

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: January 12, 2022

Attendees

Kurt Wiesenberger, Chair, Charlotte
Phillip Gussman, City 1
Doug Pray, County 1
Natalie Rutzell, County 2
Sherry Washington, County 4
Mark Loflin, County 6
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Bob Cameron, Davidson
Walter Ballard, Lincoln
Kim Hardee, Matthews
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Charles Soussou, Pineville

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Sarah Yenson, HMMH
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Dan Gardon, CLT
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Amber Leathers, CLT
Chris Poore, CLT
Pearlis Johnson, FAA
Matt Felton, FAA
Alan Reed, FAA
Robert Berlucchi, American Airlines
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Summary Minutes

❖ Open the Meeting

- Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- Wiesenberger: Welcome to the January ACR 2022 meeting. This group is to provide the City of Charlotte Aviation Department (Airport) and the FAA with broad-based inputs into airport-related noise impacts and to find, where possible, practical solutions and Recommendations for the FAA to consider when determining aircraft operating procedures at Charlotte Douglas International Airport.
- Gagnon: *Facilitated introductions of members of ACR, FAA, CLT, HMMH, and CSS.*
- Gagnon: Participate in the meeting via WebEx and on the phone. *Went over the WebEx features*; please try to use the “raise the hand” function. When speaking, please state your name. We are going to try to keep the meeting to 90 minutes. We will save the chat. The PDF that was sent out yesterday is virtually the same that you will see today.
 - *Reviewed Agenda. Noted Ground Rules:* Healthy meetings, productive, and effective. Make brief points. Stay focused and professional. Be effective in making noise improvement in our area.
- Wiesenberger: Are there any elected officials or representatives attending tonight? *No.*
 - Need a motion to approve Minutes from November: *Loflin moved to approve minutes, and Washington seconded. All in favor? All. Minutes are approved.*
- Wiesenberger: Quick comment to those who may be new on this call about the Ground Rules. This group of volunteers is participating because aircraft noise causes them great angst and frustration in their daily lives. With that being said, for the meeting to be productive, we are going to table our complaints, arguments, and other feelings that we may have. We have emotional buy-in to this cause, but we will focus on the meeting and the agenda.

❖ Receive Public Input

- Gagnon: *Went over guidelines for public speakers: 3 minutes.* If more time is needed, it is up to Chair. ACR may or may not respond at time of meeting.
- Public Speaker Name: Jacob Pollack.

- Loflin: Can we have his comments sent by email and shared with the CLT members?
- Pollack: Will send to Dan the comments as well as a draft letter sent related to the EA.
- Rutzell: Would it be helpful to share some feedback of the proposals that have been presented? And where the status is so he knows that we have been in conversation with the FAA on this issue? Maybe a follow-up call?
- Wiesenberger: We will update Jacob on what we've been doing and the Recommendations proposed. Certainly North/South flow has been a topic of conversation. I will be happy to talk with you separately from this meeting.
- Pollack: Correct me if I am wrong, but I thought that some of the local ATC could make some of these changes without FAA involvement - local decisions and what can be done.
- Gardon (from the Chat): For the group: If you have constituents who would like to address the ACR the link is here: <https://charlottenc.seamlessdocs.com/f/KRTK3p>

❖ **Update on Moving Forward – Monitor, Engage, and Improve**

➤ **Reminder of FAA Slate Review/Implementation Process – Ed Gagnon, Facilitator**

