

# Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

## Unapproved Summary Minutes: June 10, 2020

### Attendees

Sara Nomellini, Chair, County 2  
Kurt Wiesenberger, Vice Chair, Charlotte  
Phillip Gussman, City 1  
Priscilla Johnson, City 4  
Bobbi Almond, City 5  
Sherry Washington, County 4  
Mark Loflin, County 6  
Sayle Brown, Cornelius  
Bob Cameron, Davidson  
Sam Stowe, Gaston  
Bob Lemon, Huntersville  
Walter Ballard, Lincoln  
Kim Hardee, Matthews  
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg  
Theresa Brunner, Pineville  
Kevin Vesely, York  
Sean Muckenfuss, York (Central)

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)  
Adam Scholten, HMMH (Technical Consultant)  
Pearlis Johnson, FAA  
Reginald Davis, FAA  
Andreese Davis, FAA  
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)  
Dan Gardon, CLT  
Kevin Hennessey, CLT  
Sara Easter, CLT  
Terrence Jones, CLT  
Amber Leathers, CLT  
Melissa Treadaway, CLT Public Affairs Manager  
Tracy Montross, American Airlines  
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)  
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

### Summary Minutes

#### ❖ Open the Meeting

- Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- Nomellini: Called the meeting to order. There is a quorum.
- Gagnon: Thanks for joining. Agenda is on screen. Did not make it into the handouts. In WebEx, there is a raise your hand function that Dan will be monitoring as well as chat comments. We don't want to use chat excessively. Please state your name before talking. Handout document: 13 pages. Page numbers at the top of page when referenced.
  - Reminder of Ground Rules: **Healthy** conversations and discussions – focus on facts; **productive** - keep responses brief; be **effective** - positive influence on the noise situation. You can contribute via phone, chat, and send notes after the meeting.
- Approve Minutes: Wiesenberger moved to approve. Member seconded. All approved. The minutes are approved.

#### ❖ Note Goals for Actions to Occur in June/July ACR Meetings

- Hair: Thanks, everyone, for joining and being involved in the meeting. We are approaching our goal. We are almost ready to finalize and submit to the FAA. In addition to you all being here, I wanted to thank you for all your hard work through this process. It has been a lot of work on your part. We have all felt frustrations as well as enjoyment about hoping to make a change in our community. Tonight, we are going to try to winnow the 10 different recommendations - figure which of those 10 we need to prepare submittal documents on. It is a significant process for our staff to produce the submittal document, so we want to identify what actually should be in the submittal document. Tonight, we will go through a series of motions that have been crafted. They can be changed, customized. This is a process to make your opinions on the record at this point. With what items you all vote for, Dan will then go back and work on.

