

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: November 20, 2019

Attendees

Sara Nomellini, Chair, County 2
Phillip Gussman, City 1
Loren Schofield, City 3
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Sherry Washington, County 4
John Garrett, County 5
Mark Loflin, County 6
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Bob Cameron, Davidson
Sam Stowe, Gaston
Bob Lemon, Huntersville

Walter Ballard, Lincoln
Ben Miley, Mint Hill
Theresa Brunner, Pineville
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Kevin Vesely, York
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Dan Gardon, CLT
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Call-in Participants: None

Summary Minutes

Meeting started at 5:58 PM

- ❖ **Open the Meeting:** Sara Nomellini opened the meeting.
 - Approve Minutes: Member moved to approve. Loflin seconded. All voted to approve.
 - Review Ground Rules by Gagnon: Goals: Trying to make sure that we are having healthy environment and conversation, in meetings and outside of meetings. Want to be very productive and effective as well.
 - Review Meeting Packet Information by Gagnon: Agenda, meeting minutes. Long page of requests/motions from last meeting. Requests/motions database is included in handout that I will pass out later in a separate packet. ACR PowerPoint and HMMH PowerPoints included.
- ❖ **Review Public Input:** Reviewed guidelines for the speakers. The following citizens addressed the ACR:
 - Person #1 Dale Hegler
 - Person #2 Natalie Rutzell
 - Members: *ACR participants shared initial feedback. Regarding speaker #2 – Brown commented that he did not think ACR voted down what she was commenting on. Nomellini stated that ACR did. Gagnon stated that the way it was sent to HMMH, the preference was 2K feet but HMMH could use their professional discretion to see if there was an altitude that was more effective between 2K and 3K. Reindel noted that 2K was accepted, but we agreed that between 2 and 3 we could get a little more altitude before turning. HMMH has not done that yet. It is still on the table. Speaker #2 had a comment after this short discussion.*
- ❖ **Analyze/Uncover**
 - **Preliminary Analysis on Proposal to Maintain 6,000' Arrival Altitude until Final Approach Course –** Gene Reindel, Vice President HMMH
 - Gagnon: Last month we added a 9th recommendation. The other recommendations have all been analyzed with a full year of data. (New packet passed out). This packet has some additional handouts. Back of cover page - The Guiding Principles. *Gagnon went over what was in this packet. Written updates under unfinished business; request and motions database. Back page of handout – new government engagement team.*
 - Reindel: HMMH was asked at the last meeting to look at keeping aircraft at or above 6000 feet on the downwind arrival. In August 2018, we reviewed the downwinds, so we used that data which was 2017-18 radar data. Altitudes data has not changed much since then, so we decided to stick with that data at least for this preliminary analysis. If we move into the noise analysis, then we will use the data set that we have used for the other measures. We are looking at the north flow east downwind because we have

done all that analysis, but we have looked at the other 3 downwinds, and they are very similar. We can take what we see here and – for the other downwinds – assume the same result. We are looking at feasibility of increasing and maintaining altitudes of 6K on downwind flight paths.