- Gagnon: Will share some flowcharts that the FAA has provided and get them to share more about where Recommendations 1 and 3 are in the process. We're also going to get some information from HMMH as it relates to the evaluation of raising the altitudes. We will get our typical updates from CLT and hear from Project Teams. Under Unfinished Business, there is a pretty large written updates document that we will walk through, and we will also have a discussion about the frequency/focus of the meetings in 2022.
- Gagnon: Page 3 in handout: Mentioned last meeting that the FAA checklist format might be better shown in terms of reviewing processes within each Phase. Matt Felton sent us a 56-page PDF file, “.41 process” that is being used to evaluate the Slate Recommendations. One of the nice features of that document is under each one of the Phases that the FAA goes through, they have a flowchart. We have talked about Phase 1 repeatedly since you all submitted the Slate. This is the flow chart relating to Phase 1. I will now ask FAA to talk about some of the terminology and acronyms, and briefly describe this flow chart. Focusing on two of the Recommendations that they are looking at in various ways. Recommendation #1, which is the CDA/OPD Recommendation, and #3 is the Recommendation where they have submitted the alternative proposal in raising the altitudes at several waypoints. I will turn it over to the FAA.
- Felton: I cannot speak in great detail on the technical side of the .41 process. I'm sure that if I look back on prior ACR meetings, the .41 process has been brought up numerous times. The .41 is the actual order. An order is a written order of how the process or rules of moving forward with what the FAA does. The .41 is the order for performance-based navigation and submittals for developing procedures/approaches, much like Recommendations that the Roundtable has presented.
 - Recommendations 1 and 3 and where they fit in - to give an update - What we are calling the alternative to the original Recommendation #1 - I think it was captured pretty well in the November Minutes, realistically we are not able to provide any updates on that as it is still going through the very early Phase 1 process. We will hopefully have something at the next ACR meeting. Nothing to discuss now on the alternative to Recommendation #1.
- Wiesenberger: Would you consider that Recommendation is at the first box/initial review?
- Felton: Yes. As far as the alternative to Recommendation #3, I believe an initial graphic was presented by HMMH in November, there was a little more review, crunching of numbers and putting together graphics and other work happening, from November to now. I think we may be able to see something during this meeting; as far as where we stand in this process – being in Phase 1 or Phase 2 – understand that it is a fluid process. Technically speaking, the alternative to Recommendation #3 could be said that it is still

in Phase 1 as the first step for Phase 1; that Recommendation would need to be submitted or presented through the IFP gateway or in this case, I do believe that Recommendations previously have been submitted very much through coordination with the Roundtable group along with coordination with the airport and then formally submitted to the FAA that everyone is on board with. In a very technical way, you could say that alternative to Recommendation #3 is still in Phase 1 because it would be considered IFP – Instrument Flight Procedure – gateway, and that is basically submitting to our Flight Procedures Team, FPT, in the FAA for them to then start doing all of their review, which includes safety, environmental, and so forth.

- Some aspects of that have already started on our part with some of the information we have provided to HMMH. Technically it is still in initial review in Phase 1, what's been conveyed to me is the next steps and getting through Phase 2 would be somewhat abbreviated as this alternative to Recommendation #3 would be considered an amendment, which would expedite many of the steps that would go into Phase 2. In November, when we were looking at the graphic that did not come out of the order but was an approach to give laymen's terms to summarize this order, I think we were saying that the alternative to Recommendation #3 was kind of in the Phase 2-ish area. I still kind of stand by that interpretation. Some Phase 2 steps have concurrently started with the initial steps to give HMMH some data. Technically speaking, it is still sitting in that Phase 1 as it needs to be formally agreed upon all parties and submitted as the formal Recommendation.
 - Gagnon: Pearlis, anything you want to add before we ask for questions?
 - Johnson: We are waiting to hear from HMMH and to get a Recommendation from the ACR to get formally started as soon as we can.
 - Gagnon: Any questions or comments from ACR members?
 - Cameron: According to Pearlis, we are waiting for HMMH analysis to come back to the airport. What is the status on HMMH's analysis?
 - Gagnon: They're next, so thank you for that segue.
- **Evaluation of FAA's Alternative Proposal to ACR Recommendation #3 (Raising the Altitudes at CAATT/EPAYE) – Gene Reindel (Vice President) and Sarah Yenson (Senior Consultant), HMMH**
- Reindel: Review of ACR Recommendation #3: Thank you for the opportunity to present, and this is an update of our analysis. This is about ¾ of what we were going to present today. Unfortunately, the AEDT (Aviation Environmental Design Tool) - noise model that the FAA uses and requires - has not completed the analysis. It ran and gave some results that we did not expect. So, we will modify some inputs. Sarah is on the line as well for questions. I will go through background information to show what we are expecting in the next few weeks.
 - Background of the Recommendation: Return CAATT Waypoint to Pre-Metroplex location. What that really was going to do was have the effect of increasing altitudes at some of the waypoints by 1000 feet. You can see on the graphic that the aircraft were lower in 2017 than they were pre-Metroplex, which was 2014. The red lines were the arrivals which were just higher in altitude, and it averaged about 1000 feet. That is what we were seeing, and we said let's put it back to the way it was and raise it 1K feet. The analysis was completed prior to the ACR submitting this Recommendation to the FAA, and under the preliminary analysis that we did, the expected net benefit of noise reduction was to about 80K residents in the Charlotte Metropolitan area.
 - Next slide you see the CAATT and EPAYE waypoints, which is where we did our analysis – raised the actual altitude of aircrafts as run in 2018 by 1000 feet at those locations. It resulted in those aircraft being similar to pre-Metroplex. The lateral –