- Skipping ahead to July. What happens then? We will ask you to take action. We will need a super majority to submit the overall recommendations to the FAA. That is 2/3 needed in support. It has been a long journey but with real milestones. With no questions, I will give to Dan for updates.
- Gardon: After our meeting on May 13, CLT staff and HMMH met with the FAA virtually, to discuss exactly what type of documentation they want for these submittal documents. This is the culmination of almost 3 years of work. This is very important. The documents are about halfway done. I need direction from the group tonight. For at least 2 of the recommendations the FAA said no, they will not support, and 4 on the whole where this group had some confusion. A poll was sent to this group, and I believe that 6 were unanimously approved. I hope to have these documents ready by the July meeting, having gone through the reviews by legal team and our executive team. Hopefully the big vote will be in July.
- Gagnon: Before we move on, any questions or comments?
- Wiesenberger: In terms of the submittal document that will be included, clarify please – it is not just a list of the recommendations, but it’s rather a holistic description of the ACR’s process and the concerns of the community and how/why we came to these conclusions. Can you elaborate more?
- Gardon: Holistic approach is a great way to put it. There is a portion that talks about why the ACR was started, how representatives were chosen, some of the progress we were making – the first year we were less formal than we are now. It also talks about the recommendations that the group supports and why supported. And how measures fit into the metrics that the ACR has devised. For instance, the Comfort, Concern, No Go of flight frequency. Not only that, but all the metrics we’ve reviewed like events over 70, and it puts them into one document.
- Loflin: Question. With the current situation, when we submit, will they go under the premise that “they’re back at full steam?”
- Gardon: I believe the recommendations will be studied as if the airport is at full capacity.
- Vesely: Since the last meeting, we had a sidebar meeting regarding the 6K proposal and the fact that some of the information is skewed a little bit, especially close in to the airport, because the landings would have to stay at 6000’ even if they were able to come in low, like with the traffic that we have now – is the information updated, or are we still going under the premise that every flight has to be at 6000’?
- Gardon: We are still working on that portion because I believe that is one of the 4 that is still up for vote tonight. To be honest, that is not at my priority level yet. We did take your feedback, and one of the nice things about this document is that the FAA has allowed for a bit of wiggle room. So, if we don’t write out everything to the nth degree of specificity, they can fill in the blank. I think that will help a lot.
- Vesely: I understand, but some people who are voting here – who are going to look at that proposal – may think that it will be more harmful than it really is. That is a concern if we are voting on it tonight. We need the actual facts rather than the assumption from HMMH.
- Gagnon: For everyone’s edification, if you recall at the end of the last meeting, Kevin wanted clarification on the wording relating to the 6000’ recommendation and requested a meeting with HMMH. We had that conversation, and there were takeaways. When we get to that portion of this meeting, I can go over the key points before we take a vote. Will that work?
- Vesely: Sure, thank you.
- Gagnon: Any other comments or questions? *None.*
  - Back to the handout document - FAA Submittal Checklist. We have been looking at this for months now – you can see the progress. Several points in blue have been deferred, primarily because of not doing community meetings. Prior to today, you looked at the HMMH PowerPoint of 130+ slides with analysis on the expanded grid. So, essentially these points were addressed prior to the meeting. What we are doing over these last 2 meetings are focused on reviewing, refining, creating the submittal documentation, deciding which recommendations will be in the submittal package, and then submitting.

## ❖ Determine Recommendations to Include in Submittal Package

- Gagnon: Next, we will look at results of survey and also the Slate recommendations overall. This is the Slate recommendations document – there are just 2 changes to what you reviewed to vote via the poll that we did in between the May and June meetings. The sort is one thing that has changed. On page 3 and page 4 are the 6 recommendations that had the strongest positive consensus for inclusion in the package. Under each recommendation are Y, N and A. These represent Yes, No and Abstain votes from the poll.
  - On page 3 are the top 3 (Utilize Divergent Departure Headings, Return CAATT Waypoint for Pre-Metroplex location (aka “Raising the Altitude”), and Modify Use of Departure Profiles) based on the Poll done in between the meetings. Page 4 are the next 3 (Utilize CDA, Remove 2-mile restriction on Departures, and On South departures change heading at first turn off 18L and 18C) - also strong in terms of consensus.
  - Page 5, you still leaned positive, but not as strong of a consensus. Those were Maintain 6K Arrival Altitude until Final Approach Course, and Utilize Altitude-based Turns.
  - Finally, on page 6, generally you leaned against using these on Slate. They were Utilizing Alternating Arrival Rails, and On South Departures delay turns off 18L and 18C. Page 7, HMMH put together detailed descriptions of each of the 10 recommendations. Page 8 are some different comments put together as a part of the survey. Dan and I are following up with those of you who had questions. Page 9 are some sample motions that we drafted to give you all a starting point. Any clarification needed? *None*.
- Nomellini: Let me clarify for the team that the intent was for those motions that had strong consensus, to vote on them as a single bucket. Then the ones that were on the fence or more of a consensus to not include on the Slate, we would open those up for discussion. Does that make sense?
- Vesely: The only concern I have is that when this vote was taken, there were only 17 people of our 26 that made up the matrix. So that is 2/3 majority and that is good, but it is not a full majority.
- Gagnon: To address that, we currently have 22 ACR members. Sam Blair is officially off. So, a quorum is 11. We had 17 of 22 respond to the poll. This was a poll; there was no technical vote taken; the poll was conducted to prioritize the work for this meeting. Today is the formal vote of what we are asking CLT to include in their preparation for submittal documents. The poll was just to get a sense of preferences prior to his meeting to be efficient and to see generally where people stood.
- Nomellini: The other option is to go item-by-item. If we choose to do it one-by-one, we can.
- Gardon: Yes, it might be cumbersome.
- Nomellini: Is there any strong preference to vote on the ones that had strong consensus via vote on them individually?
- Gussman: I’d like to make the motion to approve the top 6 recommendations from the poll to include in the Slate.
- Loflin: I second.
- Nomellini: Any discussion?
- Gagnon: Page 9 shows the top 6 recommendations under Motion #1 for which Phil made the motion and Mark seconded.
- Wiesenberger: Where does HMMH stand on the grouping of these particular 6 items, or do they have a different opinion?
- Reindel: We have done the analysis on all of these. I don’t know if we can weigh in strongly one way or the other. Looking at the top 3 on Motion #1, I think these are doable. Ultimately the FAA has to decide whether they are feasible. CDAs we know that will be difficult to do on every flight, but hopefully we can implement those when traffic is light. We had noted that it would

