the ACR, how members were chosen, and the intended results of this document. The noise issues around CLT have been refined around 2 categories: Those concerning departure operations and those concerning arrival operations. And more specifically, increasing the dispersion of departures and decreasing the noise levels from aircraft arrivals. These are the main points that the group has focused on.

- A little more background - How the ACR was started in early 2017 and how HMMH and CSS were brought on. Total of 6 recommendations that were voted on in June meeting.
  - The ACR criteria is on Page 4 - another project the ACR took on pretty early. Sometimes the 65 DNL is not sufficient to talk about how residents feel about noise levels. Cited in this section is a study talking about sources of annoyance. This study found that continuous overflights are more of an annoyance than single loud events. We wanted to put this in the document just to get to the bottom intent of the ACR.
  - Another concern - the introduction to concentration of Arrival Overflights. I believe that everyone in the area expects to see overflights, so specifically this addresses extended periods of level flights which are louder than descending flights. This is because of thrusts needed to maintain level flight. Related to this is the first recommendation (p. 7) - Greater Use of Continuous Descent Approaches (CDA). Some technical enhancements expected to come to CLT area in calendar year 2021. As HMMH has found, implementing CDAs like this could potentially have a net benefit of noise reduction to over a quarter of a million residents in the Charlotte metropolitan area. The group felt it was important to include this on the Slate before those advancements arrived in the area.
  - Next – 6000’ arrival minimum altitude levels. To confirm that aircraft maintain higher altitude levels at level flight before joining the final approach. There were a few edits to this after the version sent initially to you, but Ed is displaying the current version.
  - 3rd arrival recommendation is to return CAATT Waypoint to pre-Metroplex location. This was forwarded to the FAA in the fall of 2018, and it now involves raising the altitude on the downwind leg specifically over the SouthPark region by 1000 feet. The FAA noted that this is something they are willing to adopt. The FAA requested that we add this in the Slate to make it more official. That is everything for arrivals.
- Ballard: Back on 6000’ arrival minimum altitude, in the second paragraph (p. 8) it talks about arrival legs of upwards of 20 miles, and my understanding is they go up to 30 miles, and where it says aircraft at 4800 feet, but I thought that was 3800 feet. I would like comments on that.
  - Gardon: The 20 miles - you are right; sometimes they go 32-miles is the most I’ve ever seen. The majority on a regular day is no more than 30 miles. They are definitely more than 20. We can change that to 30. 4800 feet is specifically mentioned in the arrival procedure. There are other arrival procedures, not necessarily on the downwind, that bring aircraft lower such as straight-in approaches, so sometimes they are lower. It confounds the issue by lumping those together at under 3800. Gene, do you want to elaborate?
  - Reindel: I think you said it right. We wanted to put some caveats in here. Those are not set in stone. Maybe we can make sure it is known that 20 miles is not the upper limit, and 4800 feet is not the lower limit.
  - Ballard: My suggestion is we go to 30 miles and 3800 feet.
  - Gardon: OK. What is the procedure here? Can we open up to the group for discussion?
  - Gagnon: The group can ask questions and make points. In terms of approving the document, the changes should be made as a part of the motion.
  - Ballard: Not only is this going to the FAA, but my assumption is that this will also be used to distribute to our community and government officials.
  - Vesely: Walter is correct, most of the flights that I see in the southern portion are well below 4000 feet. If the policy and the rules of the FAA are 4000, then we should at least say that, if not lower. I think we need to be factual on what we are presenting.
  - Cameron: Since we are focusing this for people other than just the FAA, I would suggest that when it comes to motion time that we consider saying – because in the sentences, it says “often,” not always. In my area it is almost always below 4000 feet and upwards of 30 miles. This is true and more easily understandable for folks that will see these documents, since 4800’ may seem like an odd number.

