

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: January 8, 2025

Attendees

Phillip Gussman, City 1
Sherry Washington, County 4
Mark Loflin, County 6
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Sam Stowe, Gaston
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Jacob Pollack, York
Diane Dasher, York

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Matt Reese, CLT
Chris Poore, CLT
Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Ed Gagnon, CSS (Facilitator)
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Summary Minutes

Open the Meeting

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:01 PM
- ❖ Gussman: Open the Meeting: Welcome to January 2025 meeting of the ACR:
 - ***Airport Community Roundtable Mission Statement:*** *To 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.*
 - We have passed a number of milestones. I don't see any elected officials or representatives here or online. *Introductions: ACR, CLT, AA, HMMH, CSS.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Thank you. Logistics for the meeting: If participating remotely, please use the raise the hand function. CLT will call on you. Please stay on mute until called. Use the chat. We use those in the Minutes. Please introduce yourself when speaking. Meeting is scheduled to go for 2 hours. CLT is recording this session to make sure that we are capturing everything.
 - **Ground Rules:** Healthy meetings, productive, and effective. Focus on issues and solutions, trying to not make or take things personally. Productive, by staying on task. Effective in making noise improvement in the community.
- ❖ Gussman: Is there a Motion to approve the Minutes? *Dasher moved to approve. Seconded by Washington. All in favor. None opposed.* Minutes are approved.
- ❖ Gagnon: *Reviewed Meeting Packet* - We will reference page numbers in upper right-hand corner. Agenda, membership of ACR and key stakeholders, and guidelines for public speakers are all included.

Review Public Input

- ❖ Gagnon: Do we have any members of the public signed up to speak today?
- ❖ Hair: We did have one signed up, but they are not in attendance.

CLT Update on the Part 150 Process and ACR Mission

- ❖ Gagnon: Before the CLT update on the Part 150 and the ACR review of the Part 150, Tracy wanted to talk about the Part 150.
- ❖ Montross: Before we get started on a recap of the December activities, I wanted to take a moment on behalf of the American Airlines team to thank the ACR for their diligence throughout this process, thoughtful questions and engagement. As you noted from the Council discussion, this was not a rubber stamp, and there were some very important questions that needed to be asked. I want to thank Phil and the committee who spent a lot of time and effort to answer and address some of those questions and concerns from Council. I know it has been a challenging discussion for this group, and American is pleased with the outcome and the opportunity to reset on a more modern approach to noise mitigation in this market. We are grateful for the effort that you have gone through. I want to thank Phil for his talk and Ed for personally being at the meeting. I have heard from Council that your feedback was very helpful and critical for them in terms of understanding this work. There are more questions to be answered and more due diligence for all stakeholders as we go into the EA, assuming FAA approval. I offer my gratitude, and on behalf of American we are very thankful for the effort that you all put in to help the community and City Council understand this very complex federal approval process and the efforts that have been ongoing the last few years with the ACR at the table. Thank you.
- ❖ Gagnon: Thank you, Tracy.
- ❖ Hennessey: I will give the Part 150 update, but first I want to echo Tracy's sentiments. CLT is extremely appreciative, not just for the Part 150, but for all the hard work over the years. Specific to the Part 150, a big milestone was reached in December with Council approval of us submitting it to the FAA. Our consultant is working with the FAA on some technical matters, and once we get through that, we will officially submit it. Now the timeframe for submittal is late Winter for submittal. That puts us in late Fall for approval. It is a moving target, but as we start getting dates plugged in, we will let you know.
- ❖ Hair: I asked Kevin to do that update as he has been my project manager on the Part 150 project. This was one of his core responsibilities these past couple of years. He has been the community and noise expert for the Part 150 process. He's the one doing the work.
 - As you all are probably well aware, we set up the ACR about 8 years ago now. We had been charged and challenged by FAA regional staff to create a community-facing noise group. They did not provide us a brief on that. There was not a playbook, we did not have clear expectations of how it would be formed or what it would accomplish or what its lifespan would be. We went to DC and sat in on the long-standing noise group there - I think Tracy helped facilitate that introduction for us. We benchmarked a couple other noise groups that existed around the nation, and came up with the Mission Statement and the membership structure for the Airport Community Roundtable. One of the big things is what Phil talked about in the convening: *"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."*
 - I break that down in 2 main pieces. This was something that we drafted out, and it has a piece that was about engagement but also about recommendations. That led to the Slate of recommendations that was put forward. One of them was implemented outside of the Part 150, some of them are included with the Part 150. We have gotten feedback on 5 of the 6 of them now, and the FAA is still working on the 6th of those. The 2 sides of that charge were around engagement and recommendations, and the recommendations Slate has moved forward.
 - Now that the Part 150 milestone has been reached and Council has given that approval to go to the FAA, we are looking at a better solution than how the ACR is set up now. Let's look at our membership. Membership has dropped off. Engagement has decreased, but we accomplished the other side of that coin. As we looked at the ACR this past year, we wanted to come up with a better solution. So, over the next couple of months, Matt, Kevin, and I are going to be working on that better solution for the Airport Community Roundtable. We want your involvement. We want you to continue to be involved in whatever form this new function looks like.

