

# Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

## Unapproved Summary Minutes: January 15, 2020

### Attendees

Sara Nomellini, Chair, County 2  
Kurt Wiesenberger, Vice Chair, Charlotte  
Joe Gater, City 3  
Priscilla Johnson, City 4  
Bobbi Almond, City 5  
Sherry Washington, County 4  
John Garrett, County 5  
Mark Loflin, County 6  
Sayle Brown, Cornelius  
Bob Cameron, Davidson

Walter Ballard, Lincoln  
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg  
Theresa Brunner, Pineville  
Kevin Vesely, York  
Bob Mentzer, HMMH (Technical Consultant)  
Courtney Goes, FAA  
Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA (ex-officio)  
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)  
Kevin Hennessey, CLT  
Dan Gardon, CLT  
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)  
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

**Call-in Participants:** None

## Summary Minutes

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- ❖ **Open the Meeting**
  - Approve Minutes: Loflin moved to approve. Member seconded. All voted to approve.
  - Review Ground Rules by Gagnon: They apply to all inside and outside the room, in the meetings and outside of the meetings. Healthy and respectful conversations, productive discussion.
  - Introductions: New member Joe Gater, representing City 3. Live in Berewick since 2007 - replacing Loren Schofield. Relocated from Pittsburgh. New FAA attendee: Courtney Goes; air traffic controller/operations manager. Worked in Charlotte 12 years.
  - Nomellini: Can we see who the person with the camera is to make sure that no one has objections to being photographed? (He is with CLT and the photos will be used internally, but could be used externally in annual report that they do every year). *No objections.*
  - Gagnon: Several months ago, we had an FAA submittal work schedule, and last month we converted that into a Checklist. At the beginning of each meeting, we want to get a sense of where we are in terms of the checklist to get to the point where you can submit to the FAA. First section was - Finish analysis of recommendations and finalize the slate. First 2 Action Items were review/approve expand baseline grid, which you all did last month; also last month review analysis on 6K minimum arrival altitude recommendation on expanded grid and to determine whether that should be on the final slate. Today after HMMH presents, we are going to vote to close this slate to new recommendations. Also last month you selected groupings for collective analysis, and there are a couple of other items that you will address. One is receiving feedback on potential non-starters that was suggested by FAA's Michael O'Harra. That is planned for February. Other items are: Reviewing 2<sup>nd</sup> collective analysis and also looking at all of the recommendations with the expanded grid. We have looked at all recommendations, except the 6K altitude, on the smaller grid. HMMH will give you the full grid analysis. We will look back at this at the end of the meeting. Any questions?
  - Review Meeting Packet Information by Gagnon: Cover page, agenda, minutes that you just approved, requests and motions that came out last meeting, then items that Bob M. will walk through. This is basically a statement of the purpose of the collective groupings. The full FAA submittal document, and complaints statistics that we provide every 6 months. Then PowerPoint from CLT and the PowerPoint from HMMH. Color coded key on table. Also on table is a packet that we will look at later.

- ❖ **Review Public Input:** No public presentations made tonight.
- ❖ **Analyze/Uncover**
  - Gagnon: Went over page 9 on CLT PowerPoint. This Slide is a reminder of slate recommendations. The month beside each item is when HMMH provided their full analysis. Now have 10 items. You can look back using this page to see what was presented on each item.
  - **Reviewing Purpose of Collective Analysis** – Robert Mentzer, Principal Consultant, HMMH
    - Mentzer: Presenting for Gene this month. We are looking at one of the collective analyses tonight. The collective groupings will do the following. They will enable you to understand the overall effect of the combination of the slate items - how it might affect the noise environment around the airport. Also, how those recommendations might affect the Guiding Principles. The groupings are for ACR use primarily. Only the individual recommendations will be submitted to the FAA. The full submittal packet will not be shown to the community. The public will see only the individual measures.
    - Cameron: Why?
    - Mentzer: Each of the groupings have some of the measures but not all of them. It is unclear which ones will be moved forward and which ones will not. The FAA will have their own process of how they will evaluate the data and how they will combine measures. So, it is best to not present to the public. Just for your use.
    - Wiesenberger: I am confused about that as well. In December, we talked about the collective groupings; now it seems like we are taking a step back away from those.
    - Nomellini: My recollection is that this is just another data point for us. They won't actually go back and model it because of the time involved, and it is not information that the FAA would require.
    - Cameron: If we made our decision on what we learned from the collective groupings, it seems that as we are a public group and the taxpayers are paying for the consultants, we should not shield the public. I understand not overtly sharing, but it seems like – that way you put it – we are trying to keep something from them.
    - Mentzer: No, and I don't want it to come across that way. We want the public meetings to be focused on the individual measures. This information is on the Slides and part of the website so the public can look at them.
    - Cameron: What public meetings are you talking about?
    - Mentzer: The ACR is planning public meetings to go over slate items once they are decided.
    - Garrett: Who is having the public meetings?
    - Gardon: It is a combination. Airport and HMMH staff will be there. Ideally the ACR will be represented, because at the end of the day, this is your decision. We will give you about 2 months' advanced notice. We are planning on 2 meetings currently - one north and one south of the airport.
    - Mentzer: Any other questions on the collective analysis purpose? (*None*)
  - **Sharing Results of First Collective Analysis** – Robert Mentzer, Principal Consultant, HMMH
    - Mentzer: There are a few things we will review. 1- The expanded grid size. Last month there was a question of Gene of the actual size of the grid, and also a clarification of the lack of downwind rails as depicted on the north side as they are on the south side for the number above 70 analysis. And then our collective analysis which is basically Grouping #14 – 6K foot downwind altitudes, divergent departure headings, and removing the 2-mile restriction.
      - First item: Expanding the grid size. At December 2019 meeting the ACR requested a clarification. It was 20 nautical miles by 20 nautical miles. We have since gone to 60 nautical miles in height and 40 miles wide. 30 miles north and south of the airport, and 20 miles to the west and east of the airport.
    - Nomellini: Can you explain the graphic at the bottom – with the lines outside the grid box?
    - Mentzer: This graphic behind the modeling grid is the extent of the radar data that we had. Flight track density plots of all the radar data. Arrivals from each corner.

- Cameron: Within the blue shaded area, can you identify what some of the furthest points are? What is that way up in the northwest?
- Gardon: Troutman is the farthest north, Lancaster Mill down south.
- Mentzer: Expanded grid is to be used going forward for all analysis. All the data was updated with the 2017 American Survey Census data.
- Wiesenberger: Question about the east and west parameters being 20 nautical miles. Will that encompass all the downwind legs of flights?
- Mentzer: Yes. *Pointed out the current downwinds.*
- Brown: Can you point to Cornelius? *Mentzer pointed them out on grid.*
- Mentzer: When I was here last time presenting, there was a lot of discussion on what was happening with arrivals south and north of the airport, and that was a major impetus on enlarging the grid.
- Vesely: Moving forward, can you make these available for us to take home so we can blow them up on our computers? *(Yes)*
- Mentzer: 2nd item: Clarification on the lack of downwind rails depicted to the North as they are to the South for N70 analysis. We had presented noise and flight track analysis increasing and maintaining altitudes of 6000 feet at the December meeting. We modified calendar year 2018 so that the aircraft would maintain 6K feet on the downwind based on different altitudes for each of the 3 parallel runways. There was a question about why the number of average daily noise events above 70 for south flow arrivals did not depict downwind rails. You will see why on the next graph. Slide 5 and Slide 6: The area in question are these lobes representing downwinds on North flow. There are events in the north, but they are less than 26 events, and that is why it is not showing up in the graph.
  - Slide 7: The areas on the north and south of the airport where the downwind rails would appear, and in the baseline they show up but by raising the minimum altitudes, they go away. They go away because they are at a higher altitude.
- Brown: That is an excellent Slide. At 6K feet, no noise.
- Vesely: I would like to point out why in the south you have more noise; when we were doing analysis, there are twice as many flights that use the downwind rails down south.
- Mentzer: We modeled the calendar year 2018, and the overall runway use was about 60% in north flow which is 20% more flights than down south. That is why there are more noise events on the south side of the airport than what is showing on the north side. It is not that there is no noise underneath the rails here; it is just not showing because it is less than 26 events.
- Brown: That shows perfectly what 6000 feet downwind can do for you.
- Wiesenberger: The baseline on Slide 7, what is the altitude at the downwind legs down south?
- Vesely: What is it supposed to be or what is it really? Today if you modeled, it is 3500. Supposed to be 4000. On the west it is supposed to be 5000-6000, but it is 4700.
- Mentzer: As I said the north flow for 2018 was 60%, and south flow was approximately 40% - which is why you do not see the number of events above 25 on the north side for the downwind rails.
- Vesely: When you were calculating the downwinds staying at 6000, is that also assuming that every plane stays at 6000 even if the planes are backed up as they usually are? The reason I ask is because you cannot have all the planes stay at 6K at the waypoint all the way in. We have the glidepath and clearance for landing. The intent of the suggestion was certainly come from EPA/FAA and then come right in lower on the downwind. If you are staying at 6K regardless, the airlines will not be happy as using more fuel. We did further analysis and found that there were just 70 flights or less that needed to come further instead of 700 or 800 flights that come the whole distance. That is a significant point. Cannot assume that all the planes will be flying further while staying at 6K.
- Mentzer: What was done for the modeling, if they were coming in and they were higher than 6K, they would continue to descend to 6K, and they were kept at 6K and stayed there for a certain distance. Then they were allowed to descend in – in some cases they had to fly further south.
- Vesely: Right now, they could stay at 6K and then turn, except for about 70 flights. I don't know if the assumption that every plane has to come down – I don't know if it's a correct assumption.

- Mentzer: I will have to look back and see how it was modeled.
- Vesely: Again, if the plane can land sooner, great.
- Brown: I think what you are saying is majority of the planes are traveling 18 miles south of the airport. Maybe 25 or 30 could turn at 14 or 12 miles out. The majority of the planes are going past 18 miles anyway, so why don't you keep them at 6000 feet. They will be able to intercept the glide path after 18 miles from below.
- Mentzer: When we looked at the data, we did raise them up if they were below 6K.
- Brown: The intent would be to have the majority of them at 6000 feet on the downwind. Is that what you are saying, Kevin?
- Vesely: Yes, and also right now, most planes coming in on that center runway, they fly 30 miles back at 3900 feet and stay at 3900. That is a bit much. It is very important to me. To say that the planes have to have 1000 feet separation, they don't do that now. It is just the turning that they have to be separated.
- Ballard: In arrival rails, the baseline and the modified do not look different. I recall from last month, that we had more events above 70 dB on the arrival rails particularly up north because it affected me and my house. So, I am puzzled why I am not seeing a difference on the charts - particularly on the south.
- Mentzer: The only change is on the downwinds on the outside.
- Ballard: That is not what was shown last month. We had more flights going further downwind because of the higher altitudes, therefore more flights coming in on the arrival rails than previous. I know the charts because I asked for blowups so I could look at it and saw that my house was directly underneath the ones that had more noise events.
- Gagnon: I think I can help with that. This is showing N70. This is based on total noise. I think what you could be referencing was the graphic of number of overflights.
- Ballard: No. Absolutely not.
- Vesely: Could it be that it is a certain amount of events that did not reach the threshold?
- Mentzer: As far as I know these are the same Slides as were presented last month.
- Hennessey: At the top of the Modified, it's subtle, but the blue is darker to the north.
- Cameron: What is the timeframe of these events?
- Mentzer: On an average day.
- Ballard: We're looking at a chart with N70 where we had green, yellow – so maybe we're looking at a different chart. This one is definitely showing more events for arrivals (looking at last month's graphic).
- Gardon: I think it is very subtle. We are sitting a bit closer. It is definitely there, you're there – it's just hard to see.
- Wiesenberger: The point is that while there is a decrease on the downwind leg, there is potentially an increase on the arrival leg - certainly on the North side.
- Gardon: That is correct. Noise is often talked about as a balloon. If you take it from one spot it shows up somewhere else.
- Mentzer: I will get clarification if needed.
- Wright: Can you go over the summary on Slide 8?
- Mentzer: Sure. We had modeled the downwind arrival rails for both the baseline and the 6000 foot alternative for both north and south flow aircraft. The downwind rails do not appear on the graphic for the south flow arrival aircraft in the same manner as they do for north flow south of the airport due to differences in the arrival runway use. North flow is 60% of the time, and south flow is 40% of the time. Due to increased utilization of the north flow, aircraft on the east and west downwinds south of the airport will trigger more N70 events.
- Wright: Is this why I get so much noise?
- Gardon: Yes, that's part of it - you hear the departures overhead more than arrivals.

- Mentzer: ACR Slate Collective Analysis: 3 slate items together. 6K foot minimum altitude on downwinds, Divergent departure headings, and removing the 2-mile restriction. Off each of the departure runways we modeled 4 different departure headings, each spaced approximately 20 degrees apart. Four headings to the north, and 4 to the south. For the south ones, the 2-mile restriction was removed, so departure aircraft in addition to using multiple divergent headings would turn prior to 2 miles. It is assumed that the turn at departure heading would occur at the end of the runway under both north and south flow.
- Garrett: Can you explain divergent departure headings? Are the airplanes sequenced based on their destination, and how long are they on that heading before they turn to final?
- Mentzer: I believe it is a few miles, but it is based on that they will be vectored off to their different destinations.
- Brown: What they are talking about here is right after departure. Going off the south runways, heading 183 – going straight out. Starting at 2 miles up to 4 miles, you have to have 15 degrees divergent headings minimum. Runway 18L you could go to 160, and on the right runway you could go to 200. That would give you 40 degrees divergent headings. The runways are so close together you have to have divergent headings. It needs to be predictable. Is that right, Bob? *(Yes)*
- Gagnon: Did that answer your question, John?
- Garrett: Yes, I am just wondering as far as the dispersion, does that happen naturally or is it managed? Or just based on the destination of the flight?
- Brown: I think the answer is once you have turned on departure, control gives you a different heading. If you are going north, they will give you a heading going east.
- Hennessey: You will get some diversion by just being assigned a different heading.
- Wiesenberger: Would it be fair to say that using this departure headings based at least somewhat on final destination, there will be a more direct flight path? *(Yes)* So potential fuel savings? *(Yes)*
- Mentzer: And possibly would increase throughput. FAA would not have to wait to send more aircraft, with sufficient separation.
- Wiesenberger: When articulating benefits of our recommendations, those might be good to note.
- Mentzer: We compared the modified results with the 2018 baseline results at each grid point, including population estimates, in terms of: Number of annual average overflights and number of average noise events above 70 dB. The collective results are presented on the expanded grid with updated 2017 ACS population data. Slide 12: with the annual average day aircraft overflights analysis, you can see a number of increased operations wider to the west and east on north flow and on south flow. For example, population of approximately 31K exposed to 121-240 overflights.
- Gardon: These are overflights only, not N70. Higher number of overflights but at a much higher altitude – in certain areas 8,000-10,000’.
- Mentzer: Because of the way the modeling is done, we are assigning the different headings and we also have to assign to modify flight procedure. An assignment had to be made for some operations that go off vector and come back on. In some ways there is less dispersion in the Modified than Baseline. I think it is evident in the next figure. Baseline and modified. With collective analysis, there is smaller area of higher aircraft overflights to the north of the airport. It is a wider area of lower numbers of overflights. That is because of the use of the different departure headings.
- Vesely: Is there a way to represent with different colors which would depict different altitudes?
- Mentzer: Yes, it could be.
- Vesely: I think that would be a better representation of what those flights are when they are really high up.
- Mentzer: I think you will see when looking at the N70 results. The metrics were decided when you originally started looking at the different slate items, but altitudes could be evaluated and shown.
- Wright: Question: On the modified, there is now on the bottom right a diagonal where it was not before. On the Slide 13, it is a very different picture on the lower left on the map. It’s an area that wasn’t affected before.

- Mentzer: The concentration has gone away. Some have been dispersed onto different headings. And since this is annual average daily overflights, the effect from the 6K foot minimum is not really shown on the downwinds and on the actual approaches. The lines look the same because this is just the number of overflights.
- Vesely: Overflights need elevation results to make it make more sense. So, I don't know that this is giving a true picture.
- Cameron: A little later in the presentation he gets to the noise. Page 18.
- Mentzer: We had agreed that we would show the remaining slate items and the collective analysis with just the overflights and the N70 metric. Originally when we were looking at the slate items, there were 4 or 5 metrics. They will be looked at again for the individual slate items, but not here.
  - Slide 15: Change graph that you have seen previously. Red colors increase in overflights, and green colors decrease. This is still overflights. Overall 18.3% of grid points and 21.7% of people would experience reduced numbers of overflights with this collective measure. And 28% people and 23% grid points would experience increased numbers of overflights. Average overflights - there is an increase with this collective measure.
- Nomellini: The fact that you overlaid the original map over this makes it hard to read. Is there a reason for the shading in the middle?
- Wiesenberger: Maybe use dash lines of left/right sides instead of the shading.
- Mentzer: And we can take out the ones of no change - just use greens and reds.
- Nomellini: And hopefully we can see landmarks.
- Brown: That is just showing the increase in dispersion.
- Nomellini: The shading hides the landmarks.
- Hennessey: Do we need more landmarks?
- Ballard: If we can blow up maps, we can see them on our own computers.
- Nomellini: We asked months and maybe a year ago to have these blown up and into four quadrants so we can see detail. We want to know what is happening in specific places, and we cannot really tell with these.
- Mentzer: We can talk about that and consider whether to separate them. We can definitely provide PDF, and you can zoom in for detail.
- Nomellini: At some point, we have to make decisions on which go forward. We have to have detailed maps. Particularly in the Southeast, there are areas of industrial, and that is not depicted. We do not care what happens over those areas, and we don't know where they are.
- Cameron: That is why I appreciate the tables on the left and 2-line summaries at the bottom. For me this depiction tells me lots. I don't care about overflights. But N70 yes.
- Wiesenberger: A little clarification on chart on the left. The number of overflights 1-10. That constitutes 22% of the 27% increase. So, 1-10 additional flights per day. That is negligible to most people.
- Vesely: That is because of diverging, right? The whole thing about points exposed, is not as important as how low those planes are when exposing that population. Let's get to Slide 18.
- Gagnon: It is good to be asking all these questions of clarity with this first collective analysis. Don't feel like at the end of this meeting you need to draw some firm conclusion. There will be another presentation in February. This is to make sure that we understand what we are getting with this information – getting that clarity is the emphasis today.
- Mentzer: Slide 16: Number of events above 70dB. With the collective analysis of the same 3 measures. The area of departures is larger to the north, and that is because of the higher % of north flow use in 2018. 60% of traffic is departing to the North, and only 40% to the south. Slide 17: Moving on to the comparison to the baseline. Similar to what we were talking about before, we have the regular downwinds going away in the modified because of the 6K altitudes. Divergent departure headings are making the noise less in places. Slide 18: More positive view of this with approximately 945K people, approximately 43% experiencing fewer events above 70 dB. 21% experiencing more

events. Because we have removed the 2-mile restriction, the oranges and reds are because of more events right off of the runways.

- Ballard: These rails are increase in events over 70 dB for me over my house. So, in terms of me, I don't like this.
- Wright: I have a similar issue.
- Mentzer: This increase is primarily because of the departure headings.
- Ballard: I don't have an issue with departures today. No difference in altitude coming over me but more of them, correct?
- Mentzer: Yes.
- Ballard: Where I have my noise complaint is from arrivals.
- Mentzer: But maybe a particularly loud aircraft being sent to the east is now being sent to a north heading.
- Wright: Slide 18 - is that the expansion of the modified on the previous page? Is that what is represented?
- Mentzer: This is the difference between the baseline and the modified for the collective analysis. This is showing the differences in the number of events over N70.
- Wright: It is not an expansion of what is on page 17?
- Mentzer: It is not an expansion of Slide 17 – it's comparing the two. So, for example, west of the airport there is less than 25 N70 events, which is why there is no color. However, in the difference grid, there is some change, which is why you see the green color - some benefit.
- Wright: In the comments, the people that are going to get more events above 70, those potentially are the persons that are already experiencing events, so they are going to get more events?
- Mentzer: Potentially, yes.
- Loflin: Is it not important to understand that if it is 1-10 events, and you're affecting a large percentage of that, so the scale of the # of events is important also.
- Mentzer: So yes, it is a large area of a small benefit - which is why the population number is higher.
  - Summary: Number of average daily overflights – a greater number of grid points and people experienced an increase than decrease. Number of noise events greater than 70dB - a greater number of grid points and more people experienced a decrease than an increase. Maintaining a minimum altitude of 6000 feet on the downwind provides the greatest benefits for areas north and south of the airport between the extended runway centerlines and arrivals downwind, and a disbenefit for areas north and south on runway centerline further from the airport.
- Vesely: Can you explain that?
- Mentzer: Because they are at 6K feet, they will potentially fly further to be able to descend to final.
- Nomellini: The graphic that you were talking about earlier will help most. If we can get a graphic that shows – if you do this, the planes will be at 6K at this point, 5K at this point. That, to me, will tell us what we care about and what we don't. Although the 70dB gives the same information, I think that will help eliminate noise about the people that are getting the increase, but it is at an altitude that shouldn't bother them. It would be another piece of data to help us understand the pros and cons of each of these scenarios.
- Mentzer: I believe in the initial 2018 data that you were looking at, there was some evaluation and showing of the different altitudes on approach and the downwinds, so I can go back and look at that.
- Brown: The downwind will definitely have a benefit at 6K feet. 6K foot noise is minimal, but they will have an increase in noise.
- Vesely: But the way the statement reads “a disbenefit for areas north and south on runway centerline further from the airport.”
- Brown: Those people will have more overflights.
- Vesely: Back to my point about 70 flights only having to travel that distance. It is important.

- Mentzer: Back to conclusions: Multiple divergent departure headings, without the 2-mile restriction provides the greatest benefit for areas north and south of the airport where aircraft turn today and disbenefit for areas close to the airport east and west of the runway centerlines as well as north and south of the airport on the extended runway centerlines further from the airport. Potential noise increases in the central as well as eastern and western portions of the grid and potential reductions elsewhere in the community of Mountain Island Lake. Potential noise decreases in the center area of Steele Creek and increases in the northern and southern portions; for SouthPark, potential noise increases in the northern portions of the grid and reductions in the southern portions of the grid for that community. The 6000 foot downwinds may negatively affect throughput due to reduced flexibility and the potential to increase flight miles. However, the divergent departure headings may positively affect departure operations throughput due to aircraft achieving divergence sooner. Any questions?
- Wiesenberger: I like your summary items especially as a resident of Mountain Island Lake and Steele Creek, but previously when we looked at the graph on page 18 it showed areas of increase in some of those. I understand that we are not having pinpoint clarity, but I thought we said that because of divergent headings there would be some potential increases directly north and directly south. Directly north is Mountain Island Lake. I am struggling with your summary and the data on there.
- Nomellini: I think the area of Mountain Island is large.
- Wiesenberger: I just don't see your data matching the summary points.
- Mentzer: Ok. We will check on that.
- Gardon: For a little bit of background, when he is talking about Mountain Island Lake and Steele Creek, we provided a general shape. So like Sara mentioned, they are huge. It is a little bit too general to tell.
- Mentzer: Slide 20: Your point is well-taken. On the 3rd bullet, discussing Steele Creek, is backwards. The noise decreases are in the central portions of Steele Creek and the potential noise increases are in the northern and southern portions. I'll check the others to make sure they are correct.
- Mentzer: Remind of the collective analysis purpose. These are being generated to give further understanding of how these measures might interact with one another.
- Ballard: I'd like to continue on a request made earlier, particularly on Slide 18. I would really like to be able to see that on my computer and blow it up.
- Gagnon: Summary to Walter's point. I had listed (1) That request to be able to blow up and enhance certain Slides and compare Slide 7 v. the similar Slide from last month (2) With the expanded grid, to take out the coloring on the white grid points, and just put a rectangle box around the grid (3) Ensure we can see the highways and other graphics behind the map. (4) Work on the 4 quadrant approach that Sara mentioned. (5) Look at how to incorporate altitudes in some way and (6) Slide 20 - verify the comments in the summary. These are the key action items coming out of the presentation. Any other questions of clarity or comments before we move on?
- Nomellini: With the altitude thing, we'll need a population count underneath that.
- Wright: Steele Creek, in the past we had members that were a part of ACR. I know there was a lawsuit. Was the lawsuit just financial, or were there restrictions that the airport had to make to not affect that area?
- Johnson: Recently I read that it was settled for almost \$2 million.
- Hennessey: There have been numerous lawsuits over the years. The most recent one was about 2012 – it related to the opening of the 3<sup>rd</sup> parallel runway (60 different houses). Some noise procedures came about because of the lawsuits in the '80s. I can get more information from our attorneys, if you want. The most recent was regarding noise lawsuits from the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway, and they have been settled.
- Vesely: Can we go over Slide 18 again? What portion of that center line comes from divergent departure and what portion comes from raising the altitudes? My point exactly. We cannot know. I would bet that most of that comes from divergent headings.
- Ballard: Last month's graph tells a different story. It tells that raising the altitude is the major cause.



- Vesely: I need to see how much is 6K feet and how much is from turning. It is important.
- Gagnon: Slide 9 in the ACR PowerPoint shows the 10 Slate recommendations and when the recommendations were presented, and you can go back and look at what areas are affected by specific recommendations.
- Nomellini: My initial thought was “the more the merrier” when it comes to what goes into the slate. Now I think we might need to be picking and choosing what we include in the slate. We need to be really particular about what we put on the slate. These additional graphics become really important, so we understand how many people are affected and where they are. This has been really interesting. We should not be going in there with 10 things, because if by some miracle the FAA says we can do them all, we may be creating a bigger mess. Just an observation.
- Ballard: Can we get last month’s Slide bigger as well so we can do a direct comparison? (*Yes*)

➤ **Voting to Close Slate to New Recommendations** – Sara Nomellini, ACR Chair

- Gagnon: Thanks for all your questions and different advice in terms of what you need. One more item we wanted to discuss before Unfinished Business. This was brought up last month and added to the checklist: *Vote to close this particular slate to new recommendations.*
- Nomellini: The reason we think this is something to consider is we had discussion last month about whether to add another recommendation based on the timing. People are ready to move forward. To formalize that decision, we thought it would be best to close this slate, with some flexibility. If the FAA looks at our slate and comes back and gives suggestions, or if Gene comes back or, for example, someone raises something important that Gene supports – that kind of flexibility to consider other options. With that understanding, let’s talk about closing it.
- Ballard: So, the suggestion that I made could be considered for the slate, or is it out?
- Gagnon: What Sara is describing is that if the FAA says that we should consider that particular item, the alternating arrival altitudes, we could include it, in lieu of another recommendation, if the FAA or HMMH or CLT suggests that, you all want the flexibility to say, ok that makes sense. What Sara is saying is that if a new proposal comes in from the community or a member, something that does not come from a subject matter expert, to not allow those to slow down the submittal of the slate. So, this is about closing this slate to new recommendations not made or supported by subject matter experts.
- Garrett: Stipulate that no new recommendations from ACR board, but ACR has option to accept what is suggested or supported by HMMH and FAA.
- Gagnon: Motion is: *For this slate, no new recommendations from the ACR unless suggested or supported by FAA or HMMH.*
  - Motion: Cameron made the motion. Johnson seconded.
- Wiesenberger: I think we should put a date on it as a parameter.
- Nomellini: Today - Walter’s suggestion is in.
- Cameron: I make the motion that *As of January 15, 2020 for this slate, no new recommendation from the ACR unless suggested and supported by FAA or HMMH.* Johnson: seconded. All in favor: Yes. Motion passed.

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

➤ **Unfinished Business**

▪ **Review FAA Submittal Checklist** – CLT Staff

- Gagnon: There is a document that was in your packet. The FAA checklist. We looked at this earlier, and I will ask CLT to go over it. Today, we voted to close the slate. So, we can check it off. The first 5 are checked off.
- Gardon: CLT staff, as well as HMMH have formed a working group with several higher up officers at the regional office of the FAA. We had our first telecom to set up roles and responsibilities. Our next meeting is February 5th where the FAA is preparing to give us some guidance on some of these slate items and tell us any major headaches that they may have. After that we will perform collective reviews similar to today, plan and conduct community meetings,

and perform a final review and submit the slate. This checklist I really like. We are making progress, but we still have a ways to go.

- Wiesenberger: In terms of receiving FAA feedback of potential non-starters, are you also welcoming feedback on what the FAA is excited about?
- Gardon: Yes. It has been described to me as: there will be hard No's and soft No's. There might be a yes. I don't think FAA is quite enthusiastic about anything.

➤ **Other Unfinished Business**

- **Written Updates:** You will see 3 pages of written updates in packet from the table. Literally about 14 different items that are being addressed or worked on between meetings by CLT, FAA, and the airlines. We won't be walking through them, but if you want to talk about them, we can get them on the agenda. Then you will see 2 pages at the back of that document, which are updates to the requests/motions database. There are over 110 requests that you have made over the past 2 years. I am showing you pages 20 and 21 of those. Several new requests from December.

➤ **New Business**

- Gagnon: Any new business?
- Garrett: We need a chairperson for the government outreach project team.
- Wright: Adding the list of items you read earlier, we will now have about 116 items on the database?
- Gagnon: Yes, that's where they will be added. Heading toward about 120. A lot of them are complete. Any other comments?

❖ **Adjourn**

- Vesely motioned to adjourn. Johnson seconded, all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:49 pm