- Brown: If you look at the approach plates for the 18 runways and the 36 runways, the initial approach fixes are 18 miles south and 18 miles north of the airport. For example, runway 18L, CAVVY is the initial approach fix 18 miles from the airport. On a 3 degree glideslope, that is 6000 feet. For the 36's, it is basically the same. The 3 degree glideslope on the ILS is 6000 feet, and that is why Kevin and I mentioned 6000 feet. You keep them high until they can intercept the glideslope, and then let them come down the glideslope. But 6000 feet at 18 miles north or 18 miles south of the airport is where the 3 degree glideslope intercepts. I think if you let them go down to 4800 feet, they are going to start cutting corners again and sending them to the final approach fix at 3800' coming right over all of us.
- Gagnon: To clarify that, below 4800 feet is part of how the current state is being described, but the actual recommendation is 6000. Is that correct, Dan?
- Gardon: Yes.
- Brown: I think that would clear it up for most people. We are trying to keep them up high enough so they can get down safely.
- Gagnon: Dan or Gene, can one of you talk about how this document was constructed and which audience was it constructed for?
- Gardon: This letter is written for the FAA audience. It is possible that we could put together a simplified version for the general public.
- Reindel: I do not support two documents. I think that this document does both – provides information to the FAA and to the more general public. Clearly it is more understood by the ACR members than it would be by the general public, but it is written for the FAA.
- Garrett: This recommendation is really giving a context, background information. If we need to tweak the numbers a bit, it doesn't seem to be problematic.
- Reindel: I agree, and I think changes to 30 miles at the top and 4000 feet later in the paragraph, it would satisfy what has been discussed.
- Garrett: Let's make that part of the motion before the vote – approved with these changes.
- Wiesenberger: Quick question: When we are talking about these altitudes, is it altitude at sea level or airport elevation, which is about 750 feet. It makes a big difference when planes are at 4000 feet and 3% glideslopes.
- Gardon: Good point as well. I don't think at any point in the document we differentiate between AGL and MSL. Gene, is that something that we need to add?
- Reindel: We do need to add that and be specific with what these altitudes are. We will work with Dan to do that. We will need to make that recommendation as a part of the motion as well to determine MSL or AGL on these altitudes.
- Wiesenberger: I hope it is the airport altitude that we are basing these altitudes upon.
- Brown: I think you want to base them on MSL because the controllers use MSL. MSL is Mean Sea Level, and AGL is Above Ground Level.
- Wiesenberger: If that is the case, when we are making recommendations of specific altitudes, shouldn't we add in the altitude of the airport into those projections? For example, in Mountain Island Lake area, if they are at 4000 feet, it is actually something like 3400 feet.
- Garrett: What are procedures written to?
- Gardon: Procedures are written to MSL. We can be very specific - simple fix. We can note both MSL and AGL where altitudes noted. Any other questions before we move on to departures?  
*None.*
- Gardon: Page 11. Primary purpose of these 3 recommendations is to alleviate the recurring departures over specific areas. First, probably the most complicated - Removal of 2-mile restriction on departure. Important paragraph – 2<sup>nd</sup> on Page 12 – *this recommendation cannot be implemented without an appropriate reduction in noise over an associated area by implementing one or more of the other departure recommendations.* Basically, the ACR is saying they do not

wish this to be removed without an additional departure measure taking place. If we just remove the restriction, it just shifts the flight tracks and noise 2-miles north. This is very important. It's also addressed in the prioritization section.

