Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: April 17, 2019

Attendees

Kurt Wiesenberger, City 2
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Sara Nomellini, County 2
Sherry Washington, County 4
John Garrett, County 5
Mark Loflin, County 6
Bob Cameron, Davidson
Kim Hardee, Matthews
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Bob Lemon, Huntersville
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA (ex-officio)
Sonya Busch, FAA
Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Dan Gardon, CLT
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Cathy Schroeder, CSS
Call-in Participants: None

Summary Minutes

- Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- Open the Meeting
  - Sara Nomellini opened the meeting by thanking all for attending.
  - **Approve Minutes:** Loflin moved to approve. Wiesenberger seconded. All motioned to approve.
  - **Review Ground Rules** by Gagnon: Apply to all in the room and with all communications. Main focus is to have healthy, productive, effective meetings.
  - **Review Meeting Packet Information**
    - Gagnon reviewed information in packet. Agenda, Minutes from last month's meeting, Noise Improvement Matrix, Request/Motions database is very large so not included, and a couple of PowerPoints, including HMMH's analysis. Please remember when speaking to use the microphones, pressing the green button. Introduced Bob Lemon, new from Huntersville.
- Receive Public Input – No speakers tonight.
- Analyze/Uncover
  - **Presentation on CLT Baseline Noise Metrics – Gene Reindel, Vice President HMMH**
    - Gagnon: Next we will have Gene come up, and he will walk us through some baseline data that you all will be comparing the recommendations against as you move forward.
    - Reindel: Fortunately, I have all the results of data. Had extra folks to help. Not happy with the color results but will have that corrected next month. You'll see a lot of yellow, and it makes it hard to see with the land use colors.
      - We took a full year of flight tracking aircraft identification data from the airport monitoring station - calendar year 2018. That is the basis for all the analysis we are going to do. We did not change the data – only ran the data through the noise model.
      - Slide 4: Obtained current land use data and population data within study area. All of this is in the grid analysis that we have been doing. Each grid point has been assigned a level or a number based on our analysis. First is population, next is maximum sound level, number of events above 70 dB. We also included the day night average sound level (DNL) – we think the FAA is going to want to see that. We have DNL values at each grid point. Then we determined the counts of each grid point using the baseline data. Then in tabular form we determined the population exposed to various Lmax points and DNL ranges.

- Reindel: Slide 4: This map shows the land uses. A lot of yellow and will conflict with the yellow grid points. We are going to redesignate what these are: Non compatible land use in yellow – these are residential and churches, etc. They are only non-compatible according to regulations of being inside the 65 DNL. We are going to change the nomenclature a bit. So where there is yellow, there are people residing - noise sensitive. Take a look at these maps. If they have these electronically, they can zoom in on areas.
- Gardon: We can provide those maps electronically probably by tomorrow.
- Reindel: So, we obtained the current land use of population data for the full year of flight tracks, plotted over the land use map. Note that the FAA considers all land uses to be compatible with aircraft related DNL levels below 65. Most residential and other noise sensitive land uses considered by the FAA are incompatible with aircraft related DNL above 65, so 65 is the federal regulation limit of whether they are compatible or incompatible, and land use is always changing. Base map may not reflect all recent changes or development. The first one is population. Using the table on the slide (5) you can see population interval and number of grid points. Notice the key on right of slide – harder to see – but it gives the population points (# of people at a particular dot). This will help us determine where population resides or exists. Maybe we can look at this and provide areas that may work for redirecting some flight patterns. You'll want to take a look at this and get to know it a bit.
- Wright: Can you zoom? (Not available on this slide). Asked about grid points.
- Reindel: There are 563 grid points on the map that have no population.
- Cameron: This references "the study area." It looks like there are areas on the edges of the map with no grid points. Does that mean they are not within the study area?
- Reindel: We are trying to determine if we will expand the grids out.
- Cameron: Could you provide a few geographical points. What is that lake North of the airport? The place with no population, is that a lake?
- Reindel: I would have to get back to you. Clearly there is a park or a non-developed place there. No yellow, so no residential in that area. Looks like maybe some water.
- Cameron: Is the scale at the bottom 4 nautical miles?
- Reindel: Yes. We also put in some boundaries – these brown areas are Steele Creek area (as told by airport staff), SouthPark area, and Mountain Island Lake area. Identified these areas that had been asked to identify as landmarks in addition to the other locations noted in blue as landmarks.
- Wright: So, is that part of the Catawba? (In that area that Gene was highlighting with his laser pointer)
- Gardon: The area is Mountain Island Lake about 8 miles North of the airport. The extent of this map is 20x20. 10n miles from the airport all around.
- Wiesenberger: How large is a grid point? Is it an acre, a mile?
- Gagnon: With 6400 dots (80 dots by 80 dots) so ¼ mile per dot if 20x20 miles.
- Reindel: Slide 6. This is the baseline results for the maximum sound level analysis based on 2018 operations. Going forward all will have the interval of the matrix, the count of grid points and the population. You can get an idea of the population exposed to each maximum sound level. Ed asked a good question before this. It could be that there was one event in 2018 that caused the maximum sound, and yes it could be that maximum level is from a single event. It could also be hundreds or thousands of events that are at that same level. That is why we do numbers above because it provides more context with not only the level but how often it occurs during the day.
- Wright: The slide is mostly yellow.
- Reindel: It's mostly yellow except near the airport. The outermost yellow is 70-80 dB. Then the red is over 100 dB in some places. It is not all yellow, but we are going to change the color pallet. So now you have some numbers to work with. We will stick with this grid size unless