- Reindel: Reminded of the downwind before the turn to go back to airport to land. (slide 2).
 - Slide 4: Constructed a series of gates every ½ nautical mile. Plotted altitudes for each aircraft flight track as they flew along east downwind. Plotted them on an xy graphic. X axis represents distance north and south of airport center point. Y axis represents altitude above Mean Sea Level (MSL) in hundreds of feet. Flight track profiles are depicted in Green with darker shades representing greater density. Graph shows a 3 degree slight descent path and that is important because the aircraft cannot turn onto the approach unless they are underneath that 3 degree glideslope.
 - Slide 6: Observations of analysis of 6K downwinds: Aircraft currently do fly at those 3 altitudes: 6000 feet (center runway), 5000 feet and 4000 feet on the north flow. We learned that these altitudes are at North flow and South flow at those altitudes based on the runway. Note altitudes per runway on slide 6. These altitudes also provide separation from arrival aircraft on the base legs at 6000 and 7000 feet. The procedures that the FAA have, the procedures actually have higher altitudes in them than the 4000 feet - some are at 6000 and 8000 feet. FAA published procedures: We have pulled some things out of these – Altitudes at certain waypoints are already at 6000 feet. None of the procedures are below 6000 feet, and that can be a good thing because we are not asking them for a procedure change but instead how they operate the aircraft as they are arriving at the runways.
 - Slide 12: Aircraft could be kept at 6000 feet on the north flow east downwind, but doing so would require the aircraft to fly a greater distance from the airport on the downwind in order to intercept the 3 degree glide path for each runway. An altitude of 6000 feet on the downwind would require aircraft to fly at least 17 nautical miles south of the airport before turning off the downwind to final approach on all 4 downwind flight paths.
 - For vertical separation requirements for parallel runways, aircraft altitudes during the turn from the downwind flight paths would need to be adjusted – so they would have to be at 6000, 7000, and 8000' based on the runway where they're arriving. Looks like the planes have to fly further south for this to happen – 20 NM for 7000' and 23 NM for 8000'. These distances are fixed because of where they intercept the 3 degree glideslope. Extended flight paths resulting from increased altitude would reduce airport throughput due to less flexibility for air traffic controllers to sequence aircraft in addition to creating potential conflicts with base leg arrival aircraft and in the Class B airspace. Bottom line: The turns would be pushed further south.
- Cameron: What is the distance that they are turning now?
- Reindel: Some are turning between 8 and 17 miles. It would push those further down.
- Ballard: One negative is that you would have more traffic if you are under one of those arrival rails?
- Reindel: Yes. Right now you are getting some traffic, so now it would push the traffic more south. But now they would be at 6000' where now they are at 4000'.
- Cameron: None of that traffic would be lower than it is now? Further out at 20 miles, they might have more planes going over, but not any lower than they are now?
- Reindel: That is correct. They would most likely be higher. The start of the new trombone effect would be about 17 nautical miles.
- Vesely: During our analysis, we found that there are twice as many flights from the south going back up north than the other way around. Twice as many flights coming down south near us. That being said, that trombone never ends in SC and that is part of the problem we have now. The trombone is fully extended for most of the day - at least 3 or 4 times a day. What you are saying is not exactly the whole picture. People on the downwind are already seeing what you are talking about. Whether planes are at 3900 feet and you are seeing twice as many flights or they are at 6000 feet, it is a big difference in sound. At least for the people underneath them. I think you need to look at how many flights.
- Reindel: This is preliminary analysis as we've done with all the other recommendations. This was just to see is it feasible to see if we can do what is proposed. And by our analysis, yes it is feasible, but here are some of the repercussions or effects of doing that.