- Brief note - in an updated version, we did add a footnote to the actual flight procedure that dictates the 2-miles.
  - Page 13: Divergent Departure Headings. This is also complicated. The work that HMMH did is only referenced in Appendix. HMMH had studied 14 headings in order to spread out the flight tracks as much as possible. The FAA requested that sometimes the measure needs to be somewhat vague. For example, with the 6000' recommendation, if they can't do 6000', could they do 5500'? And this is a good example of that, too. If 14 unique divergent headings are not possible, then what can the FAA do? We do include all the data that we used to create this in the Appendix, which I have not sent to you – simply for size – but it is information that you have already seen. Next Page (p.14) is a secondary map of that that shows the noise reductions.
  - Page 15: Change Headings of First Turns off Runways 18L and 18C. This accomplishes the same effect of divergent headings but to a smaller degree. Page 16 talks about possible outcomes of implementation. First paragraph is of note – the airport has historically put some benefit on noise abatement when it comes to Open-SIDs – that we have now. It is not a perfect system, but it is better than departure rails seen at other airports.
  - The next section – Groupings and priorities – I think the group needs to talk about.
  - Regarding priorities, the group has noted previously that it has no preference for prioritization. Last paragraph on Page 16 - At this time the group does not want to set priorities because members of the ACR are from all over, but the FAA wants some discussion on that. If any measure was to be sped through the process, we would let them know.
- Nomellini: Let me summarize some of our conversations. We do not want to indicate that arrivals or departures are more important than the other. My concern was if we prioritize, the FAA will not look at it as a combined package. We want the subject matter experts to look at this and say, *we see what you're trying to do; while we can't do what you asked, what we can do is...* Once we say this is more important than that, we open it up to allowing them to pick and choose what they want to work on and move the rest to the side.
  - Wiesenberger: I agree with that – we don't want to get preference to one part of the area over another. It is assumed that in the Appendix we have some data regarding largest population benefits with each of these recommendations.
  - Gardon: The Appendix is basically the conclusion slides from each HMMH PowerPoint. Generally, there is always a high resolution map with various rows of green and red.
  - Gagnon: (Pulling up an example of what Dan is talking about) This is on the expanded grid as well. I believe that these were on the documents that Dan sent for everyone to review.
  - Wiesenberger: My point was just to say that data is available if the FAA chooses to make choices based on best benefit, etc.
  - Gardon: Basically, HMMH put together a nice overview of everything – number of people with benefits and disbenefits from each measure. That is included in the Appendix.
  - Vesely: On all the other implementation it talks about how many people are affected except the 6000'. You could add that to that measure.
  - Gagnon: (Showing on the screen some examples of what's in the Appendix) That would be in the Appendix. The data that you would see would be similar to these types of slides that show grid points affected – Comfort, Concern, No Go. This should give you kind of a feel as to what will be in the Appendix.
  - Gardon: To Kevin's point, the other 2 arrival measures do have population numbers included; we can add that number to the 6000' recommendation as well.

- Gagnon: To complete that point about the Appendix, all the data in the Appendix is based on the expanded grid. Other comments and questions about the priority points?
- Wiesenberger: One additional comment about altitude pursuant to sea level. In the document on Page 7, you have a CDA diagram; it might be helpful to be more specific about what the y axis is in terms of altitude, and for the 6000' arrival minimum, is that 6000' above sea level or airport level. I think clarification is important.
- Brown: You are talking about maintaining 6000 feet. Just say 6000' MSL (5250 feet AGL).
- Ballard: Ground level is different elevations relative to where you are.
- Gardon: I think I need to kick this to Gene, but I believe you would want 6000 feet AGL.
- Reindel: I actually think Sayle is correct. And I think our analysis was MSL as well, but I will verify and get back to you, Dan.
- Gardon: The intent of the ACR is as high up as possible. On Page 17, combining recommendations is a priority. To talk about the processes of this letter, once any changes are made as a result of this vote, tomorrow morning I will be in the office to print these off and send a hard copy to the FAA. At same time, sending a digital version along with digital version of Appendix. We should receive notification when the administration has received those. Then a basic timeline of when we should hear back from them.
- Gagnon: Before we summarize specific changes, are there other questions for Dan about submittal documents?
- Ballard: I am concerned that we are going to approve this without seeing the final draft. Can we approve with accepted changes, and then you send it out to tomorrow to the committee to see if there are any objections?
- Sauber: I understand where you're coming from, but if we have not read this stuff by now, I don't know what will change.
- Ballard: We don't have a final document yet.
- Sauber: I think we do; we have some modifications, but it's not been significantly altered.
- Ballard: With three years of work, what is one day?
- Sauber: I just think it's overkill.
- Garrett: Seems like these are minor tweaks. Doesn't seem like much change, nothing real material here. I am comfortable with doing a motion subject to the changes we have talked about.
- Nomellini: We need a supermajority to pass this. If you are not comfortable, you can vote no or abstain. That will make the decision if we review the document or not. Fair?
- Wright: Yes. I have a different question. Bob had submitted something that we did not have an answer for. It was a document that the FAA was reviewing.
- Nomellini: I think it was the waypoints, and that is included.
- Gagnon: I think it might look different because in late 2018 it was submitted as moving the CAATT and EPAYE waypoints back to pre-Metroplex locations. When the FAA looked at it in 2019, they decided to change it to still accomplish the positive noise effects by raising the waypoint altitudes by 1000 feet. So, if that is what you are referring to, it actually morphed into what the FAA recommended as an alternative.
- Cameron: In March 2018, we asked that the FAA raise altitudes, which is what we're talking about with our 6000' Slate item. It's okay having that on our Slate, even though the FAA previously reviewed that.
- Wright: I am actually talking about the FAA representative, not Bob Cameron.
- Gagnon: Bob Z's (FAA) recommendation was on the CAATT and EPAYE, since he and Mark Clark were the primary FAA representatives at that time. Bob worked on that, made presentations on the alternative that the FAA developed. It was rolled into the Slate based on conversations the