you want to extend it out. I recommend we just narrow it in because all the things we have been talking about are relatively in that area. Here is the situation today, and here are things we are trying to change and how will that affect it. We will see the difference when we do analysis to these metrics.

- Gagnon: To clarify: Looking at the table on slide 6 (Ed summarized this slide, noting how many people had at least 1 flight at that noise level).
- Reindel: That's correct.
- Brown: How are these noise levels measured? Are they measured by sensors?
- Reindel: No, this is all using the FAA's noise model. That is a benefit of noise model over noise measurements is that you can model at all these grid points. You would never be able to do measurements at all these grid points.
- Wright: So, this is not an average?
- Reindel: No this is the loudest aircraft noise event at each of these grid points.
- Nomellini: So, we have determined that anything above 50 or 55 dB induces some level of discomfort. I understand that this is an FAA definition, but for those of us living underneath it, it is much higher than what we would consider acceptable. Is there a way to modify the model to reduce that?
- Reindel: This 70 dB is the maximum sound level as an aircraft goes over a particular grid point. It is not the same metric as the day night sound level (DNL), which is what the Federal regulation is based off of, which is the 65 DNL. You can have events well above 80 – 90 dB within that 65 DNL contour. It is two totally different things. This is not showing DNL. This is showing the loudest part of a flight path as it goes over a grid point.
- Nomellini: Understood. That is a noise level that is higher than would be of interest to me knowing that what is supposed to be an acceptable level is between 50 and 55.
- Reindel: Based on what?
- Nomellini: If you look at websites about citizens being concerned with noise, it is saying that an acceptable level is 50 to 55. If I look at this, it does not help me understand – if I was looking at a proposal – whether or not it provides any relief. If it changes from 70 to 65 or 60, that is still too high. Does that make sense?
- Reindel: It does. I question whether people find a single event basis of 55 unacceptable. Studies show that annoyance is on a day night level sound, and that is a cumulative metric. The World Health Organization recommendation is 45, but that's on a LDEN basis - that is on a level during the day, evening, night – a cumulative 24 hour average. You cannot compare a 75 dB single event to even a 45 LDEN or a 65 DNL. There is no regulation for single event noise level.
- Garrett: For reference. How loud is 75 dB?
- Reindel: If you are talking at 3 feet distance, that sound level is about 70 dB. Normal conversation is 65 dB. Amplified conversation is usually between 70 and 80 dB depending on size of room and number of people talking.
- Cameron: This is based on less than 70. Do you have the capability of putting in a layer that also shows less than 60?
- Reindel: We could go to lower levels. There is nothing under 70 on the grid. No grid point that has anything less than 70 as a maximum sound level.
- Cameron: On slide 6 you have 15,902 at less than 70. From what I understand, we don't know if that is 1000 events or 1 event.
- Reindel: If we went down to 65 or so, we are not going to get very many of those. The problem is that the model has difficulty determining how accurate that is at lower levels.
- Gardon: We are talking about 2 separate things. We typically measure the contours, our normal maps on a DNL basis. That is an average during the day and night and when planes are overhead and not overhead. That is where the feds describe the 65 DNL. Many organizations