- Vesely: My second question: Why do we need 3 elevations if there are 2 downwind rails?
- Reindel: There are 3 runways. From our analysis of the data, you can see the 3 level-offs. They are going to 3 distinct runways. The decision is on the downwind. This is what the data is showing.
- Vesely: Not what I am seeing.
- Reindel: Slide 7: This is all data, and none of these have not turned onto final yet.
- Vesely: When I am on flight radar, I am seeing 3900 feet, 3900 feet. Something is not lining up.
- Reindel: OK. Now the questions. Does this meet your needs?
- Garrett: What does the EPAYE mean, being at 6K feet on the procedure?
- Reindel: Basically asking them to be around that 6K on the procedure, because then they know where they are. Obviously they are allowing them to be lower. It could be an upper altitude thing. That way they know where they are going to release them. I could look back and see.
- Brown: It all depends on if there is a line below it or above it. Where you could be at or above or at or below.
- Cameron: That is directed to the pilot from the FAA?
- Reindel: It is in the procedure, so the pilot understands that.
- Cameron: If he is told to expect runway 36C, then he knows from his approach plate that he should be at a 7K feet downwind? Or whatever it is?
- Reindel: Yes, it would indicate as “at or below” on his chart; he would also be directed by tower.
- Cameron: It would seem that in order to ensure 1K feet separation, there would need to be an FAA directive to descend to and maintain whatever the level is.
- Reindel: Yes, and you see that in the data. If they are the only aircraft in the area, you have some flexibility.
- Cameron: I am up north, so I am seeing the flip side of this. I never see aircraft at 4K feet. I see lots of aircraft at 3800 feet MSL, so that means that they’re 3000’ above my head. Why are they going 3800 instead of 4K?
- Reindel: I use 4000’ as a round number, but you can see that there are a lot at 3700/3800. The centroid of that data is 4000, so they are probably between 3700-4300.
- Cameron: What is the pilot told to do; where is the discretion? Discretion with FAA or with the pilot?
- Reindel: Typically, the pilot is told to descend and maintain a certain altitude. If it is 3800, they will maintain that.
- Brown: What they are doing is, on the arrival, if you stay on the arrival, you are supposed to be at 6K until you turn base leg up above Mooresville coming down the main channel. Then they put you on the arrival, and you have specific suggested altitudes. Once they turn you to the final approach fix off the arrival, they take you off the arrival so you are cleared to the final approach fix to 3500 feet. You are cleared the ILS (Instrument Landing System). They are diving and driving, and you have to be at the intercept of the glideslope from below. Final approach fix is 5-6 miles off the end of the runway.
- Vesely: Then why is it that they are diving at 20 miles away? 30 Miles? There are planes at 3900 feet at Waxhaw coming in. I’m trying to understand why.
- Brown: We are talking about the upside down wedding cake. TCA (Traffic Collision Avoidance). As long as you are up above the bottom altitude of that TCA, the controller can turn to a fix. I don’t know the name of the fix. As long as you stay above the bottom of that TCA floor, you’re in good shape. That is why they dive and drive down to 3500 feet. That is the floor of that upside down wedding cake. Once the final controller clears you to a specific fix on the final approach fix, if he clears you to that fix and the altitude at that fix is 3500 feet, that is why they are coming over your house low.
- Vesely: (asking about slide 16) Most of these flights are not in this make believe world of coming in. That is why I had asked before to know how many planes are on those points, those red lines? I think you will see that the majority of the turns are way down, not up high.
- Reindel: Once they are below that glideslope, they can turn them. It provides more flexibility for the controllers and the pilots as soon as there is room, they can turn you and put you in. If they are above it, you might miss that slot and have to fly further before making the turn.
- Vesely: I did not know about the visual.

- Brown: Sometimes you can see the airport from 50 miles away. You have to know what the altitude is with the visual.
- Gagnon: What Gene is looking for is guidance on whether to proceed with the full analysis as we've done before – whether to move forward with full analysis of the recommendation to maintain a minimum of 6K altitude before final approach.
- Vesely: You have been just looking at straight out. You haven't included base turn in that calculation of miles to the runway.
- Reindel: But it is implied with the analysis.
- Vesely: As you pointed out, they do it now.
- Brown: That is very rare that they will be below 3800'; when there's no traffic, you're clear with vision.
- Wright: Page 13 explains about the negatives of implementing this procedure, is that correct?
- Reindel: Yes. Talks about less flexibility, some of the negative effects of implementing this procedure.
- Vesely: We haven't gotten all of the data. Number of planes turning.
- Nomellini: All he is asking for is whether we are interested in going forward to the next step to get that information.
- Cameron: If we move forward, would we get some feel of how much it would affect throughput. If it reduces throughput a lot, we don't want to do it because it would be a non-starter. When would we find that out?
- Reindel: That is outside of our wheelhouse. We would have to give that to the FAA. We wouldn't know that. They would have to determine that after the analysis of the slate. We just know that it could reduce throughput because you are having to take aircraft further down which may affect turning. You lose flexibility with this because you're not below the glideslope; therefore, they cannot turn you in.
- Garrett: We decided that at the last meeting we would delay our slate. Is that correct?
- Nomellini: I would assume that if we say "no" we will not delay.
- Reindel: We are already delayed some because of this preliminary analysis, and it will delay more to do the full analysis.
- Hair: And we have that unfinished business item to talk in more detail about that (schedule), John.
- Schofield: Since our main goal is to reduce noise overall, are we walking down a path where at present we are at an 8–14 mile sandwich, and we are pushing it out to a different population further away?
- Reindel: Normally I would say yes, but with this you are raising the altitude. People will still be experiencing the flights today along the downwind. If you live between the downwind and the runway where that base leg is, you will be getting fewer flights but under the downwind and further south you will be getting the same or more flights but at a higher level, so noise levels should be down some.
- Schofield: Perhaps on the final, the noise is lower? That's what I am trying to understand.
- Reindel: No change in noise level close-in to the airport.
- Brown: Five miles out, you won't notice any difference.
- Vesely: When I made my presentation, I noted that some planes travel 50 miles from the waypoint, downwind, base turn, and come back. If you had it 50 miles at 3900 and now at 6000 feet, people would hear noise at a higher level. I think it would make a substantial difference.
- Gagnon: Are there any other questions or any information that you need before you decide on whether you want to do a full analysis on this?
- Gussman: Just to clarify. We will not have throughput numbers in a month? Is there anything the airport can do?
- Gardon: The planning department may have some resources we can look at. I can follow-up.
- Reindel: We can also check with the FAA.
- Hennessey: Realistically, the planes are not going away, so if throughput is reduced, the trombone of hours will be spread out. More early morning; more later at night.
- Gagnon: Options regarding whether to have HMMH conduct the full analysis: 15 yes, 0 no, 1 unsure. So, the group has said yes, more analysis.

➤ **Potential Collective Analysis Groupings** – Gene Reindel, Vice President HMMH

- Reindel: We have taken the 9 recommendations and put them into a matrix. Came up with 20 combinations that you can do analysis on. We have two tables of potential measures to put together. Slide 3 – wouldn't take more analysis. It would just be merging the inputs and rerunning the model. Slide 4 – would be harder/more analysis. Of 20 possible combinations, 12 relatively easy to do; 8 modifying the input (lots of computer time involved). Increasing the grid size is one of the reasons. It is already taking about 20 hours to run each model. So, the cumulative ones would probably exceed 40 hours to run. It is a whole year of data. The alternating downwinds is not recommended to include in the collective analysis (you know what that is going to do by itself), because you'd have to analyze all 3 downwinds – creating 3 runs for every collective group. But if you decide that, we will do it.
 - You asked for my recommendations. We came up with 3 to suggest. But at the end of the presentation we did pros and cons of all 20. Slide 6: These are the 3 that we are recommending and will go over tonight. #10, 12 and 18.
 - 1st one: (Collective Grouping #10) Continuous descent arrivals, Altitude-based turns and delaying initial turns on departure. Pros: Reduced noise exposure from continuous descent because it is at reduced power settings. Continuous descent allows the planes to come in at a greatly reduced thrust setting because they are coming in on a glideslope. Not fully powered up. Increased approach altitudes. Altitude-based turns: Ability to maintain/improve dispersion of departures due to variability of aircraft turn altitudes. They don't all reach that turn altitude at the same time. Ability to shift aircraft departure turns further from the airport.
 - Cons: Concentration of aircraft flight paths on base legs and low utilization. Increased controller workload. Potential to shift departure noise over communities further from the airport.
- Nomellini: I thought we had determined that continuous descent was off the table because the planes are not equipped to do that.
- Reindel: The planes are equipped. It is the traffic volume here (CLT) that would not allow us to do it all the time. Some would not be able to do continuous. It is a limited amount of aircraft today that can do this.
- Wright: How would departure noise increase?
- Reindel: It just shifts the noise. With Altitude-based turns, it shifted the number of operations from North to South (South departures), so you'd have less noise to North, and more to the South.
- Cameron: If the objection to CDA is low utilization, I don't see a comparison for the other 2 in this collective. What if we did Altitude-based turns and delay initial turns?
- Reindel: You can always eliminate continuous descent and do the other 2. I have continuous descent on all my recommendations, but we can always remove it.
- Cameron: We had discussed CDA just to be used during the low traffic periods of time. That's why I can see taking it out of our analysis, but still say to the FAA to look at it when you can.
- Reindel: I would say keep it in there and only in limited use. This would force them to design the procedure, and it would get those early morning/late night flights to fly that procedure. Wait also for TSAS to come - that is their automated sequencing system that they are trying in Denver now. When that comes online, they might be able to use continuous descent for a larger # of those.
- Cameron: I don't want to confuse the analysis by loading it up with an assumption that all approaches would be continuous descent.
- Reindel: I would only show what could fly continuous descent. I would not put everything on it.
- Miley: As newer technology comes on, will more planes be able to fly that technology?
- Reindel: Yes. And it is getting in more and more all the time. The fleet here is pretty well equipped. Right now, it is more of a traffic volume issue than equipment issue.
- Gagnon: In July was when Gene made the presentation on CDAs, and they used it on 19% of the calendar year data and they used it between 9:30 pm and 5:30 am. If you want to look back at that specific analysis, it was this past July.
- Reindel: Slide 8: Collective grouping #12: Continuous descent arrivals and change initial departure heading. Pros: Reduced noise exposure from continuous descent at reduced power settings. Increased