- left and right profiles - did not change. Only the vertical aircraft were changed in terms of altitude.
- Results slide: As you go from the blues to the green to yellow/orange, it means more noise events above 70 dBs in those areas. If you look on the left and compare to what is on the right, there is a difference in events above 70 in terms of the blue line off of the bottom right of the graphic. For lack of better terms, it looks like a tail, and it is essentially gone as a result of raising the altitude. Here shows the area of change. There is a lot of information here, but basically it shows the number of people experiencing noise events under 70. There is no place where an increase happens. There are only benefits from raising the altitudes by 1000 feet. When we do the other analysis, we are not moving waypoints, we are raising the altitudes, but we are not just raising the altitudes on the east side, but also increasing the altitudes on the west side of the airport because the FAA in their proposed approach, in order to raise altitudes on the east side of the airport, we have to raise the altitudes on the west side of the airport. What we are expecting is a similar area of noise reduction in the number of noise events above 70 dB in an area similar to the southeast of the airport.
 - Reindel: I apologize that we are not finished, but the results did not make sense to us. I think that there is error in input. Any questions?
 - Soussou: It looks like your results are coming from one aircraft that you had fly at different altitudes. Is that correct?
 - Reindel: No. We are taking a full year of flight tracks - 2018 - and modifying the altitude on all the aircraft as flown in 2018 to see what the results are if they are 1000 feet higher at those waypoints. Not just one aircraft, not just one type of aircraft. It is a full year of flights as flown in 2018.
 - Soussou: Are there microphones already set there?
 - Reindel: This is all done through noise modeling. You could not do this through measurements because you couldn't measure at all the grid points. I think we have over 30K grid points there to where we are showing the actual difference in noise level based on – all those dots are showing areas of a years' worth of noise events above 70dB. How many times did that grid point experience noise from aircraft greater than 70 dB?
 - Soussou: Ok. I'm just not seeing how the data makes any sense because typically when you are doing noise simulation you have to take into acoustics, also temperature, humidity. There are quite a lot of things involved. I looked into 2 studies. When changing altitude going down that might mean that the aircraft is going down at a faster speed to be able to get that altitude degradation, and that would actually increase the noise. So, I don't know if any of that was studied. It looks like just a simulation was done. Was anything else taken into account, like the actual aircraft itself? That would affect the engine speed, the aircraft speed, the approach speed, because that would make much more noise.
 - Reindel: We used the Aviation Environmental Design Tool which has in it all of the aircraft noise and performance data, not just noise, but speed, altitude, thrust settings, all of that – landing gear – all sorts of things – whether it's out or not. Then you raise the altitudes and adjust those profiles to make sure that the aircraft comes down at no more than a 3% glideslope. Rather than coming down faster, one of the things that could happen is that the aircraft would have to go further south before turning back north before landing. It is not going to descend in an unsafe manner; the tool takes into account. What this is showing again is the difference in noise levels or the number of events above 70 in order to show the areas of improvement or disbenefit for the recommended procedures. All of the Recommendations from the ACR were put through this analysis so that they had the information they need to show whether or not they wanted to move forward with the Recommendation.