- We will be drafting a new Mission Statement. We have a working session on Monday. So, we anticipate, pretty quickly, coming forward with a new Mission Statement. The mission of the body will be focused on noise impacts, advocacy, and being the technical experts that you are. The role of creating a Slate of recommendations - that is done. It might come up again later.
- But, we have the Part 150 happening, we have flight procedures that will change with the commissioning of the new runway in 2027. There is talk of the FAA doing another airspace modernization if they can find internal monies for that. There is talk of major work on our eastern most runway that may change flight procedures. There are a lot of changes to flight procedures that are in-process. Frankly we heard loud and clear from the FAA that they had to design a process on how to consider the Slate of recommendations. They do not have a process to consider another Slate of recommendations, especially with all the change coming up. It is going to be multiple years – 5-ish years – before they would be able to consider new changes to flight procedures because of all the other things that are cued up to change around flight procedures.
- The better solution that we are going to be looking for is around - how does it impact you – with you being the advocates for the community and being the technical experts that you have grown into being. One of the big changes in this new body is we won't be so formal – not a quasi-legislative body. We represent different districts. We are supposed to be voting in the interest of those districts; we have a Chair, we follow Robert's Rules of Orders. We are thinking - because we are not going to be voting and advancing recommended Slates - there will be a different structure - structured as an advisory body is probably a better model for us to look at for the ACR.
- Another primary driver is around a new membership structure of the body. I do not know what that looks like yet. I want to have the diverse geographic representation that we have, but we want to have more engagement, and more opportunities for engagement. As an example, Courtney (remote participant) has attended so many of these meetings, but because he does not represent a seat, he has no voice to speak to the body. When we think about the new membership structure, I want to be assured that we have a way to provide the platform to anyone who really cares about this and wants to spend the energy in learning about noise and being the advocate for it. That is one of the other big changes with the new Mission Statement. Matt has done legwork on this and has already received a bunch of applications. We got one from Bob Szymkiewicz who used to be with FAA. He has been a great partner for us for a number of years, but there was never a spot for him. We have a group of people who want to get engaged through the structure of the new body. Frankly, I think that 20-25 works well with an advisory body. Due to attrition and life changes, we are well below that now.
- We are not going to lose Ed and Cathy and Gene. Still have a third-party facilitator and subject matter experts in HMMH as an on-call expert for us to leverage. FAA was surprised when we spoke with them, after Part 150 went to Council, that we wanted to keep the ACR. They were ready to stand the body down because they do not have or are not willing to commit the bandwidth for this type of ongoing community-based noise initiative. FAA has always directed that airports are responsible for noise in the local community. Their commitment to the body previous was extraordinary, and they are having to take a step back. We think they will still be involved but maybe on an every other meeting or once a year frequency. Pearlis is always just a phone call away. They are not disengaging, they just cannot commit to being at all the meetings.
- What is the timeline on this? In April, we will have no business; we plan for a celebration at the April meeting. We will be working through the logistics of where we do it. I would like to invite all the past members and everyone that has been involved with the ACR. A capstone celebration as an end to this Mission.