aircraft approach altitudes. Ability to maintain aircraft departure turns in current location and shift aircraft departure flights paths further from the airport. Cons: Concentration of aircraft flight paths on base legs and low utilization. Potential to shift departure noise over communities further from the airport. Potential reduction in dispersion due to reduced turn angle. Potential reduction in departure airport throughput due to increased time for aircraft to obtain divergence.

- Nomellini: Why did you select these groupings? First reaction was to focus on ones with all the X's.
- Reindel: The next one has more X's. We wanted to give you a range. We also looked at ease of doing them - getting them ready to run. I looked at low hanging fruit. I wish I could tell you doing "this" would solve all your problems. I can't; I don't live here. I am trying to give you information so you can decide. Some cannot be run together. That is part of the reason for the matrices.
- Nomellini: My one concern with some of these is that we get one shot. If there is something we have missed, it will be years before we get another shot to correct it.
- Reindel: The cumulative analysis is for you; it is not really going to provide any additional information for the FAA. They are going to look at them measure-by-measure. I see you possibly recommending all 9 of these to the FAA, regardless of what you select for the cumulative.
- Reindel: Last one: Collective grouping #18. Continuous descent arrivals; divergent departure headings, removal of the existing 2-mile restriction and 6K foot downwind altitudes. Pros: Potential to better disperse departures based on destination. Potential to turn aircraft closer to airport. Increased airport departure throughput. Ability to keep aircraft on downwind legs at higher altitudes. Reduced noise exposure from continuous descents. Increased aircraft approach altitudes. The reason that you can have 6K foot downwind and CDA together is because we are only doing 19% of arrivals during a certain time period. The others would be 6K. Con: Potential new communities exposed to departure noise. Lengthened downwinds. Concentration of aircraft flight paths on base legs and low utilization.
- Cameron: On your matrix, it also shows that #18 includes the alternating downwind legs. It is not on the verbiage.
- Reindel: Yes, we decided not to do that since it would take 3 runs. We probably should have not called it #18. Again, my recommendation is to not include the 3 alternating downwinds on the cumulative analysis.
- Cameron: If we picked #18 without alternating downwinds and we loved it, would we then need to see if alternating downwind degraded it?
- Reindel: I would offer 2 options at that point. One is if you wanted us to do #18 but without the alternating downwinds, we could give you a qualitative understanding of what the alternating downwinds would do to those results. Two, we could do it with the alternating downwinds.
 - We can do any of the groupings. Just remember the amount of work. The 2nd matrix will take more time. We also did the pros and cons for each of the groupings. I want to talk about the timing of the analysis. We will expand the grid. We also have public reviews/comments on these measures. When do you want this information? Would the public sway you? When do you want to have this? It will be extensive in terms of time.
- Gagnon: In terms of actually selecting the collective, is there a hard and fast timeframe where you need to know what the ACR wants X days/weeks/months before you run the analysis?
- Reindel: There really isn't. It's probably more than a month's effort plus keeping on schedule with the other things, the expanded grid, etc. Sooner the better, but 6 weeks or 2 months would be best.
- Nomellini: The point of this process – the collective analysis is a way to provide us with additional information. Is that correct?
- Reindel: It is mostly to inform you. The FAA will look at each of the measures and what they do. I think more importantly is when they come back, it's important for you to know how these things interact with one another.
- Gagnon: When you are thinking about what to submit to the FAA or present at the community meetings, consider whether this goes with your Guiding Principles, so you're confident it will have the desired effect. For clarification, Gene, will this all be run again with the expanded grid? (Yes) So even if you don't do a collective against all 9, HMMH will have information on these with the expanded grid and updated 2017 population.