want lower – 55 or 45. What Gene is talking about is Lmax, which is single event – a plane flew over, how loud was that single event? 65 dB is the sound of my voice if we were 3 feet apart. So 70 dB Lmax is not very high. Over 200,000 people had at least 1, and that includes people out in Belmont and the far west. To get a single event under 55 is likely not going to happen, unless the aircraft is at 10,000 feet or so.

- Reindel: There are 355 points less than 70. They were probably in the 60s, probably not getting down to 55 even.
- Cameron: This is just one piece. The real irritation comes with frequency.
- Reindel: Which is why we have the number above 70 so you could tell how many during the day.
- Wright: So, what is the DNL-to-dB equation?
- Member: Shown in 2 more slides.
- Reindel: Slide 7: Noise analysis for number of events above 70 dB for baseline operations. This slide talks about number of events above 70 at each grid point (Summarized this slide). This slide talks about frequency. We don't know how often the flights happen, but we do know the number of times.
    - Slide 8: Day night sound level. Went with 45 DNL and greater. So less than 45 DNL is almost 4000 grid points and the population affected is 480K. Fewer grid points as you get higher in dB because you are getting closer to the airport. DNL is the one metric that is centric of where the aircraft begins their flight and works its way away from the airport. So, by this chart you can see what population is affected based on 2018 operations.
- Wright: So, the first column is DNL. I want DNL and dB side-by-side.
- Reindel: You can't compare. You need to have the two different maps open side-by-side. You could superimpose the two to compare.
- Wright: I understand it is 2 different measurements. I guess there is no formula to say 70 dB equates to the Lmax value?
- Reindel: No. You cannot say what the single event noise level is at a particular spot based on DNL. At a certain DNL, you are going to have a wide range of maximum values. Lots of things vary.
- Wiesenberger: Is the DNL the best representation of the frequency to that sound level?
- Reindel: Not necessarily. Industry-wide, we are starting to look at number of events above because…I show this graphic – "What makes up a DNL?" One event can create that 65 DNL for a day, but you can have many quieter events also create 65. It is about how loud an event is and how many loud events you get to put into your DNL equation.
- Wiesenberger: Can I ask that you share that?
- Reindel: I could do a Noise 101 to familiarize you with the metrics that we use and how you get to them, and what they mean.
- Wiesenberger: I think that would be helpful, particularly when we share with the broader community.
- Reindel: Probably should do that sooner rather than later. That background will help you understand each of these metrics. In summary, take a close look at these. Get any questions to Dan, and he can get them to me. If you put these on your screen, you can zoom in.
- Wright: Going back to the previous slide (slide 8), I don't see a correlation between the complaints and the numbers on this slide.
- Reindel: (Told us about a study in Oakland) Their noise format had the same question: Operations are going up, but complaints are not going up, or the opposite. They wanted to know what the correlation is between complaints and other metrics. Unfortunately, we don't see correlations with number of operations, we don't see complaints with loud noise level. Most of the complaints today are being filed from people outside the 45 DNL contour. Previous, 15-20 years ago, complaints were more close to the 65 DNL. You have complaints

when you have dramatic change, like when Metroplex was implemented here - spike in complaints when something changes. It's hard to correlate complaints to much else, unfortunately.

- Gagnon: I know that you are going to be coming back to the group with analyses of individual recommendations and how they compare to the baseline. If they were to make a recommendation, would an example be that you come back and compare the baseline data to what the group is recommending such as *"the baseline shows 480k people with a DNL under 45, and if you make that change, HMMH will show that # decreases to 450k with a DNL under 45 or increases to 510k with a DNL under 45 – the 'before with the baseline' and the 'after with the recommended change?'"*
- Reindel: That is exactly what we will provide for every alternative that we are looking at. We will have baseline slide and the recommended data on a slide – we'll show the grid points with data and population. I think we will also look further than that. Where are those changes? We defined the community areas, and we can analyze the changes at those areas, if you are interested. We are showing these baseline measures so we can see how effective or not the measures are compared to these.
- Brown: It will also show the effect of the reduction AND the increase.
- Reindel: Yes, all change.
- Wright: Again, I am thinking about what this data represents. Can you explain how you are determining the grid points and the population?
- Reindel: So, the grid is a standard grid – we believe it is ¼ mile for each grid point; each grid has a population assigned to it. The grid point represents a square area. Based on the census and other data we were provided, we could determine population in each area.
- Wright: But this is not based on complaints. It is based on the DNL levels that are occurring around the grid.
- Reindel: Yes, or the Lmax, or the noise above a certain level. Not complaints - only looking at pure population and each of the noise metrics that we talked about.
- Reindel: Slides 11 and 12 - Talking about the ACR adopted slate of recommendations. If you have recommendations about having some evaluations done before others, we could prioritize. Slide 13: HMMH has questions. Each ACR recommendation is listed and Priority TBD, clarification or questions from HMMH. For instance, the first recommendation, HMMH wants to know if they should look at North Flow as well as South Flow. Only looked at South flow in the past.
- Nomellini: To expedite, the understanding was we should look at both South and North.
- Reindel: We may not be able to look at both the same. The FAA has different guidelines and operating procedures to the North. We may not be able to implement it the same way to the North, which is why this question. The way they operate to the North now is most efficient. I am not saying not to do it; we may apply it slightly differently to the North. That is why we asked this question.
- Nomellini: Anyone from the North? The North is as important as the South. I think what we do to the South we do North as well.
- Wiesenberger: I am not affected by departures to the North.
- Brown: The condos near 485 - those folks have not bought the houses yet.
- Hardee: I was not told by realtor that there would be noise, and was told that the realtor did not have to disclose.
- Wiesenberger: Interpreting the comments, let's apply to the North.
- Reindel: We may find that it is a disbenefit to the North and a benefit to the South, but at least we have done the analysis.
    - Divergent departure headings. We will work with the FAA more. How do we apply the divergent headings? I know that the FAA and AA want divergent headings. What they

have in mind, I think, is that as soon as they gain enough altitude, then they turn. That allows them to have more departures because you are not waiting for another plane to get out of the way.

- Nomellini: How is that different from altitude-based turn on departure?
- Reindel: They are similar. The purpose of divergent heading is to get aircraft deconflicted out of the way of each other. The runways are too close together for them to go straight and fly side-by-side. So you have to diverge them away from each other. So, you would do that as soon as you had enough altitude to turn them. With altitude-based turns, we are delaying that turn until they got more altitude.
- Nomellini: Doesn't removing the 2-mile constraint fix that?
- Reindel: What is typical for divergent headings, you would have to remove the 2-mile restraint, yes.
- Garrett: Can we review divergent headings? Is it multiple headings? What is the divergent part?
- Reindel: Normally, with runways so close together like they are here, need to determine the angle that they need to diverge in order for them to operate independently. Turn as soon as altitude allows. It is usually a heading where they need to go. We have talked about modifying that here - perhaps having different departure headings. We are looking at delayed departure headings based on where they are going. If they are going east, they would take this divergent heading. This is a good discussion. Typically, the heading is the same.
- Garrett: But we don't want to have departure rails like we have arrival rails.
- Reindel: I think divergent headings do that pretty well because aircraft do not perform equally, so they will get to altitude in a different space, so it makes for dispersion. Not the same as RNAV. Maybe not to the amount of dispersion we would like, but that is why we are looking at other things.
- Nomellini: Would it be fair to say if we got rid of the 2-mile constraint, it would be some kind of divergent heading similar to what is happening in the north? They almost overlap.
- Reindel: Yes. Cannot do one without the other.
- Gagnon: To clarify a point that John brought up. Looking at HMMH analysis from October. Right now when they are departing from the South, is it 240 degrees in the initial heading?
- Szymkiewicz: Yes, at 2-miles or before.
- Gagnon: In the analysis that HMMH did in October said…what if when we divert we have some flights divert off 18C at 240, others at 220, others at 200, etc. So, all the 240s might be going to the northwest but the idea is you might have multiple divergent headings off of 18C and that makes the fanning effect. Divergent departure headings is the angle they turn, and altitude-based turns is the altitude when they turn, correct?
- Reindel: You would still have an angle to turn. Multiple divergent headings is not the same as divergent headings, but you could have multiple. If you had multiple of those, would it help disperse?
- Hardee: When I lived on this side of town and launched all my complaints about 2008-2010, we were told that South departure was the FAA's preferred operation because it was most efficient. Is it still?
- Szymkiewicz: Back then, we were South about 65% of the time, and one reason was the weather favored that. It has become closer to 50/50 and maybe even more North operations.
- Gardon: That's correct. In 2018 - 65% North flow. Different factors like runway use with 5/23.
- Reindel: With divergent headings, we will work with the FAA to see what will work best and that would require the removal of the 2-mile restriction.
- Garrett: If just having a single heading on South flow, it seems like it will not disperse it.

- Reindel: I haven't done the analysis, but if we remove the 2-mile restriction and allow them to do divergent headings, you will have more dispersion. Right now, they are all turning at 2-miles, so they are all at the same place. They are at a safe altitude at 2-miles.
- Garrett: Will they all turn at 500 feet?
- Reindel: Yes, but they won't get to 500' at the same distance.
- Garrett: It occurs that having multiple divergent headings would manage that dispersal better.
- Reindel: We'll look at having multiple as well. If we just say divergent headings, they will pick a heading, and all will turn there.
- Nomellini: I think we need more information.
- Brown: I did a proposal a couple months ago. Delaying the turn to altitude-based turn, not all aircraft get to the same altitude at the same time. If you are talking about a specific DME, everyone will be turning at that particular mileage. The only divergence you will get is the rate of turn – 3 or 10 degree angle bank. You can all go to the same heading, but if you use an altitude-based turn, everyone gets to that altitude at a different place. Or use a combination of DME (distance measuring equipment) and altitude-based turn. Why was the 2 DME restriction put in?
- Gardon: That has been in place since 1956 – well before Berewick. Predates many of the neighborhoods. Almost too much effort to change it. My understanding is that the airport is open to removing the 2-mile restriction if and when the analysis goes through.
- Brown: *(Asked FAA that they have to turn after 2-miles and before 4 miles)*
- Szymkiewicz: Turn no sooner than 2 and before 4. In a busy airport, we have an assembly line, so we need some predictability. Depends on what altitude Gene picks whether we will give pushback.
- Reindel: I think I understand what we are going to do with divergent heading. So, on South departures, should the delay also be considered for north?
- Nomellini: Yes. North flow - thanks.
- Gagnon: Quick summary asked for by Sara and Kurt. HMMH: Would do a Noise 101 and would later use that information to educate the broader public. Next, when the recommendations are evaluated, Gene would show the metrics for the recommendations v. baseline. Are we effecting more or less people? They will put tables side-by-side for comparison. Along with showing the 3 different areas that we have identified as having many complaints when Metroplex was implemented, they could probably look at Lmax dots - will they see more noise or less noise?
- Loflin: When we get these results, will we get information on other areas that are not within this map?
- Reindel: No. We don't know if there will be an effect other places; we are just looking at this area.
- Loflin: So, when we make recommendations, we will not know if we are making others uncomfortable outside of the 20-mile box?
- Wiesenberger: When planes get 10 miles from the airport, we're making the assumption they're not as loud.
- Gagnon: 70 dB was also brought up – should we look at levels below that, what are the capabilities/benefit? We'll have conversations between meetings. Another takeaway: North and South equal, East and West equal – in terms of what will be analyzed.

❖ Review/Refine Draft Overall Goals/Guiding Principles

- Nomellini: This is going to help us determine if we want to push things forward to the FAA. I got some feedback, and some of them were very detailed. Make sure that we are moving in the right direction and start building off of that.
- Gagnon: Macro View: Overriding goal of what ACR is trying to do: Reduce the airplane noise effect on the population. *(Group agreed on the Goal description)*

- Gagnon: Micro View: Desired effect: Looking at the areas that get lots of noise – How are they affected? Is the focus on "higher affected areas?"
- Nomellini: Understanding that changing one area may affect others. We want to be clear that we need to be fair.
- Cameron: What constitutes **higher** affected?
- Gagnon: Not necessarily looking at numbers now. ACR needs to make that decision.
- Cameron: Is higher affected not included outside the contour? Is the contour the 65 DNL?
- Hennessey: Yes. I think you will almost always be outside the contour. The contour to the South is only a half mile before the current turn.
- Brown: Getting rid of the 2-mile restriction will get more complaints.
- Hennessey: Yes.
- Brown: That's why I think we need to get higher.
- Garrett: So my question earlier – if you do all these things under desired effect - the noise is going to happen, it's just a matter of where? If you want to get less people to experience the noise, you fly all planes over the same point, but that's not desirable because you're disproportionately burdening those people.
- Wiesenberger: I think there are exceptions. Dispersion is a big part of it. There are technical advances in engine noise and category 5. I think this is the metric of how we make recommendations. Will they achieve these effects?
- Garrett: Since we have no control over engines, etc., we are saying dispersion is what we have the ability to effect, right?
- Nomellini: Not necessarily. If we could find an industrial area that met all the criteria for the FAA, we could send all planes over that, and that is not dispersion.
- Wright: I think part of what we want to see is that the airlines are doing what they should be doing. They are not flying lower than they are supposed to, or they are not flying over areas they are not supposed to be flying over.
- Gagnon: Let's say we have these 8 recommendations to submit to the FAA. Are they implemented correctly? This is where HMMH will come back and tell us what should be able to work.
- Wright: This is current state and future state – are guidelines currently being followed by the airlines, and will they follow the recommendations.
- Gagnon: About 6 months ago during public input, we had a speaker asking about departure profiles: Are we flying according to procedure? Probably something for the Noise Improvement Matrix. *Showed this graphic:* When we talk about higher affected areas – this box represents what HMMH is analyzing, basically 6400 dots – 20 miles by 20 miles. *Pointed out airport and contour.* When HMMH comes back with data, we can determine are those higher affected areas getting any relief? So, with that definition in mind, any thoughts? Would that be a focus? Making sure the folks that need the most relief getting it? *Members had no concerns with focusing review of recommendations on higher affected areas.*
- Nomellini: I think in order to expedite this, only talk of objections.
- Gagnon: Any objections to number of flights per day?
- Brown: I don't object, but how is the airport going to accept this?
- Nomellini: I understand. We are trying to identify pain points. This is a way to evaluate and score those things.
- Garrett: Remember we are saying "for higher affected areas."
- Gagnon: Yes, as an example, let's say one area is getting 200 flights above a certain noise level, and another is getting 10. You make a change, and the first area now has 170 flights and the other has 40. Getting some relief in the higher affected areas. Although we're moving some of the noise, that area with 40 may still be well under the threshold that the ACR establishes as being "highly affected."

- Gagnon: Any objections to reducing number of flights per day? *No objections.*
- Gagnon: Any objections to reducing the number of night flights? *No objections.* What about reducing the plane noise level? *No objections.*
  - Before we get into groups affected outside the contour, is your primary concern those folks outside the contour area? If there is a 65 DNL contour, the folks inside the contour - they have had ability to be bought out or insulated if built before 1979.
- Hennessey: That is correct. If built after 1979, they're not eligible.
- Wiesenberger: I would like to stay with the same terminology. Higher affected areas, and we have a definition of what that is. Then call bullet point 2 – lesser affected areas.
- Hennessey: The folks inside the contour have been abated, and they don't complain. The folks that are actively filing complaints are outside of the contour.
- Cameron: I think that the higher and lower is a good idea.
- Garrett: Higher affected area not the same as inside the contour? I am in a highly affected area, and I am outside the contour.
- Gardon: We are saying "higher affected areas" can be used outside the contour as well.
- Gagnon: Going forward we will eliminate the reference to the contour. In terms of the evaluation criteria, these get at number of people affected, any objections to that? *No objections.* What about locations of high plane noise - any concerns?
- Nomellini: How is that different from people? – neighborhoods/ locations.
- Gagnon: It is geographic as opposed to people.
- Member: Could it be an area like The Sanctuary gets a lot of complaints but is not necessarily densely populated?
- Garrett: Can we do that with HMMH data?
- Reindel: We would have to identify the areas. Yes, we could.
- Nomellini: To me, when we get the results and we see an area of high noise, we can hone in on that area and get more information. Keep 2B in.
- Gagnon: What about 2C - Focus on schools? Any objections?
- Cameron: I wonder if you want to include hospitals or patient health facilities.
- Montross: Today the City Council committee met and discussed their noise ordinances, and they included medical facilities, churches, schools. You may want to connect the two definitions.
- Cameron: Are we walking down a path that is overlooked? Minimize the negative – look at the possibility of unintended consequences.
- Gagnon: Even as we are talking about the higher affected areas, we also want to make sure we are not overlooking other areas that may get noise. So, you have decided to accept all these and look for unintended consequences. Any other comments as we wrap up next steps?
- Wiesenberger: Keep the same language as council. For the purpose of consistency.
- Montross: Council is going to vote at upcoming meeting. It has only been discussed at committee meeting, not been voted on. Look at where you are moving noise - Environmental justice considerations.
- Gagnon: We can add: We can follow the city's noise ordinance process and follow some of their terminology once that's decided.
- Garrett: How would we find out what council is changing? Are they talking about airport noise at all?
- Hennessey: I'd have to find out. Probably not airplane noise. It would be traditional noise.
- Montross: You'll hear about in the news tomorrow.
- Reindel: Airport noise is exempt from those regulations. It is because of federal mandate.

- Gagnon: We will keep this as is and follow what the city does and revisit. In terms of before the May meeting, I will work with Sara and Kurt to tweak the Guiding Principles based on comments here tonight. We will bring back in May and finalize the metrics and Guiding Principles.

❖ Additional Business

- **Unfinished Business -** Gagnon: On the back of the Draft Guiding Principles handout, we are providing updates on various motions/requests such as Waypoints.
- **New Business**
  - Recent Procedural Changes?
    - Garrett: Have there been any procedural changes implemented in the last 6-12 months? I've noticed more noise on arrivals, and I got a call from someone in my district, Barclay Downs, who says he has more noise. Just wondering if there are material changes made.
    - Szymkiewicz: Not that I am aware of. In terms of Barclay Downs, that is near SouthPark? I am speculating: Do we have departure trainings?
    - Busch: Yes.
    - Szymkiewicz: We may have trainees in the building who may be turning right at 2-miles. I can try to look, but there is nothing procedurally.
    - Garrett: If natural variability, that's fine.
    - Wright: They are coming over my house. There has been an increase - early in the morning, midnight.
  - Agenda Approach – Written Updates
    - Nomellini: I wanted some feedback. I am trying to work on the Agenda so that we get to the meaty stuff and increase the time we spend on that. Things that are more informational are put on paper so we are spending our time wisely. So, if there is something on the FYI part that you would like to address, let us know and we can put it on the Agenda.
    - Cameron: Regarding the Voluntary Curfew request letter?
    - Gardon: The letter was sent to the ACR in March. All 8 responses from operators have been positive overall. I can compile those responses for the group.
  - Softcopy Maps
    - Loflin: For those of us who want to zoom in on maps, Dan, you will get that for us?
    - Gardon: Yes. I will send them first thing in the morning.
    - Loflin: And color changes as well?
    - Reindel: Yes.

❖ **Adjourn**

- Wright motioned to adjourn. Loflin seconded, all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:50 PM