- Soussou: That's perfect. Do you know if it shows fuel consumption data? If we could show it reduces that, it could make it quite easy for the airlines to push on that.
- Reindel: Only noise was taken into account for this study at this time.
- Gussman: This is great to see. Very promising data. My question is how do we take this bit of information and combine it with data hopefully some time before we meet again. Are we going to see more of this?
- Reindel: Yes, I will be putting this together as soon as the information is correct out of the noise model. I do expect it to be where there are no areas of increased noise events above 70. Now, do remember that is what we are looking at in this case. Because as we said, when you increase the altitudes, they may fly farther. But those events down in that portion of the flight does not cause events above 70. So, some people may get more flights, but not as much noise.
- Gussman: Thanks. I just want to get this ready for a vote.
- Wiesenberger: Looking at additional waypoints on the west side, will that increase the total number of waypoints to four?
- Reindel: It is more than 4 - maybe six or eight total. The information that FAA gave us was to increase altitudes at specific waypoints.
- Yenson: *Listed the individual waypoints to change, and one not to change.*
- Reindel: That information I will provide you as well when presenting - where the waypoints are, how the altitudes change.
- Gagnon: To confirm - the analysis that will be done will be a total of 7 waypoints where the altitude will be raised 1000'?
- Yenson: Yes.
- Gagnon: CLT and HMMH will be in touch, and we will determine how best to share the information when it is completed.

➤ **CLT Update – Stuart Hair, Director of Economic & Community Affairs, CLT**

- Hair: Thanks to Gene for explaining all of the above. Regarding the EA and Part 150, like I used to defer to Mark, I will now defer to Amber.
- Johnson: Before Gene leaves, do we have the numbers for the west side?
- Reindel: No, we need to run the AEDT correctly for those numbers. I think it may be less because of less population.
- Johnson: Thanks. That is promising.
- Leathers: EA for the major capacity projects - EA for the airport; after several years we have good news. Final EA was submitted to the FAA on December 6. They have been taking all that information and reviewing it. It will be within their review about a month. We will get comments back in first week of February. Hopefully then we will be able to finalize this EA. Once the EA is complete, we will be able to start the Part 150 study. It is in the final stretch, and it is all good news for now. I am hoping that at the next meeting I can share that it has been completed. The Part 150 does look at ACR Recommendation 4, 5, 6. Any questions? *None.*
- Hair: Update on existing initiatives and operations.
- Gagnon: Page 5. Dan produces this document – CLT ACR Key Measures document. It is complete through calendar year 2021. Same format as seen for the past few meetings.
- Gardon: Lots of data. Basically, we are comparing a number of key measures between the years of 2019, 2020, and 2021. Moving forward we may want to add a fourth year to this for 2022; that way we can see the normalcy of 2019 in comparison. At some point we will need to have the conversation of whether to use 3 or 4 years. The interesting are the top 3 - Average number of flights a day, % of flights in north and south flow, and average number of cargo flights per day. Cargo still makes a small percentage of average daily flights. Going a little deeper, mix of operations by runway is listed.

Complaint stats are listed there as well. I believe further in the handout is a more detailed breakdown of complaints. This page is 1-shop stop for information.

- Gagnon: There are 4 pages in the Written Updates with more details on the complaints.
- Rutzell: Dan, you know this is one of my favorite topics. Can you tell me the number of new households with complaints?
- Gardon: I don't really keep track of new households. That might be something I could get.
- Rutzell: I thought that was one of the measurements, that it was only counted if it was a new household.
- Gardon: When we look at a month-to-month update, we look at anything new from the last month. When we are looking at a whole year's worth of data, you do get that data set, and you can see in Ed's highlighted area, we gained 15 houses. You get that month to month, but right now I don't have a metric of these 262 houses as compared to 2020 and what might be different. I can pull a report of that.
- Rutzell: You and I can talk about that later. I am always interested in the trends.
- Wright: The number of 2021 complaints is almost double to 2020, but the number of complainants is a small increase. Can you explain?
- Gardon: What we see at Charlotte and at other airports around the country is that typically a small number of individuals are submitting a large number of complaints, and it is somewhat disproportional. You can see over the course of the entire year, one resident accounts for almost 30% of all those complaints. That is why from an airport standpoint we like the unique household metrics more. We feel that it paints a more accurate picture. That way if you complain once, you are still counted. Whereas the high volume complainants can skew the data.
 - Complaints by Zip codes: This was presented to the group in June of 2021. This is updated for the whole year. It breaks down both complaint numbers and complainant numbers by their geographic location. [Page 12] In the city of Charlotte, we received complaints from 166 individuals. You can see the highest percentage is zip code 28278, which is just southwest of the airport. The next highest is 28216, which is just north of the airport. Nearly 50% of the complainants came from those 2 areas. You see that 60% of all complaints came from 28278, and 30% of the complaints came from there. I hope that kind of paints a picture.
- Wright: Yes, I am familiar with 28216 zip code. Are you 28216, Kurt?
- Wiesenberger: I am 28216 - Mountain Island Lake. The major metrics of the year, you are using 2019 as a baseline. However, my recollection was that some airport operations really slowed down in the second half of the year due to COVID.
- Gardon: COVID entered the discussion at airports in late December 2019.
- Wiesenberger: I think your data has some errors in that the complaint process is very arduous for a new household to make a complaint. You have to go on the CLT website to fill out the complaint form. It takes 3-5 minutes depending on if you can recognize the time and the aircraft, enter your address, phone, and email. By that time, another aircraft has passed over your house. You have to do that every time. There is no repeat process. People get fatigued. I think it would be much more accurate data if there was an easier way to register their concern or complaint. I think those who get annoyed the most are going to stick with it. I would like to see the airport do something much easier to give people a place for legitimate complaint data than what you have in place now.
- Hair: Our existing contract with our noise complaint system is coming up this year, so that is good feedback.
- Gardon: We have another year on that contract, but we have been in talks with our developer as we are exploring other options. They are interested in keeping us as a

client, so they are interested in adding new capabilities to their system. If you have suggestions, I would love to hear them. Before 2014, you had to call to record a complaint. We saw an increase in complaints with this system. We include complaints on these measures mostly because the ACR likes to see them. We are open to the fact that the process is somewhat flawed. We have had this discussion in the past.

- Wiesenberger: Once a resident has made a complaint - registered, couldn't they just log in after that without repeating the administrative stuff?
- Gardon: I believe if you type in your phone number, it should autofill. If that's not the case, it should, and we will tell our developer about that.
- Wiesenberger: You don't publish these complaint numbers except for the ACR? You don't consider this a measure of your airport's performance?
- Gardon: Upon request, but otherwise just for the ACR.
- Wiesenberger: So, you don't consider this a measure of airport performance?
- Gardon: Not necessarily; I know that's a hard answer. There is a very large human factor between aeronautical noise data and what generates a complaint. There have been many studies over the last 4 years, basically trying to pinpoint a factor between aeronautical source of noise and an actual complaint. It is very hard to make that correlation. There is a general correlation in that, yes we have noise complaints in certain areas and certain flight patterns near airports, but there are a lot of outliers and things that don't make sense.
- Wiesenberger: I don't mean to put you on the spot. My response to that is - wasn't there a FAA Neighborhood Environmental Study that was published in the last couple of years that identified noise as much more significant a problem in annoying people than previously understood? And that 65 DNL is really not appropriate. There is a lot of data we can get into about those things, but I think the complaint process needs to be easier. I think it is an important metric of how the airport is doing. We are trying to put these things in place to reduce noise. Wouldn't you like to show a benefit publicly? Seems like you would.
- Gagnon: To summarize where we are with this complaint discussion, as I understand it - this is a metric of interest to the ACR. It is interesting to look at the zip codes and how it reflects where they are complaining, where they feel the issues enough to complain. What I am hearing from Kurt is that it is a metric the ACR wants to continue to see. Is there a way of looking on the front-end process, and is there any way to streamline that process? From what I understand, it will be about a year before a potential partner turnover, but there may be opportunities to work with the developer to continue to improve how the complaints are tracked and recorded since it is of value to the ACR. That is what I am hearing as key takeaways. Are there other comments on this topic?
- Gardon: To clarify, improvements to the system can be made anytime. We are not waiting a year or anything like that. Our developer and CLT have a close relationship, so we can normally get things done fairly quickly.
- Gagnon: From CLT, any other updates from operations and initiatives standpoint?
- Hair: Want to make sure that the ACR members are aware of - We do have multiple newsletters. One of them, The Airport Neighborhood Update, is starting to cover some of the ways that connections are not just made at the terminals, noting non-travel stuff that the airport is involved in. Easy to sign up with email address at our website. I would encourage you to sign up to see some of the stuff that the airport is involved in other than travel.

➤ **Engage/Improve: Updates from Project Teams**

- Gussman: Page 6 in handout. Community Engagement Project Team update. Not a lot of activity on our front. We will be having monthly meetings to get more engaged and

targeted in our efforts. Next meeting is February 3 – Thursday at 6pm. Anyone interested in joining please join us. I will send out that information.

- Cameron: Government Engagement Project Team. The government team does have monthly meetings. Our immediate next goal is to re-brief the folks that we have already briefed. We have pretty much covered, thanks to Alma Adams meeting with us last year, we have covered the territory, but there are a number of new members of various town councils, etc. So, we need to bring the new folks up to speed and to refresh memories of “older” members. We do not have a real good answer to what support we would like each of the different government bodies to give us, but we think step one is getting their sympathy and understanding.
 - We know that the airport and FAA do not work, for example, for the town of Davidson, so what the town can do is somewhat different than what the City of Charlotte commissioners can do. Next meeting will be January 27. We would love new members. Each time we go to a community, it really helps if we can say, this person is one of your constituents. We are working to get a backbone of a PowerPoint briefing that we can have. We appreciate the updates.
- Wiesenberger: Local Operations/Improvement Project Team. *Stated purpose.* We have had a limited amount of activity in the last few months. I did have a benchmarking call with a gentleman from the Miami Noise Abatement Club, Brian Gilderman, who had a number of concerns of how Metroplex was affecting flights over the population of Miami. The group could use some more members. Currently we have Sherry Washington, Mark Loflin, Thelma Wright, Greg Chase, and myself. We would like to begin meeting monthly especially when the ACR is not meeting. I’d like to propose Wednesday, February 9, at 6 pm to begin the monthly meeting process.

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

➤ **Unfinished Business – Note written updates on Motions/Requests for Support**

- Gagnon: Informational: Page 9. These are the Requests and Motions that came out of the November meeting.
 - Written updates. Page 10. Main one that is different is American Airlines - all but 6 aircraft have been retrofitted. The due date remains March 1, 2022.
 - Next are the complaint documents that Dan has already gone through. You can see the volume difference and complainant differences.
 - Next pages are provided by FAA, response to November ACR requests. These pages relate to key items on the website for community engagement. Talks about regions where they engage. Matt also provided a 1-page document on Community Roundtables and the role they play in the FAA.

➤ **Unfinished Business – Discuss Frequency/Focus of 2022 ACR Meetings**

- Gagnon: Page 19. Results of the survey that you took relating to your preferred meeting frequency as a group and what the priorities might be for 2022. Had 13 respondents. Only 12 responses about preferred meeting frequency question – one person did not answer that although they did reach out to Dan today and said they preferred quarterly meetings. Options included monthly meetings, every other month, and quarterly meetings. It was a 50/50 split – 50% prefer the monthly meetings, and 50% would prefer bi-monthly or quarterly.
- Gagnon: Member priorities - We were asked to share the top 10 list that Kurt had put into a PowerPoint to share with his community in terms of potential areas of focus for the ACR. You all rated these – if you said something was Very Important, we gave it a score of 3, Somewhat Important - 2, and Not At All Important - 1. Rank is based on average score, and the percentage that gave it a 3 is listed. It is pretty clear that the top 2 rated as most important were (1) Staying engaged with FAA and (2) Maintaining professional working relationships with CLT, FAA, and American Airlines. Next are

Participating with CLT's Part 150 study that will evaluate Recommendations 4, 5 and 6, Defining and publishing AGL altitudes for 3% arrivals at specific lateral distances. You can see some of the others that rated lower.