- Then in July, we would come forward with a draft Mission Statement and membership configuration for you to comment and adopt. My goal is that we have drafted something internally and get it to you all soon after the April celebration so that you have some time to spend with it, so as you have suggestions for improvement, we can work through that; in July we would convene a new advocacy group/advisory body, new name to be determined. Quarterly meetings, or we can change. How we are structured now is no longer relevant. The mission of the ACR when convened has been accomplished. We want you still to be involved, we want your energy, engagement and technical expertise, and to find a way to make it meaningful for you all moving forward. That is the update on the ACR mission, and I welcome your feedback.
- ❖ Gussman: Stuart has assured me that they will listen to what we think, our input. This is a change, but I think it is a change that will better fit how we can represent folks. In my experience with working with City Council, they weren't sure how well we were representing everyone. If we can get some of these very active people on board with this group, I think we can step back into moving things a bit faster, have more people in our groups.
- ❖ Loflin: I like everything that Stuart is saying. I've always thought that - in tying people to geographical regions - we were missing it. We weren't getting the representation, the expertise, that we need. It seems like we are fixing that by taking away the limitations of the current membership structure by area. I was going to ask tonight about members, that we are getting stuck. I think it is important to keep the conversation open with the FAA. I hope that we can funnel ideas to them without them having to be here. I think it is a good idea; 25 seems like a lot to me; think about the timing of meetings. I look forward to the celebration.
- ❖ Hennessey: It would be nice to have 25 people plus 50 more of the general public.
- ❖ Wright: The plan is not a surprise because, yes, there has been less engagement. When I think about persons that have been here over the years and the areas that have been represented, part of this is that they didn't seem to see that there could be a change in what was happening. Participating is not going to make a difference, so those persons dropped off. And of course there were other personal reasons that people could not participate. I think it is a good idea. My question in terms of local groups - will we have these upcoming meetings prior to April?
- ❖ Hair: There is no reason to stop work on things you are passionate about. We are not trying to stop you from doing anything. Just looking to reform this body. If things are in process, I don't see a reason to stop what you are doing. We talked through some public meeting concerns, and I don't think we will have any. If work groups want to keep going, we will figure out how to structure things within the new body in the future.
- ❖ Gussman: I would encourage those groups to continue working and meeting at least through April. How do we best meet the needs of this group? If we can get that information to Stuart. For example, on the Community Engagement side, one of the things we have identified is we need a clear avenue of direct communication with us. Find the things we can fix, and fix them. When I first heard about this, I thought it might be a challenge for us to adapt. After thinking about it, this gives us the ability to be more flexible. Maybe this is a good opportunity to keep connecting with the communities that are most impacted. If we need to go out and listen to those groups, we could do that, as well. I think it is a step forward.
- ❖ Gagnon: Any other questions or comments?
- ❖ Brown: Did you say you already have a list of people who are interested in joining the new group?
- ❖ Hair: We have about 10 people that are interested. Their applications either did not fit into the body as convened, or we were so far down the path that we could not bring in someone new up-to-speed this summer, when you were voting on things that were so technical in nature. We deferred some of those applications.
- ❖ Brown: I agree completely, realizing it would take so much time to catch them up. I'm glad to see there are 10 people interested.