take time to be fully implemented. Removing the 2-mile restriction, that is an airport decision. It would provide more flexibility. Changing the headings on south departures seems doable. Is that what you needed to know, Kurt?

- Wiesenberg: Yes, thanks - that is very helpful. What about the groupings discussed maybe 4 months ago – when we had these grouped in a package, those that really complemented one another? And some may have been contradictory.
- Reindel: That will also be in the documentation that Dan is preparing. I will be helping with that, as well. Those points will be noted.
- Wiesenberg: Will that information be helpful in proceeding with these votes, or is it more detail that will be appropriate more in the documents?
- Reindel: I would recommend the latter being the case. Look at them on their own right now - on its own merits. Maybe consider more what you wouldn't want to have.
- Nomellini: Any additional discussion before we vote? Everyone is clear on what we are voting on? *Yes*. Are we doing a voice vote?
- Gagnon: It is up to you. If it is not a clear majority - and all we need tonight is a majority - we can revert to a poll.
- Loflin: So next month, the final presentation would be a super majority, correct?
- Gagnon: Yes, today, a simple majority would allow CLT to continue building the documentation for the submittal of the recommendations. But to send the actual full package, next month you would vote on the entire package and need a 2/3 majority.
- Loflin: And that would include anything that we may be adding in the future tonight?
- Gagnon: Most likely.
- Nomellini: I think the intent is to keep Dan from working on something that we have no intention of approving.
- Wright: So, we are voting on each one individually or the top 6 as one?
- Nomellini: The motion right now is for the top 6 in one bucket. Yes or no.
- Wright: Then my vote will be No.
- Nomellini: You can make a motion to vote on these individually.
- Wright: It won't matter because they negatively affect my area.
- Nomellini: Any other discussion? All in favor, say Yes.
- *Voting: All Yes, only Wright voted No.*
- Nomellini: Motion passed.
- Gagnon: In terms of the other 4 recommendations, how do you want to proceed?
- Nomellini: I think we ask for the 4 remaining motions and see how the discussion goes.
- Johnson: Will we be voting on the non-starters as well?
- Nomellini: Yes.
- Vesely: I make a motion to include # 9 Maintain 6000' arrival altitude until final approach course.
- Washington: Second.
- Nomellini: Any discussion?
- Cameron: This item is, to me, the most important. If we could only have one thing happen in Charlotte and that was to raise the downwind altitude and to keep aircraft up there until they turn to their final approach course, it would overwhelmingly reduce the noise in more locations than in any other one item that we have considered. The FAA has said that they have concerns about it. In my opinion, we are not to ask the FAA for permission before we come up with our best

Slate. I believe that we should hold the FAA's feet to the fire. I think it is time for the FAA to become a partner in the solution.

- Gagnon: From the meeting that Kevin had with HMMH and CLT, the wording would be worked on. Slight tweak that will occur will say – on North Flow, departing North flow and arriving to the south – arrivals can come in lower on the downwind from the south than 6000' if that enables them to turn earlier provided they don't lower and hold. Gene and Adam will work on the wording. Kevin, does that basically address some of what came out of that meeting?
- Vesely: Not exactly.
- Brown: I'd like to add something. The problem is that on the downwind they are turning them on to the final approach fix either from the north or from the south and descending them to 3500', which is the final approach altitudes for those runways. If they would keep the planes higher and turn them base leg onto final above 3500', that is what Bob and Kevin are talking about. You want to keep them higher turning onto final approach fix. Up here in Davidson, they dive to 3000'; they're coming over Davidson at 3000', and driving in for 5 miles until they get to the final approach fix. Same thing in the South over Kevin. You've got to keep them higher coming onto the final approach course.
- Vesely: Consider continuous descent. That is what we are trying to accomplish here.
- Nomellini: Any other points of discussion?
- Wiesenberger: I would like clarification. Why is this a disbenefit for the Mountain Island Lake community? In the evaluation table for recommendation #9 on page 5, it says a disbenefit to the north for Mountain Island Lake. How does that differ from today's experience?
- Scholten: The reason for the disbenefit to the northern portion of Mountain Island Lake as compared to what is going on today, is if you keep the airplane at 6K longer, they cannot join the final approach course to the airport as close as they used to, specifically if they are operating under bad weather or flying on instruments because they have to join the glideslope at a specific altitude – from below. The issue is if they are higher and they join the final approach course at a high altitude, and if it is above that published glideslope, there is something called false glideslopes that are above regular glideslopes, that are at a steeper angle and they are not safe for large commercial aircraft to use for descent. If you increase altitude, that increases how far from the airport they have to go before they turn to final approach course. The controller has to be sure that they will be below that glideslope. So, you have some aircraft that previously turned closer to the airport now turning a little further out, and they are on that extended runway centerline for a greater distance – more likely to be to the North of Mountain Island Lake.
- Wiesenberger: Thank you. It will not make a difference to me because I am already on the final approach.
- Reindel: What Adam just described is exactly why Kevin had suggested that if they can turn sooner, then lower them so they can turn in, but if you need them on the extended downwind – keep them up at 6000'. I think that tries to address that disbenefit, so there wouldn't have to be a disbenefit.
- Wiesenberger: How many miles do they need for final approach?
- Scholten: It depends on the published approach procedure. Normally about 5 miles.
- Wiesenberger: I am 8 miles north of the airport, and we have a consistent pattern right over our Mountain Island Lake neighborhood. Anything closer would be good.
- Nomellini: Any other questions? I think because how close the poll is it might make sense to use the polling in WebEx.
- Wright: For callers, how will they know who the phone numbers belong to?
- Wiesenberger: They can say their name.
- Gardon: Creating the new poll now. I will take that from page 9.

- Wiesenberger: On #9 that we are going to be voting for, is this the modified language that Gene was describing a while ago or the previous language that we have on the description?
- Nomellini: It is the modified language.
- Gardon: The poll is open. Only ACR voting members vote.
- Wright: There is no Abstain option.
- Gardon: I can add that. Why don't we take that as verbal on this one?
- Nomellini: So, let's do a voice vote since we have folks not seeing the screen.
- Gardon: So, let's do a combination. We have 10 votes in the poll right now. How many ACR members on the call?
- Gagnon: My understanding is that we have 17 assuming Sam Stowe is still here – he was going to have to leave about 5 'til. Yes, he is still here.
- Gardon: We have 13 votes on the computer. If you haven't voted, please do so. We can take the remaining call-ins verbally. Priscilla - Yes; Thelma – Abstains; Bob L. - Yes.
- Gardon: I am closing the vote. It looks like we have 13 supporting, 2 opposed, and 1 abstained. I just shared results.
- Gagnon: Next motion.
- Nomellini: We need a motion to include Altitude-based Turns, item #1? Do I have a motion to approve? *No one made the motion.* We are dumping it.
  - Next one - is there a motion to include Utilize Alternating Arrival Rails?
- Wiesenberger: I have a motion to **exclude** it from the Slate.
- Nomellini: We are voting to NOT include this. *Vesely seconded.* Any discussion? *None.* All in favor to exclude, say yes. *Many yeses.* All opposed – *None.* Motion passed to exclude Utilize Alternating Arrival Rails.
- Nomellini: Do we have a motion for Delayed Turns on South Departures?
- Wright: I make a motion to **exclude** #5. *Vesely seconded.*
- Nomellini: Any discussion?
- Brown: I believe that the first Motion, first item – Utilize divergent departure headings and on South departures, delay turns off 18L and 18C – those are basically the same.
- Nomellini: To your point, Gene never did any real analysis on those.
- Nomellini: Any other points of discussion. All in favor of dumping motion #5 on page 9? *Lots of yeses.* Any opposed - *none.* Motion passed to exclude Delayed Turns on South Departures.
- Gagnon: Quick summary. In terms of the submittal package, basically you have approved CLT working on these 7 recommendations – the 6 under Motion #1 and the recommendation under Motion #2 - Maintain 6000' arrival altitude until final approach course.
- Gardon: Congratulations, everyone.
- Gagnon: Congratulations, this is a major celebratory milestone.

#### ❖ Request/Address Additional Business

- **Preparing for Community Engagement Project Team and Government Engagement Project Team Activities Post-submittal – ACR Chair/Vice Chair**
  - Gagnon: We are getting to the point where hopefully there will be a formal vote to submit the package of recommendations to the FAA in July. In preparing for what will take place after the submittal occurs, they would like to give a charge to the Community Engagement Project Team and the Government Engagement Project Team.
  - Wiesenberger: My only input is given the timing we've been going through the last 3 months, the 2 Project Teams have just been waiting around to see what the ACR develops. I think at this point we are ready to turn the page. We have a target on these 7 recommendations that

we have approved to go forward with. So, I think we have something to communicate. Those teams, we would ask them to organize how you want to go about doing that. Obviously, we will not have community meetings, so how will we communicate with the community and the government?

- Gagnon: **The only major asks are for the Community Engagement Project Team and the Government Engagement Project Team; if the Teams can meet before July or schedule to meet soon after the July ACR meeting to start figuring out strategies for their work post-submittal, that would be great. We'd like them to get at least the scheduling ball rolling, and we'll ask you for updates for the July meeting.**
  - Gussman: Looking forward to it and being able to put out something tangible; thank you, everyone!
  - Cameron: Until we take next month's vote, we still don't have anything, correct?
  - Gagnon: You have not voted to submit a package to the FAA at this point.
  - Cameron: If we put ourselves in the position of a government representative, and someone knocks on your door wanting to talk about airport noise, #1, in this day, with the traffic vastly reduced and with COVID on everyone's mind, the ACR is not their top priority. So we, on the government engagement team, really look forward to having something concrete to say. The trick has been to say where are we going and what help we need from them – at next month's vote, we will have that. I think it is fine to have a meeting, but I don't know that those government folks are going to have us as a priority. Once we have a Slate, our intention is to have a unified PowerPoint project presentation that we can take to all the government representatives so as they talk to one another, they will have the same information. Some of them have been approached and this will be an update, but some don't know what the ACR is. We need next month's vote before we can say anything concrete.
  - Wiesenberger: Good point. What do you recommend for these Project Teams as a goal for July?
  - Cameron: If we can get a skeleton of that presentation together, we can put the meat on the bones when we get to the vote in July. Assuming that we get to the point where we can go and speak to representatives, then when things really open up, we will be ready to make those engagements.
  - Wiesenberger: What do you think about pre-scheduling some of those meetings or presentations, given the lead-time to meet with those officials?
  - Cameron: I don't think at this time – until air traffic picks up a bit and things become more normal, we are not going to be a priority. And I am not sure what we can ask them for.
  - Gagnon: The priority in July is hopefully approving the submittal package. The idea was just to get the ball rolling. Convene the project teams - having meetings with members. Then in July, just give us an update. Any other discussion about that particular item?
- **Written Updates on Motions/Requests**
- Gagnon: Wrapping up the unfinished business portion, I will briefly walk us through the rest of the Written Updates as well as the rest of the handouts. On page 10, these were the actions and motions from the last meeting. Written updates on page 11. Update by Dan on current state of CLT operations, etc. Bob Cameron provided an update as well. Tracy provided updates on vortex generators. Only one new request that was in the Request/Motions Database, and the last page of the document has that. There were a few modifications, but we just included the new item identified, requested, and completed.
- **New Business**
- Gagnon: Any new business?

- Vesely: No new business but old business. Perhaps Tracy can speak on – we see in the news about AA tightening its belt and maybe decommissioning some planes – would that help with the vortex generator issue?
- Montross: Unfortunately, we have about 400 aircraft that are parked. They are parked at stations across the country. The retrofit has to happen in Tulsa, and there's no way to expedite the retrofit. There is no change for the scheduled completion date – we're still on track.
  - We have accelerated some of the aircraft retirements that were scheduled. That's good news on the noise front.
  - Lots of changes at AA. Tough times at American. Lots of restructuring in management. Vice president of the Charlotte hub is retiring. We will have a new leader who is new to Charlotte but not to American.
- Vesely: A positive spin or outcome could be put on this by AA.

❖ **Adjourn**

- Nomellini: Motion to adjourn?
- Loflin motioned to adjourn. Vesely seconded; all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:21 pm