ACR had late last year when Michael O’Harra came to the ACR. Bob Cameron’s point about the March 2018 request is correct.

- Brown: As far as Walter’s concerns, they are clarification changes. There is nothing substantial, if Walter is concerned about that.
- Ballard: I am not concerned. I would just like to see a final document before it goes to the FAA.

❖ **Vote on Submittal of Package to FAA – Sara Nomellini, ACR Chair**

- Gagnon: We can look at a draft motion that Kurt and I have been working on with guidance from Stuart, as well. Basically, it is a draft motion that has been developed if you all wanted to have one. This is something that you can modify, or you can have something totally different. Any guidance from Kurt or Sara?
- Nomellini: Due to the significance of this vote, it will be done by roll call. I think we look at the draft motion and with these additions. Since Kurt you are going to be making the motion – are you comfortable doing that – then we ask for a second. First, let’s make sure we’ve captured everything in the draft.
- Gagnon: The draft motion is: To submit the ACR’s Slate of Recommendations and Submittal Package to the FAA with the changes noted (on this slide) for their evaluation and implementation. The changes that I noted that were discussed are – moving from 20 mile reference to 30 mile (page 8). Also on page 8, moving what is being experienced now from at or below 4800 feet to say at or below 4000 feet. Wherever we note altitude, note that as both MSL and AGL. And where we do not have a population number addressing the net effect, we add that in the summary for the recommendations. Those are the 4 changes that I noted. Are there others?
- Ballard: Can I get a clarification about ground levels. We have different ground levels depending on where you are located. How do you define that?
- Reindel: We typically use MSL because it is very clear on what the reference point is. So, with Above Ground Level you have to have a reference point and it is usually the airport, in this case. Given the terrain around the airport, it may still not reflect the altitude of a particular person’s location. Whatever we put in here, AGL will be referenced at airport elevation, and that will be very clear when we add that in.
- Gagnon: If we are going to make changes, we want everyone to understand.
- Wiesenberger: I’d like to make a motion to submit the ACR’s Slate of recommendations and submittal package to the FAA with the changes noted (on this slide) for their evaluation and implementation.
- Gussman: Gussman will second.
- Nomellini: Any discussion? *No discussion.*
- Gagnon: My numbers say we have 18 on the call or who have submitted their vote in advance. We would need 12 for a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority to approve. (*Did a roll call vote*)
- Loflin: I want to make sure that the 3 members who had already voted would understand the changes of tonight.
- Gagnon: I will contact them after the meeting. Just so you know, if we excluded their vote due to the changes noted tonight, we would need 10 of the 15 on the call to pass. (*Continued the roll call vote; there were actually 19 total members present or who provided their vote in advance*)
- Gagnon: 19 Yes’s. It is unanimous.
- Nomellini: The motion passes.
- Gardon: The crowd goes wild!
- Hair: Congratulations on the hard work. This is a milestone. This was the ultimate meeting, and it looks like we had the ultimate outcome. I look forward to talking about next steps.
- Sauber: I’d like to say something to the airport folks. If we’ve learned one thing from this whole process, we have learned that it was not the airport’s fault or issue. It was about our ability to

come together and get something done with the FAA. The CLT people have been great, and I commend them. In no way did they play politics. I don't think we could have gotten through this without them. Thanks to Stuart and their crew there.

➤ Brown: Thank you, Ed and Gene and Dan and Stuart. You gave the direction and kept us on point.

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

➤ Gagnon: I am going to walk through the rest of the document as we get into unfinished business: Back to Page 18. ACR Submittal Checklist for the FAA. We have reviewed today and will check mark the last box in the next day or two after Dan makes the changes, and we get the Sara/Kurt signatures added. This is a major milestone, and great job by everybody. Page 19 – What's next – these are items we will look at as we go forward. Next meeting in August but may go bi-monthly after that.

➤ Vesely: Can we, ACR members, get copies of the final document in final form?

➤ Gardon: Yes, I plan to send to everybody on the ACR.

➤ Hair: It will also be on the CLT website.

➤ Wright: Is it appropriate to put something in the Observer about this, or some other communication?

➤ Hair: We have Chris Poore from the communications team on the call tonight. He and others on staff have been working diligently on communications related to this. We have a neighborhood update going out on Monday, I believe, that will have an article on this. We will start pushing this out through our communication channels. We had not anticipated doing a press release – instead using existing channels. I think it will be very appropriate when the FAA responds to this to have much larger communications.

➤ Gagnon: And also to your point, Thelma, project teams – Government and Community Engagement – actually met since the last ACR meeting and are making plans and communication documents to share with their constituents.

➤ Gagnon: In terms of other items, submittal documents will be on the website after FAA has received it. ACR will meet on August 12. Future plans – We will be monitoring FAA progress. We may revisit the Noise Improvement Matrix that Kurt helped to launch a while back. The FAA decisioning flow was started to be developed in August 2018 and was finalized in March of 2019. Early this year we sent it back to the FAA to see if any changes need to be made. This is the process that the FAA will go through. When we re-sent this to the FAA earlier this year, John Carraher said this is still the process. He had a note about timing of Step 14. We will continue talking about this as things move forward.

- Pages 22-23 - Requests and Motions from June meeting. Read updates.

- Pages 24-25 are written document updates, and we encourage you to read them. Engagement Project Teams' updates, FAA, and airline-related updates.

- Pages 26-28 - Bob Cameron asked that I include some talking points for the Government Engagement Project Team; they're starting to build a PowerPoint slide show.

- Pages 29-31 are updates to the Request/Motions Database, including some requests made last month and also a couple of motions that have been either updated or were added.

- Any questions on any of the items in unfinished business?

➤ Vesely: We had a discussion about North flow vs. South flow, and I see a brief bullet point listed there, but it was not included in the package. I assume they maintain the current status or at least improve on that. Is there anything on that?

➤ Gagnon: Sean Muckenfuss was working on that. As a reminder, FAA did respond to what I believe was 8 different questions submitted to them. They came back with responses, and I believe Sean has had offline conversations with them. Any update, Dan?

➤ Gardon: I don't think there are any updates.

- Gagnon: The charge that the ACR gave was once those questions were answered, Sean would bring that back to the ACR to see if there was something actionable there. That could be on a next steps agenda.
- Vesely: The FAA responded that the answer is “how the wind is blowing.” As we have seen with the data, that is not always true. That is why I brought it up – didn’t feel that we got an answer. At some point, I’d like to get back to that.
- Gagnon: We will follow-up with Sean prior to the next meeting. Any other items related to unfinished business? *None*. Any new business? *None*.

❖ **Adjourn**

- Nomellini: Do I have a motion to adjourn?
- Cameron motioned to adjourn. Vesely seconded, all in favor.
- Nomellini: Thank you, everyone. I appreciate your hard work.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:21pm