- ❖ Hair: And that is what we have received purely by word-of-mouth. I think that how I envision us getting involvement is much more robust than just word-of-mouth. If you remember when we convened the ACR, we did a direct mail piece to everyone who had complained about airport noise. Then we did multiple different follow-up methods to convene the body originally. Some of you may have gotten tapped by Town Mayors, Council members or other folks, some of you just organically found your way in. That type of outreach intentionality, we have not done that in years. We want to be very intentional in trying to put together a reformed body.
- ❖ Brown: Getting away from districts, if you can find people that are interested that come from a wide spectrum of knowledge, that would be awesome.
- ❖ Wright: So, the technical group would continue, as well?
- ❖ Gagnon: The Technical Working Group working on the OPD/CDA Recommendation - I got the impression when Stuart alluded to there being one recommendation that was still in the works, that group could continue.
- ❖ Hair: Let me be very direct on this; the Slate of recommendations that you all put forward, we want to see the FAA take action on those - either implement those changes or provide a firm response to them. The Technical Working Group, I see as necessary and vital work. I want us to keep pushing the pressure on the FAA. Very frankly, FAA is good at following their timelines, but when the community puts pressure on them, they respond to that pressure.
- ❖ Brown: I have been disappointed in their responses so far, except they did answer a few of the Slate questions. But as far as the other stuff, I think they ignored it.
- ❖ Gagnon: Other responses before we move on? *None.*

ACR Review of the Part 150 Process

- ❖ Gagnon: Agenda 3b is doing somewhat of a debrief from the ACR's perspective on the review of the Part 150. If you notice, there is no Project Team update that we usually have on the Agenda, as we will weave that into this part of the Agenda.
- ❖ Gussman: If anyone did not watch the show on that Monday, there was plenty of company with us to speak to Council - both for and against. All the pilots that Tracy brought looked really sharp in the crowd. The community members there were some we have seen here, in front of us, and a number of them have talked to Matt. I think it is important to note that we were touching many of the parts of the community who are most concerned about this. All of the media uproar about 27 different flight tracks was a knee jerk reaction. We were aware of what some of that means, but to the general public, it is confusing. This is one of the things I think we can help with - helping provide analysis from a community perspective, if we could do analysis in the format we've done in the past, we could make a more informed decision on the impact of airport noise.
 - Some of the things we did leading up to the meeting, I first want to say thanks to the Government and Community Engagement teams who spoke to folks, documents that we created – which every Council member saw and was talked to. No City Council member that I talked to viewed our general support of the Part 150 as a blanket support. They understood that we were not thrilled with all of the Part 150. We sent our documentation and our messages to all of the City Council members, specifically targeting the Transportation, Planning and Development Committee members. We communicated directly with Councilmember Driggs throughout the process – I think 4 times total. He definitely heard our caution. Our communications specifically highlighted our informed nature of our feedback, and while we pointed out shortcomings in the process, specifically we need to do more to mitigate the impacts of airport noise from a community perspective.
 - Key Takeaways: Going forward, let's look to work with more community groups. We only had one media contact that got through to us, and that was an “in person bump into” situation. I know that Matt was forwarding our contact information, at least they told us that. How do we get contact information out faster? Everything blew up after that Council committee meeting where there were discussions about how everyone was supposed to be doing their jobs, but that doesn't involve us – just got the media's attention. But I do want to hear what everyone thought about how the process went. Are there more things that we should be thinking about? Jacob did a great job of writing his specific concerns – I also gave those to City

Council members. It was an example that what we approved was a compromise. What I heard from multiple City Council members was to keep doing what we are doing. I think there are opportunities for us and/or through Stuart's group to engage City Council. While they have oversight, when they have unhappy constituents, they want to hear about this. Any other takeaways?

- ❖ Pollack: I'm not sure that I fully understand the way the Council views - just listening I get the impression that there is frustration. Maybe I am misinterpreting here. Do they feel we are not doing our job, or we are creating a problem, that we are not addressing noise that they are hearing about from their constituents? Sounds like there is frustration.
- ❖ Gussman: Did you watch the committee meeting - the transportation meeting?
- ❖ Pollack: No.
- ❖ Gussman: It devolved into interpersonal discussions that were only tangentially connected to airport noise. The people who had any significant communication with the ACR understood the concerns, and their biggest contribution to the debate was that they need to reach more community members. I think we can help them do that. The media started paying attention because Council members started yelling at one another.
- ❖ Hair: There is some bad blood on a personal level between a couple of members. They are using any platform they have to talk negatively about their fellow councilmember. This became another tool for them to utilize. We did a dinner briefing on December 2, and I was literally between two Councilmembers, and I was watching it like it was a tennis match. They were talking about ACR, talking about Part 150, talking about noise, but it was axe grinding against one another.
- ❖ Brown: Was it factual information?
- ❖ Hair: In my opinion, those two members do not like one another, so they will disagree. But they typically vote the same way, so the facts are used to bicker with each other.
- ❖ Gussman: So, a lot of good debate was not had. At that point, Council was concerned "did we meet enough of the public?" We have sent many things out via media trying to access the public. Sam does a great job of finding neighborhood groups that he can get in front of. We have repeatedly tried to get our message out to the public.
- ❖ Pollack: So, the complaint was that the ACR was not doing enough and hearing the public's concerns? Not that the airport wasn't?
- ❖ Gussman: Their point was that everyone involved in the Part 150 did not do a good job. This is not the debate that we are here to fix. It was unfortunate.
- ❖ Wright: I did not watch the meeting, but the lead up as Phil described - the varying paths discussion was in the media. Whatever I saw, it felt like the ACR was not a part of the communication process. From that perspective - and this is what we talked about in our Project Team meetings - we are still not effectively communicating our presence. Many years ago, we did mailings, and we met at the Police station on Wilkinson Boulevard and things like that.
 - When you go to the Part 150 Public Meetings, if you don't know what questions to ask, then how do you know what information to ask about? There were no presentations. We can look at the pictures, but if you don't know what you are looking at, it is useless. The community wasn't there as much as in the past even though they are affected by noise. Things have changed in the last 10 years. We need to make our presence known, we need to have a generic business card for when we're out in the public that says: We are the ACR, here's a link. I don't want someone calling me personally. Someone called me personally, and I referred them to Ed. We need something generic so we can pass them out, to make our presence more known. We have been working on Charlotte noise for 8 years, and our latest process and engagement has been the Part 150. I went to the library and saw this huge 1,000 page document. Who is going to read and understand that?
- ❖ Montross: I wanted to add to Stuart's comments on the dynamic at the Council meeting. There is a lot of, I don't know if PTSD is the word, but the impact of last year's UDO (Unified Development Ordinance) and comprehensive plan has left the City Council wondering whether the public engagement process appropriately conveys impacts or proposed impacts, and that was what was really brought up during this Part 150 consideration. The public is not going to be interested until they are affected or they experience an impact.

That is really hard to demonstrate when you are advancing a proposal and not actually able to demonstrate the impacts. Councilmember Johnson and her concerns, everything that she was stating about her concern with Part 150 had more to do with the experience she had in her district with the UDO, which is that she believed that the UDO process was a vote she had to make while not her fully knowing and her community not fully knowing the impact of that proposal. A lot discussed in that meeting has ties to past votes and experiences that Council is going through. Same thing, when the Part 150 is implemented, the community will respond. We cannot tell the community what the changes/impacts will be. They still have to be studied and analyzed. And you will only react to changes in airspace when you actually hear noise. The meeting was interesting, and it is a reflection of multi-year effort around some other planning and development issues. More a general concern on how the public chooses to engage in information sharing when they cannot fully experience or appreciate future impacts.

- ❖ Hair: Thelma, thank you for calling us out on the cards. I remember talking about that years ago, and I apologize for that. Quick fix: Kevin Hennessey is investigating that now. We have business cards for the Noise Office. I think the reverse of those cards are blank and could be used – put your name and contact information if you want.
- ❖ Pollack: Does the Council understand that the Part 150 process is bound by the 65 DNL? Reacting to Tracy’s comment, if people are thinking that once these things are implemented, there will be favorable reaction, and I think the answer is no. Things were done for operational reasons and not for noise. I don’t think the community will be happy. I wouldn’t be surprised if many of the things that were positive within the 65 DNL will have much larger outside the 65 DNL adverse effects. I don’t know, it wasn’t analyzed. How many residents are now affected by planes over their house? I do not have a lot of optimism that people are going to react favorably about this. I hope the Council knows the process is flawed. They expect positive noise effects.
- ❖ Hair: The Part 150 is a prescribed process. And we followed that process. Is that process good for our community? We don’t think the process is as robust as it should be. There are steps. It is a precise script. There is some latitude, and there were things we did bigger than the prescribed process. I don’t think that Council asked or cared if we were doing a prescribed process. What I heard in the feedback was they wanted a more robust process. That is what made me want to have a better solution around this. Good point - Part 150 is a flawed process. I want us to do something better in the future.
 - Update on business cards: They are not as flexible as I thought they would be. We will get you something ASAP.
- ❖ Dasher: My problem was that the Part 150 was just within the 65 DNL. If you look around the room, no one lives in that area. That has been my frustration; this isn’t going to help me. When are we going to do something that affects the people that are really affected? That should be our goal for this group.
- ❖ Gussman: Some of the things in the Slate that will be done and will affect that and reduce noise for a majority of folks. The City is never going to be involved in that. We tried to fit a lot of things in the Part 150 that were outside of the 65 DNL, and they were almost all rejected for reasons we still want to know. A lot of us want an explanation. These are things the new group can keep doing. The work is not done even though our Mission has been completed.
- ❖ Pollack: No matter how we form or reform the group, there needs to be more engagement from the other end in terms of considering how to modify operations and improve things. Yes, the Part 150 is prescribed, but there is a lot of discretion in it. There is a lot of time where we had proposals that were positive in the 65 DNL, and they were rejected. It was clear to me that operational concerns always trump noise. There cannot be improvement until there is some good faith engagement in the form of recognizing that tradeoffs are appropriate. There are times when the tower needs to hire another person. It cannot be “this is harder for me to do my job, so no.”
- ❖ Reindel: Comment and viewpoint. HMMH does a lot of Part 150s so we understand their intent/scope. They are limited. I think the ACR knew that going in. As we put together our Slate, the only reason we focused on the 150 is the FAA wanted to analyze the proposed departure procedures as part of the 150 since they were undertaking a new 150. That was the only reason that we shifted focus to the 150. Now that process is over, the implementation of that process has not been completed, but we now know the results of what moved forward with the 150, so now it’s up to the ACR to determine where to go next since the 150 was not the end

all for your concerns. It was one avenue that the FAA wanted to go down, again for those 3 recommended departure procedures. I also want to convey with my experience, more of what this group wants to do, has occurred outside of the Part 150 process as opposed to inside the Part 150 process. I don't think people should be disappointed because it did what it was supposed to do. Part 150 is about land use compatibility, and what we are discussing here are noise effects in addition or outside of that area where land use compatibility is considered.

- ❖ Gagnon: Thanks, Gene. Pages 6-8 is the cover e-mail of the ACR Member Quarterly Newsletter. Table of Contents at the top shows the contents of what is in the newsletter. Please make sure that you are reviewing these. I will send out calendar invites for the Project Team meetings for the next 2 months - to Phil's point - to keep things moving. When you get these newsletter e-mails, please review.

CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations

- ❖ Hair: Some numbers hot off the presses: Travel started picking up on Friday 12/20, and it ran through 1/5. Almost 3 weeks of a peak this year. Flights were up about 8% over last year's holiday season. We had over 800 departures on Monday, 12/30; 2023 had a high of 734 flights – so we're breaking records. AA - Their enplanements were up about 4.5% over 2023. Their passenger numbers were up about 3.6% over 2023 numbers. Christmas Day numbers were down by about 20%, but overall growth was up.
- ❖ Montross: A tech outage on Christmas Eve. Our Sabre system did go down on that morning, and it took out the kiosks. In Charlotte, we were fully recovered by that afternoon with no cancellations in Charlotte due to the tech outage.
- ❖ Hair: Local traffic was crazy – On Friday 12/27, we screened over 39,000 people. Our total throughput for the holiday season was up 11%. Baggage numbers were up about 11%. TSA security screen times were very reasonable. Average security wait times - 70% of the time were less than 10 minutes.
- ❖ Poore: A tornado just missed the airport on Sunday, December 29. It was confirmed yesterday.
- ❖ Wright: Yes, that was Sunday. It was warm, and there was a lot of debris.
- ❖ Hair: One other operational update. There have been some land side changes. The big one for Thelma and her neighbors to the north - Old Dowd Road has been realigned. Now it intersects with Tuckaseegee and Wilkinson. It is the quickest way to the overlook. On the south side of the airfield, there is a section of West Blvd. that is being realigned. The detour route takes you down Yorkmont and down Byrum – there will be some roads rebuilt in that area. We call it the West Blvd. relocation, and it does impact people that are trying to get from Center City or the West Blvd. neighborhoods over to Berewick or Steele Creek.
- ❖ Reese: If you look online, the annual reports for 2024 will be populating soon. The airport flow report through October was 83% North Flow. November 75% North Flow. December 71% North Flow. A little bit of ease through October, November, and December in terms of South vs. North flow. The annual totals, off the top of my head are 61% North and 39% South.
 - Complaints: 34 households/1770 complaints in October. It went up a bit in November - 38 households/2410 complaints, and December the households came down (29) and complaints (2953) went up because of one sole complainant. She made 900 complaints herself.
 - Recommendation 3A Update: *Pages 27-28*. Now the good news. These are the Recommendation 3A results that you've been waiting for. When we did this, we compared January, February, and March as our baseline because the increase in altitude did not come in until after that. I just recently followed up with September, October, and November. There is a margin of error due to differences in number of North vs. South Flow days, weather, VFR v. IFR procedures, etc.
 - We've seen increases in terms of North Flow on the 2 outer waypoints. They have gone up a bit at CEDOX and CAATT, and that is where the aircraft descend lower than 10,000 feet and are officially in Class B airspace, which is what we are. But that is not where citizens tend to notice things. They tend to notice things on the downwind. On the North Flow West Downwind, we saw an increase of 291 feet on average which is good news. On the East Downwind we saw an increase of 396 feet. Some of my complainants in the Southeast quadrant down there are complaining less.

- On South Flow, it is a similar story. At AAIRE and LEEKS, which are the 2 entry waypoints, we saw increases there as well. The Downwinds were positively affected. All of this means that the measure that you put forward and the FAA approved and implemented, is now having the effect that you intended. Congratulations on that.
- Last thing, we are now having our phone number 704-359-HEAR (4327) live, so that I am answering the phone. Instead of a recording, I am actually answering the phone. The phone is live Mon-Fri 8a-5p. So far, everyone seems to like it. I personally answer every call. I always make myself available. After those hours and weekends, it reverts back to a recording where callers can leave voicemail.
- ❖ Pollack: I think it is good that the planes are higher as a result of raising the altitudes. I remember having this conversation in the past - I don't think a couple hundred feet makes a difference. I'm not saying it's not having an effect. I'm becoming more convinced that the noise mitigation is trying to get the pilots going off of throttle, starting them higher up further out.
- ❖ Gussman: I don't think we are done with analyzing that. We will still collect data. If I understand some conversations with the tower, it is possible that some of these could be higher, as the procedures become more ingrained, and pilots get more familiar with them.
- ❖ Reese: We refer to them as gates. A gate is a window – virtual – when the airplane passes through it, it records the data. I have the gates already set up. It is pretty easy to run them again in January, February, and March 2025. From what I am seeing, the FAA is keeping their word, and it is working.
- ❖ Gussman: It is good to see the tangible evidence. Start to finish – this is what we did.
- ❖ Hair: Flight tracker - We switched vendors for the software. It is the same raw information, but the interface that you use has changed. We want to make sure that you all are familiar with what this interface looks like.
- ❖ Gussman: I know a few of us have played around with it. This visibly shows the airplanes in airspace. It should help any of our community members to understand what is happening in the air above us.
- ❖ Hennessey: Matt will show you a little bit, but if you want a more in-depth one-on-one, Matt is happy to do that, as well.
- ❖ Reese: Flight tracker (providing a demo via CLT website: <https://webtrak.emsbk.com/clt>) – The first thing you see is the Message box. I am able to post customized messages. I can set up messages, and they will go away when the event is completed.
 - Starting from the left side, Quick Start guide - I suggest you read through it. It is valuable. You can read up on how the controls work, what the aircraft symbols mean, the map itself, how things are tagged, etc.
 - Top blue bar – Start here, investigate, legend, help – *went over these tabs*. Helps you investigate - allows you to look for a flight and see how close it was to you. You can actually submit a complaint from here.
 - What we like the most about this is the ability to go back historically. You can put a date and time and find the plane that woke you up at 1am. Plug in your address, click Find, it will locate you on the map. You can pick an airplane and show the details of that aircraft; things like where the plane is coming from, tells when it enters the downwind, and approaches the airport. *Matt went over some of the other tabs and things to click on, what they do - lots of neat features to play with*. We like this program. I am happy to work with anyone to go more in-depth with this. Thank you.
- ❖ Stowe: Is it a separate app from the CLT app?
- ❖ Reese: It is not an app. It is a web-based flight tracker. Access it on CLT website from the Noise tab (*from your computer or your phone*).
- ❖ Wright: The departures are in green. When we met, we talked about the ones that “cheat?”
- ❖ Reese: I can meet with folks to go over and experiment.
- ❖ Wright: When I met with Matt, some departures turn early, and they were turning right at my neighbor's house. They were turning too soon.
- ❖ Reese: What we have seen from time to time, the Eastern runway, some of the aircraft will turn Eastbound, some will cross back to the West. Same thing happens off the Center runway. It seems to be happening with international travel. Daily, there's a small number that does, what I call, crisscrossing. Instead of going where they would normally go, they cross back to the other direction.

- ❖ Montross: I'll go back and check on that. My sense is that it is just congestion on departing runways. Can I ask about Concord? Is there any data on this platform that would identify a flight landing at JDF?
- ❖ Reese: No. This is just for CLT. And the crisscrossing might be based on flight clearances. Sometimes there is not enough room on a runway, so ATC may have to send them to another one to get them off on time.
- ❖ Montross: The Concord question. How many requests on an annual basis are you getting that are specific to the Concord airport? Is there any acknowledgement of that for folks that might call in?
- ❖ Reese: No. Maybe this past year, I've heard 2 Concord complaints, and one was a helicopter.
- ❖ Gussman: Thank you, Matt.

Additional Business

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 29 – Requests/Motions from October. The first request was to consider nominees for ACR Chair. Sounds like that will not be done with the change in plans for the ACR. Sharing HMMH Slate update – I sent that out after the last meeting. Is there any update to share on identifying operational differences between recent South Flow and North Flow months?
- ❖ Reese: That is challenging because we don't know what the operational differences are. If the tower is making changes, they are not sharing that with us.
- ❖ Pollack: This question came up because in June it was unusually high South Flow month – very rare. When we ask about flow, the general comment is congestion, operational issues, no one really gives answers. So, the question is, is there any data to understand?
- ❖ Reese: Technically, we have 6 runways, 3 each North and South. On each of these runways there is something called Instrument Landing Systems - ILS. They come in different categories. (*Described categories and runway availability, weather impacts, etc.*)
- ❖ Pollack: Maybe I don't understand. This request has been out for a while.
- ❖ Hair: Why don't we table this conversation.
- ❖ Gagnon: Motions – The first one you all passed last meeting was to create Talking Points, and you did that for the Council meeting. The last one was you voted to send a reply to the FAA to their response to your FOIA request. That was submitted by Phil. Have you heard back?
- ❖ Gussman: No, we are still pending.
- ❖ Gagnon: Any new business? *None.*

Adjourn

- ❖ Loflin motioned to adjourn. Wright seconded, all in favor.
- ❖ Meeting adjourned at 7:53 pm