- Wiesenberger: What comes to my mind is that the first 2 items are how we operate – what are the basic tenets of how we behave. We want to stay engaged with the FAA, and we want to stay professional. So, if we look down the list at participating with Part 150, AGL levels, more community outreach, more government engagement outreach, and so on – I will not read them all – I think these are targets for the Project Teams. I would suggest that the Project Teams discuss if any of these are priorities for them for 2022. Let's return to this after those teams have a chance to discuss.
- Gagnon: In terms of meeting frequency, would you like to talk about that?
- Wiesenberger: One of the feelings is, because of the virtual format of our meetings, we have lost some momentum and energy that the group had. Several thought quarterly would be too long apart because it would retard the energy of the group.
 - I would like to propose bi-monthly meetings with Project Team meetings monthly. FAA only wants to participate quarterly. What month of the quarter, we don't know. There is flexibility. If the FAA has a critical deadline, I say we have a meeting. Any other discussion besides mine?
- Gussman: We have been looking and talking about this since we got the data. Kurt and I have gone over as to how to keep everyone engaged. We do feel that since we have so much to do on the Project Teams, we can meet monthly for those. That is where we are going to get “boots on the ground,” we are going to do real things. These meetings we are going to learn a lot, share a lot, do the legal aspect of approving motions, etc. I support Kurt's suggestions.
- Hair: From CLT perspective, we strongly supported quarterly meeting. But I would suggest that CLT can support these meetings bi-monthly, but to revisit it at the halfway point of the calendar year. Bi-monthly would be CLT's suggestion, especially not wanting to wait until April to receive the HMMH results.
- Wiesenberger: I think that is a good compromise. People get busy around July. Maybe we can change to 5 meetings a year. Maybe we can organize that around the FAA's schedule. I do think we need to put down the March date. Hopefully HMMH has its data, and we can formalize sending it the FAA to modify the Recommendation.
- Gagnon: The March date is March 9, if we stick with the 2nd Wednesday of the month.
- Gussman: Do we want to put the dates on the books for the year so everyone can plan?
- Gagnon: If you did – March 9, May 11, July 13, and then in May or July determine if you want to go quarterly.
- Hair: I think that would be appropriate. And from an open meeting law perspective, it would allow us to have a published calendar for the rest of this fiscal year. To be able to communicate that with the City Clerk and all the people that we need to communicate that with.
- Gussman: I'd like to make a motion unless there is more discussion.
- Wiesenberger: Can we have September and November dates as placeholders?
- Gagnon: September 14 and November 9.
- Hair: As long as we have an internal agreement that we have this conversation again, probably around the May timeframe.
- Gussman: Motion to accept the dates March 9, May 11, July 13, September 14, and November 9 as our future meeting dates.
- Loflin: Second.
- Wiesenberger: All those in favor? *All*. Any opposed? *None*. The motion passed.

➤ **New Business**

- Gagnon: Any New Business?
- Washington: Are you going to send out these dates?
- Hair: I will ask Dan to send out calendar invites this week.
- Wiesenberger: Are we still working virtually at this time?
- Hair: We are all still virtual. We will stay virtual for the rest of January. We are playing it by ear. Hopefully March can be in person. That is the goal.
- Wiesenberger: For Project Team virtual meetings, is there a platform that we can use?
- Hair: Dan can schedule the meetings and not have to be on the meetings. You can use our enterprise WebEx license. Unlimited time. What is our current quorum?
- Gagnon: We have 19 participants/members, and the quorum is 10.
- Hair: When doing Project Team meetings, if you get close to that 10, please know that you cannot meet, conduct business, or make decisions with a quorum. You need to work in smaller groups than that because it would be in violation of public meeting law. Have 9 or less people. You can make decisions but can't do actions/motions. I can pass along some copies of Robert's Rules if you need them. You can't make motions. You can decide to meet with someone, you can say "these are our priorities, and we are going to work on them."
- Cameron: For the Government Engagement Project Team, we can make a briefing on information that has already been shared through the ACR, and we can make an appointment with a government representative, and we can have a discussion on what comes up in that meeting. Right?
- Hair: You can even make an ask of an official at that time. That is appropriate because you are sharing what motions have already been done and what actions have already been taken.
- Brown: Should that be a presentation that is already been approved by the ACR?
- Gussman: We can have some, but we are working on making that better for government engagement.
- Gagnon: Any other conversation on those points? *None.*

❖ Adjourn

- Gussman motioned to adjourn. Washington seconded, all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm