

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: October 11, 2023

Attendees

Natalie Rutzell, Chair, County 2
Sherry Washington, County 4
Mark Loflin, County 6
Nakia Savage, City 3
Michael Faust, City 4
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Matt Hamilton, Davidson
Kim Hardee, Matthews
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Sam Stowe, Gaston
Jacob Pollack, York

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Pearlis Johnson, FAA
Shane Jackson, FAA
Robert Dukes, FAA
Mark Libby, ATC local
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Matthew Reese, CLT
Chris Poore, CLT
Melissa Treadaway, CLT
Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Cathy Schroeder, CSS, Inc.

Summary Minutes

Open the Meeting

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:08 PM
 - Rutzell: *Called the meeting to order.*
 - Gagnon: Thanks for your patience. We are starting a few minutes late.
 - Rutzell: ***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.***
 - Gagnon: We start with recognizing new ACR members.
 - Rutzell: Michael Faust is our new member, representing City District 4. Welcome.
 - Faust: *Introduced himself.* I came because I filed a complaint and was asking questions. Dan suggested that I join the ACR.
 - Wright: Do we have a quorum?
 - Gagnon: Yes, we do. *Led introductions. ACR, FAA, CLT, HMMH, AA, CSS.*
 - Gagnon
 - *Briefly went over how things will go this evening. We are scheduled to go until 8p. Use the “raise the hand” function if participating remotely. State name when speaking. We do have public Wi-Fi. We are recording and saving the chat.*
 - Meeting handout: Page 2 is the Agenda. Page 3 is Member Roster and locations they represent. Page 4 notes Key ACR stakeholders. Page 5 is a Roberts Rules of Order Primer. If you have a chance, review this. We have not gone over this in a while, so if you are a newer member, this is for your information and guidance. Thanks to Gene Reindel for sharing some links, and Stuart is well-versed in this, as well. Please read through this as it is basically a guide for how we should speak, how we should make motions, how the Chair navigates us through different votes. This is important.

- Gagnon: *Discussed Ground Rules and Guiding Principles*: Healthy discussions, productive meetings, and brief, effective points. Stay on the Agenda. Effective in making noise improvement in our area.
- Rutzell: Request a motion to approve the July Minutes: *Loflin motioned, Stowe seconded*. The Minutes passed.

Receive Public Input

- ❖ Hair: We have 2 speakers tonight.
- ❖ Gagnon: *Went over guidelines for public speakers*. Each speaker will have 3 minutes. If more time needed, it is up to the Chair. ACR may or may not respond to speaker at time of meeting.
- ❖ Public Speakers
 - Speaker #1 – Gabby Jones-Casey
 - Speaker #2 – Janis Hayes
- ❖ Rutzell: Thank you for sharing your views and concerns; you're in the right place – we share your concerns. If you'd like, you can leave your email address, and we can provide you with some summaries of what we've been doing. We have project teams, and we can get you involved, if you'd like to.
- ❖ Wright: We are looking at the items that the speakers shared. And living close to the airport, I understand. Good suggestion, having more meetings at different times. Take flyers that were on the table, and share with neighbors. The more people who call in with concerns, the more your voice is heard. Thank you for coming.
- ❖ Gagnon: Thank you. CLT can drop links in the chat, particularly for remote participants. Things like – how to make a complaint, how to register to speak at the meetings.

Engage/Improve: Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update

- ❖ Hair: The airport has contracted with Landrum and Brown to update our Part 150. We entered into this voluntary noise program with the FAA a number of decades ago and have gone through some reevaluations of it, but we have not updated this Part 150 in a number of years; so, we are excited to see the work come forward. Next big milestone will be an upcoming Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting. Natalie Rutzell (Chair) and Phil Gussman (Vice-Chair) are representatives to the TAC. We have upcoming meeting in November. Still working on dates. Expect that meeting invitation in the coming days for the week of the 13th.
 - In addition to the TAC meeting, please put on your calendars some public meetings. The public meetings will be over 2 nights. One at the Harris Conference Center at CPCC, kind of here on the North side/East side of the airfield. It is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, Nov. 14 in the evening, and the 2nd one on Thursday the 16th in the evening at the Embassy Suites on S. Tryon – the South and West side of the airport. Same information to be shared at both public meetings. We are providing a variety of times and places for people to provide their public comment.
 - What will be shared is an update on the Part 150. A ton of input and ideas, coming from stakeholders and others, was reviewed. They took that information and have done qualitative and quantitative analysis on those recommendations. And this information will be shared during those public meetings. This will be a report out of what the analysis has identified. After the meetings and comments on findings, from there, recommendations will be crafted. This is the next opportunity for the ACR, the general public, stakeholders, and regulatory partners to influence the next part of the Part 150 Noise Program. I hope that you will be involved. We have some ideas/recommendations that the quantitative analysis supports, but nothing is done yet. Just because the numbers support it, doesn't mean it's written in stone. From the public comment, the recommendations will be crafted. We will then do another engagement series in late Winter/early Spring, around those recommendations. After all of that, we will take the Part 150 to City Council for them to adopt. We are targeting summer of 2024. We hope that you will all be involved in that. Thank you.