- Next steps: Gene gave us some good timelines and guidelines. In terms of this group deciding on which groupings you want for further analysis, what we have done in the past when there is a lot of information, we have given the group a charge with a poll. Which of these measures are most important – maybe doing a poll - any thoughts of how to narrow down this list of 20?
- Reindel: I think it would be good to see what are most important to you. Then look for the way that they are paired together.
- Garrett: Is there a number that we are to pick?
- Reindel: My guidance is 2 or 3 but as close to one as you can get. We could put priorities on them. One is way too limiting; I recommended 2-3 because that's realistic, but we cannot do all 20.
- Nomellini: Can you recommend which ones you would not want to do?
- Reindel: I think they are all viable. I don't think there are any that I would take off, but I will look and get back to Ed and let him know in a week or so.
- Gagnon: Any ideas on how to narrow this list? Poll about the collective groups between meetings, evaluate the 9 measures and see which are most important, or both? I will defer to you.
- Loflin: Is there any benefit to suggesting one now to get the process started? For instance #18?
- Reindel: No, as we have to do measure 9 now. Also, we have to get started on the expanded grid. If we can decide next month, that would be great.
- Wright: Utilizing alternating arrival rails - is that the same as alternating downwind rails? *(Yes)*
- Gagnon: Might I suggest on our debrief call to decide on the best approach for soliciting feedback from the group?
- Nomellini: Yes, you're right. We need a poll, but what we poll on, I'm not sure at this point.
- Reindel: One of the thoughts is if we could come up with high priority measures, then I could look at those in the matrix and come back with some recommendations to think about. You have all the pros and cons for each collective. If you get me something in a couple weeks, then I could give input.
- Gardon: We have all these recommendations. We all know what they are individually. It is when we put them together that it gets a little bit messy. In my opinion, I would take them in phases. So, phase one: Pick out the items you like. Some of them don't work with one another. The maximum that work together is 6. So, take a poll of the group and if everyone likes Altitude-based turns, for example, then that rules out some collective. Depending on what everyone likes, you can narrow the collective down.
- Gagnon: On the debrief call, I'll work with Sara and Kurt to see how we can narrow down the list.
- Wright: We are all representing different areas, so a fix for one area might be bad for another area. When I am looking at the alternatives, I am not sure that I am clear that it is possibly going to have a negative effect somewhere else.
- Reindel: You do have the results with the non-expanded grid. The benefit of collective analysis is how do these measures interact together.

❖ Unfinished Business

➤ Written Updates on Motions/Requests for Support

- Gagnon: Back to handout that I handed out earlier: Going over the written updates on the handouts. FAA updates at the top of Page 1. Bottom of the page has updates on Community Engagement.
- Hair: *(Regarding communication plan/strategy)* We have refined the possible marketing strategies and have an internal conversation tomorrow afternoon on next steps and implementation. Getting closer to being able to bring something back to the group.
- Gagnon: Next page: Airline-related updates, then at bottom are Additional Updates.
- Brown: How much of a response did they get on the EA – the October 21 and 24 outreach meetings?
- Gagnon: I believe Priscilla Johnson and Darren Crosby attended. Did anyone else attend?
- Wright: I did; it was hard to tell how many attended. It was a drop-in. It looked like a total of 12 or 13 people. There were certainly representatives there to answer questions.
- Vesely: I asked if there had been any outreach in South Carolina, and they said no. I think that would have helped to have had more people there.

- Gussman: It was a pretty good initial grouping – more than 12 definitely. Generally, it helped fill out some of the questions I had about it.
- **FAA Submittal Work Schedule – Updates and Next Steps – CLT Staff**
 - Gardon: Originally we were scheduled for submittal in January to the FAA. That has been delayed. Basically we knew there would be at least a one month delay after last month’s meeting. Currently with HMMH additional analysis, it is unclear how long the delay will be. Minimum after tonight, pushing back to March with the initial analysis being done. We need to check with planning committee and avoid their EA scheduling meetings. Unfortunately, this is not optimistic. Hopefully we will get update from HMMH and get ideas of how long it will take to draw these cumulative maps and move from there.
 - Brown: After we have decided what to submit, how long will it take on your part?
 - Gardon: A few days. I have been preparing documentation over the last few months.
 - Gagnon: As an example, Dan shared a draft write-up with you all a couple of months ago on the Altitude-based turns. So, a lot of the meat of that submittal package will have been completed when you are ready to submit.
- **New Business: Government Engagement Project Team Launch**
 - Gagnon: Last page of extra handouts that I distributed noted Initial Expectations of Team: Purpose of Project Team is to build governmental/political awareness, focus, energy and support for noise improvement needs and initiatives. Come up with objectives that this group wants to achieve. Come up with a plan. Make sure that the purpose is specific and not adversarial. Select a chair. Determine how often will meet. Before take action, the group would come before the ACR for approval. Reporting is similar if not the same as the Community Engagement group. List of interested members at the bottom of this page. Is there a volunteer to chair the committee or to schedule the first meeting?
 - Garrett: I will schedule the meeting but not chair the committee.
 - Gagnon: If anyone is interested that is not on this list, we would like to keep the group less than a quorum, so less than 12. Let John know so he can loop you in on the initial call.
- **Other New Business**
 - Ballard: After our last meeting I started thinking. My house – 18 miles out – is directly under the arrival rail for the eastern most runway. It came to my attention that basically that runway rail is always at the lowest altitude as discussed earlier because of the 1000’ separation. So I started thinking why should I suffer all the time, in particular when we are looking at these alternating downwind rails - it is the same concept – shifting which arrival rail gets the lowest altitude flights. You’re going to share the problem. You are not improving it; you’re just shifting it from one place to another. But if I can get a year that it is somewhere else, it would be a positive to me and a negative to the other guy. I sent out an email to some of the members that I thought might be impacted by that, and I guess we are considering it. Ed, maybe you can comment on what we are thinking of going forward.
 - Gagnon: I participated in the agenda planning call for this meeting with Sara, Kurt, and CLT. Based on our understanding of the proposal, we decided to ask Gene about that particular proposal to see if there is an opportunity for you to consider. We have asked Gene, and we want his guidance in determining next steps/determining how to address that further.
 - Ballard: A neighbor (retired air traffic controller from Charlotte) said he thought it could be done yearly.
- ❖ **Adjourn**
 - Lemon motioned to adjourn. Vesely seconded, all in favor.
 - Meeting adjourned at 7:49 pm