- ❖ Wright: Do you have a time for the meetings?
- ❖ Hair: At this time, 7pm (*later finalized as 6p-8p*). Run them for at least an hour. But if people are still coming in, I will be there.
- ❖ Wright: Are there possibilities for daytime meetings, especially for those working nights or retired?
- ❖ Hair: I appreciate that feedback. The information that is available at meetings will also be online, and public comment can be made online. They will supplement each other.
- ❖ Pollack: I have a question, and it relates to comments from public speakers. There was reference to possibly plans for land acquisition to support expansion. Is there a plan for that?
- ❖ Hair: As part of the Part 150 process, there is not a process for direct land acquisition. The airport is actively buying commercial development space around the airport. As part of the Part 150, there may be noise mitigation or noise abatement recommendations that come forward. Generally, those are like sound insulation and sound proofing of homes. In the past, we have had land acquisition come forth in the Part 150. None of that is baked right now. We just have the analysis done and are firming up that analysis.
 - What we are actively doing is buying property for commercial development purposes. This is totally separate from Part 150 process.
- ❖ Rutzell: Follow-up about the analysis that L&B is going to put together. Can we get Gene and HMMH to review that analysis before or after it is publicly released so that we can see it in the form that we at the ACR are used to?
- ❖ Hair: We will take that as a recommendation from the ACR. We are managing the scope of the Part 150 work and, like most contracts, they do have a tendency to expand, and we are trying to prevent “scope creep” of the work and keep on the timeline and schedule. Without evaluation, we cannot commit to that yet.

Engage/Improve: Updates from Project Teams

- ❖ Gagnon: Project Team updates. Pages 7-9. You see a few documents that look familiar. The ACR approved and endorsed these documents at the July meeting. ACR Media Update document is on Pages 7, 8, and 9. It was updated to reflect the change of Dan Gardon and the change of meeting date. Pages 10 and 11 are documents that can be used to note that - while complaints are useful, they are but a tool to inform the airport of what and where the issues might be. But the ACR is the Change Agent. This 2-page document conveys the benefit that the ACR provides as a mechanism to making noise improvements.
 - Our focus today is on Page 12. This is a 1-page flyer the **Community Engagement Project Team** put together – members are Phil, Sam, Preston, Natalie, and Mark - that talks about different ways that residents in the community can complain if there is an airport noise issue. The Community Engagement Team wants us to do an exercise; Cathy and I will take notes.
 - Going to give ACR members about a minute to think of ideas on how you can share these documents and flyer with community members. Phil came up with some examples to help get started - post the flyer on social media, etc. I’ll give you 1 minute, and then I’ll go to every ACR member to get ideas. FYI - We have extra of these flyers. [*Pause*]
- ❖ Stowe: I work at Belmont Abbey, and the school, the main campus, is right under a flight path. I think it is heading 300 approximately, departing on the Northbound runways. I could ask my students if they notice the plane noise, and then I could get their ideas about the airplane noise.
- ❖ Loflin: You could strategically pick outdoor sporting events and see if the noise of airplanes is bothersome to those attending. Post flyers on entrances to greenways or at churches.
- ❖ Rutzell: Steele Creek residents association has their own website. I would look to have this posted on that site. Neighborhood Facebook pages, neighborhood HOAs.
- ❖ Faust: Those of us in neighborhoods with HOAs could put it in those. Reach out to adjacent neighborhoods. Mallard Creek Park is right up the road from where I live. Constantly events going on there, lots of people there. Soccer fields, leagues. Hand out or post flyer. Bulletin boards probably available to post things.
- ❖ Washington: Share with work folks. Everyone lives in different places.

- ❖ Brown: Facebook. Airlines advertising. If you could get the airlines involved in community-friendly initiatives and put something like that on the side of the airplanes (a little tongue-in-cheek), that would be great. AA could be an industry leader!
- ❖ Montross: There is not a speech I make or a conversation that I have in this town that I do not reference the ACR. I talk about the Part 150, and I do what I can to drive interest to the website. I'm doing my part to connect with the business community. I use my newsletter to promote the ACR. I will make sure that this flyer is included in our next newsletter.
- ❖ Savage: Social media postings. We can put it on Nextdoor, other apps. For me personally, I am the vice president of my HOA. I will send this to the community manager and see if they can do an e-blast to all homeowners. Possibly rally the HOA board or committee to stick these in the Flyer section of mailboxes.
- ❖ Hamilton: Davidson Town Council meetings - Get on docket to speak and raise awareness of the ACR that way. Small towns like Davidson, they send out a weekly newsletter through e-mail, and you could include the flyer.
- ❖ Wright: I am a member of the YMCA, and they have free community bulletin board. Opportunity to post flyer there, and libraries are also a good idea.
- ❖ Pollack: Ask local representatives/politicians to post on their social media, sharing with their constituents.
- ❖ Hardee: I have contacts close to where I used to live, and I will reach out to them. They have voices, and we hopefully can engage them.
- ❖ Gagnon: We will send these notes out to you all. [*Summarized the above comments.*] Thanks for the excellent comments. The Community Engagement Project Team wanted to solicit your ideas to make sure the ACR awareness is there.
- ❖ Faust: Can it be posted at the airport?
- ❖ Hair: No. We don't allow public postings at the airport. But my staff all have business cards that are for the noise program. Something that we do whenever we are talking about community engagement or noise, we use those business cards.
- ❖ Rutzell: And it is on the website.
- ❖ Brown: So, no advertising on buses, etc.?
- ❖ Hair: Most of our marketing is managed by a third party, and it is a revenue stream. For any marketing that we do, we actually pay ourselves for that. We would have to come up with a budget for something like that.
- ❖ Gagnon: Page 13 in the handout. What we are looking at here is an approach that the **Government Engagement Project Team** has put together. The team is made up of Thelma, Mark, Phil, and Preston. This team has been creating an approach to proactively engage Charlotte City Council prior to the Part 150 going before City Council. I will read through this approach and then ask if Mark or Thelma want to add anything. They have a motion in this document as well. The approach that this team has adopted is a 4-step approach to engaging City Council.
 - 1) ACR member or representative speak during public input portion of City Council meetings
 - 2) GEPT crafts some talking points, so whoever the speaker is, they are not talking from scratch – Pages 14 and 15 are draft presentation points that the GEPT has developed for at least the first couple of meetings
 - 3) Topics evolve over time i.e.,: First, educate on what the ACR is, then educate on Part 150, then transition to what ACR interests/what you'd like to see or not like to see in the Part 150 recommendations
 - 4) Supplement with between-meeting activities. Stuart has mentioned that the representative for CLT in this District is running for a different position on City Council, so there will be a new councilperson for this particular district; you may want to reach out to this person, 1-on-1, about the ACR.
- ❖ Wright: On Pages 14 and 15, if there is any input in our draft, please share those. Glad to hear that Matt is already attending Council meetings, so we have someone who wants to step right in.

- ❖ Gagnon: In terms of feedback on these points, please get to me or any project team member by end of next week.
- ❖ Wright: I'm making a motion, as noted on Page 13.
 - *For the ACR to endorse and support the Government Engagement Project Team's approach for engaging Charlotte City Council (as discussed at the October 11, 2023 ACR Meeting) leading up to Council's review and vote on CLT's Part 150 Recommendations.*
- ❖ Rutzell: *Loflin seconded. No discussion. Motion is approved.*
- ❖ Gagnon: **Local Operations/Improvement Project Team (LOIPT)**. I will give a brief update. This group is trying to make improvements locally that might positively impact the noise situation in the community. Members are Sherry, Sam, Mark, Jacob, Thelma, Sayle, and Nakia. They have been investigating and talking to Stuart about whether there are regional airports with which the ACR can engage and partner. It appears that those communities don't have a body like the ACR. The Local Ops team would like to track flights and complaints that might be coming from areas that are related to Concord airport, to see if there's a change that could trigger a need for ACR engagement with a Regional Airport.
- ❖ Faust: I have submitted a complaint to Concord, and the response was fairly canned and not particularly useful. For Concord, you have to go through the FAA. I have jets going over my house at 1,600 feet. I've wondered if other airports affect ours. You can see Concord flights on the apps, also.
- ❖ Gagnon: This group is looking to track if there is a change in the number of complaints for people who live in that area, near Concord. That might trigger a more proactive engagement with you all with representatives at that particular airport. Looking at adherence monitoring, some of those data analyses have been put on hold waiting on Matt (CLT's noise specialist) to join.
- ❖ Wright: Maybe there are opportunities for those who know persons living in the Concord area.
- ❖ Gagnon: Looking for adherence issues where some performances are changing. The Technical Working Group (TWG) - Sayle, Phil, and Preston are a part of that – LOIPT is wanting to see how that group is functioning and what its focus is in working with local ATC and FAA before determining relationships there between the TWG and LOIPT. A lot of things have been put on hold, but now that Matt Reese is here, they should start moving. Any other comments or questions regarding the Local Operations Group? *None.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Pages 16-18 - This is the cover email for the Quarterly ACR Member Newsletter. Reminder to please read it. Click on links.

Monitor: CLT Updates and FAA Progress: CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 19 is CLT Operations Updates document.
- ❖ Hair: The biggest operational update is adding Matt. We do have dedicated noise staff again. Melissa will be engaging more with noise, the community piece on noise, and ACR-related stuff.
 - Key Measures are here - you can see the numbers. There is real good data on our website. The airport has fully recovered, and we are setting new records. Every single business metric you can look at, we are above last year, and we are setting records from an operational standpoint.
 - Growth and development standpoint – Terminal lobby expansion is reaching some significant events. Small ceremony next Friday - unveiling Queen Charlotte. Design work on the 4th parallel runway is proceeding. A lot of enabling projects are reaching significant milestones with 60% designs on some roadways on the South side and North side of the airfield. We are hitting new records and struggling to keep up with that from an infrastructure perspective. As long as the community grows, there will always be construction and demand for more flights and aircraft here at the airport.
 - Runway 5K is next Saturday the 21st, with 1,600 neighbors coming out to run on the runway. Aviation Academy - learning more about the airport. Nakia participated in this before and is a subject matter expert on the airport now! Applications are open now for about another month. Class of 35 people. You all already know the fundamental information. This is really a deep dive into being subject matter

experts around the airport. It's 8 weeks, a few hours a week. It is an extensive training. Link to the application is available.

- ❖ Loflin: When will the lobby be generally done?
- ❖ Hair: The TLE, which is the scoped project that is under construction right now, has a complete delivery date of 2025. Holiday season 2024 should show substantial work. The project should demobilize 2025.

ACR's Response to the FAA's Noise Policy Review

- ❖ Rutzell: At the last ACR meeting we reviewed and showcased our response to the FAA Survey. It was submitted by the end of September. You can reread what we submitted; it is in the newsletter.
- ❖ Pollack: Did we go over the North flow figures?
- ❖ Gagnon: It was shown, but not discussed.
- ❖ Pollack: I did want to chat about the mix. You cannot really see, as we don't have the monthly breakouts. This past month was one of those months that the local Air Traffic Control policies are punishing folks to the South of the airport, particularly folks at the western runway. When the wind speed is high enough, they are forced to head South. There is no effort being made to make use of days when there is a choice to be made, to flow to the South, and there is a strong preference clearly to flow to the North. As a consequence, people living down South of the airport and particularly folks getting all these arrivals under the western most runway, this last month has been difficult. I would like to understand from local ATC here, what the policy is. When they have choices, why are they always going North? And is there any consideration to try to change the flow?
- ❖ Libby: When it comes to North and South, CLT airport is most efficient in North operation. There is more concrete, more pavement, aircraft can move more efficiently on the ground. Right now, we have a lot of construction going on. We have restrictions in South operation with localizers and CAT 2, CAT 3 runways. When weather is bad, we use North operations because we can go lower. Center runway, a lot of RJs won't use that runway because of RNAV approach. North is the most efficient operation.
- ❖ Gagnon: For my edification, can you redefine some of those terms you used?
- ❖ Libby: ILS – produces a signal. Most aircraft use ILS. ILS puts a signal out at the center of the runway. There is also a signal that goes across. They track the signal and catch it and follow it in. The glideslope lets them know if they are too far away, up, down. RNAV approach is GPS approach. It is on their computers. They see a line on their computers, and they follow it. CAT 1, 2, and 3. CAT 1 ceiling (clouds - visibility) minimums. CAT 2 and 3, visibility is lower. If they cannot see the runway at a certain point, they will go around. With GPS, there is different criteria for each aircraft. Airbuses will fly RNAV approach, but local guys, RJs will not.
- ❖ Pollack: There is a lot of information. On efficiency point, is there a quantitative number for that? How do we quantify the efficiency, and is there any view of the noise impact? Is there an effort to quantify the number and try to balance it out?
- ❖ Libby: There is way more to air traffic - at play - than surface. The reason why we prefer North flow is the flow from Atlanta center, which is the guys high up in the air like 36,000 feet – it is hard to explain without looking at it – envision Charlotte in the middle, and Northwest of Charlotte you have 2 gates, 2 lines. To the Northeast you have one, to the Southwest and to the Southeast you have 2 lines. And by lines I mean 2 feeds. So, they are coming in side by side from 3 corners and a single feed, which is the CHSLY/Northeast, which is our busiest, and that is why you get delayed if you go to the Northeast. The blending of aircraft, yes, saves money on fuel efficiency, but doesn't do much for Charlotte airport; but for the users, it does a lot for them; also time for the passenger – ensuring they don't have undue delay. When I talk about lines, they are RNAV lines. They are points that the aircraft follow, and the plane flies itself following these lines. Metroplex started about 7 years ago. Lots of play, a whole lot of people look at this data. When it follows that, Charlotte prefers North operation. There is a lot at play, not just on the surface, but in the air as well.
- ❖ Pollack: I would be curious to know what the per passenger savings would be.

- ❖ Libby: I don't know where you would get that information.
- ❖ Gagnon: We can see if there is a way to find those types of studies.
- ❖ Libby: The FAA does not track that. Maybe the airlines do.
- ❖ Montross: But when Metroplex was implemented, there was a lot of quantification about why that was a more efficient standpoint. I'm trying to understand the objective of the line of questioning?
- ❖ Gagnon: I can give a quick summary. On the Local Operations Project Team, a previous member was very interested in North vs. South flow. Because based on the flow, different people are impacted different ways. As you look at the chart highlighted on the screen, except for last year, it has not been close to 50/50. So, the Local Ops team – this question started 3 or 4 years ago – is looking for a way for the airport to get at a more 50/50 mix. When decisions are made, if there is any “discretion” that is available to Air Traffic Controllers in terms of North or South flow, can the mix be more equal? It has been the desire on the part of the ACR to try to – if there is any discretion available – get the overall mix to 50/50. That is why the group is still looking at it, trying to understand. I want to make sure that we are supporting Jacob and other members of the Local Ops group on this topic.
- ❖ Rutzell: I think we should take this offline.
- ❖ Pollack: That's fine.

FAA Update on Implementation Process for Alternative Recommendation #3a

- ❖ Johnson: We are still moving forward on that. Hope to bring that project in sometime early next summer.
- ❖ Rutzell: That's wonderful news. Thank you.
- ❖ Hair: It is definitely the ACR's work that went into the recommendations and led to this change that we think will mitigate noise impacts across the community. When we look at the mission of the ACR, we have a victory, and when it is implemented, we will definitely need to celebrate.
- ❖ Johnson: I don't want to set the bar too high. It will help but not eliminate all the noise.
- ❖ Gagnon: The original recommendation was to raise 2 waypoints by 1,000 feet, then it was adjusted to raise 7 waypoints by 1,000 feet. Gene and his HMMH team did analysis on this recommendation at a prior ACR meeting, as well. Just reminders on those points. Any other questions? *None.*

Address Additional Business

❖ Unfinished Business

- Gagnon: Page 20. This is our set of Requests and Motions from the July meeting. We did send FAA presentation on the Noise Policy Review to you all. You all provided edits to that document, and it was revised by Natalie, Phil, and Jacob. It was submitted by Natalie.
 - CLT is still in the process of analyzing recent trends and complaint/complainant data, so that is underway.
 - The Motions that were approved at the last meeting are here on Pages 20 and 21. Page 22 is Written Updates Document. There are no new updates to share, but we always include this. I believe the last update we had was when CLT did a polling of the carriers about the NADP-2 recommendation. This was about a year ago, and fortunately all carriers were using NADP-2.

❖ New Business

- Rutzell: Does anyone have any additional business? *No.*

Adjourn

- ❖ Washington motioned to adjourn. Brown seconded, All in favor.
- ❖ Meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm