

# Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

## Unapproved Summary Minutes: June 19, 2019

### Attendees

Sara Nomellini, County 2, Chair  
Kurt Wiesenberger, City 2, Vice Chair  
Phil Gussman, City 1  
Loren Schofield, City 3  
Sherry Washington, County 4  
Mark Loflin, County 6  
Sayle Brown, Cornelius  
Bob Cameron, Davidson  
Bob Lemon, Huntersville  
**Call-in Participants:** Sam Blair, City 6  
Kim Hardee, Matthews  
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg  
Ben Miley, Mint Hill  
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)  
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)  
Stuart Hair, CLT  
Dan Gardon, CLT  
Kevin Hennessey, CLT  
Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA (ex-officio)  
Sonya Busch, FAA  
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

### Summary Minutes

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- ❖ Open the Meeting
  - Approve Minutes: Cameron moved to approve. Schofield seconded. All voted to approve.
  - Review Ground Rules by Gagnon
    - Keywords when communicating in all forms: Healthy conversation, productive, and results in effective process.
  - Review Meeting Packet Information by Gagnon
    - Will refer to the packet a number of times and will be given handouts during the meeting. Page of updates on requests/motions that we will briefly mention but not have a presentation. Guiding principles will be referenced. There is a 1-pager that is a summary of Bob Cameron methodology. Will have a separate handout referencing those of you who responded to last month's ask of levels of noise and what is acceptable or not. Page with requests from May meeting. Graphs that relate to the last item that we will talk about today. Finally, 2 PowerPoints – CLT and HMMH.
- ❖ Review Public Input: None tonight.
  - Gagnon noted for audience members that they can look at the website for any historical information on the ACR's new website.
- ❖ Review 2019 FAA Submittal Work Schedule
  - Gagnon: Went over the 2019 work schedule. Four different phases in the 2nd column. We are in the Develop Draft Submittal Document phase. Note Key Actions in column 3. Starting #5 today. HMMH will present analysis of the changes that ACR may want to recommend vs. the baseline and how they compare. Then, later on, we will talk about the communication plan including the timeline for preparing and conducting community meetings. Any comments or questions? (No.)
  - Gagnon: Reminder of Slate of Recommendations. Today we are looking at #3 - **Modify Use of Departure Profiles**. (Gagnon passed out a document with some key questions that HMMH will need responses to after their presentation).

- ❖ Analyze/Uncover: Slate Recommendation Analysis – **Modify Use of Departure Profiles** – Gene Reindel, Vice President HMMH
  - Reindel: Tonight, I'm going to present a redo of all the figures of the baseline. I changed the colors. It did not change the results - just looked at better ways of showing the data. Easier to see differences. We developed a new figure at your request – showing average daily number of aircraft overflights at each grid point. We did correct some population counts that were pointed out to be incorrect.
    - Slide 4 - The darker the colors, the more the population.
    - Slide 5 is the new data. Average Daily Overflights. Note the intervals. Right now it is between less than 5 operations to about 240 operations per grid point per day. Any input or thoughts? This is new information, and the colors are new.
  - Gagnon: There is a new color key on the table in front of each seat.
  - Reindel: Updated Lmax operations. You can see clearly where the higher levels of noise are. LMax is maximum noise level throughout the day - could be one event or many.
    - Slide 7: Number of events above 70dB. Start out at 25 or less events and go up to greater than 500, which is near the airport, and there are 17.
  - Gardon: This map is located in the room. You can notice where your neighborhood is.
  - Nomellini: Can it be emailed to us?
  - Gardon: Yes.
  - Reindel: The reason we chose this is the discussions that we have had show that it is not just the noise level but how many at or above that noise level. Frequency is also a factor.
  - Reindel: DNL: Slide 8. This will be looked at by the FAA. DNL is day night sound values. FAA requires this in their evaluations.
  - Wright: (Needed clarification on the population affected by the 65-70 DNL level. Noted that it was a small number).
  - Reindel: Yes, that is the day night average.
  - Gardon: Those 458 residents have already been sound proofed or been bought out. It is a very small number.
  - Reindel: So, this is the baseline and what we will compare our alternatives against.
  - Miley: This is departures and arrivals?
  - Reindel: This is every aircraft that operated at CLT in 2018.
  - Wiesenberger: One metric that several of us have been considering as having a bigger impact on annoyance is not the day night average or the Lmax but the number of repetitive flights in a several hour time period. Somewhere between the Lmax and DNL. For example: A flight that is every 90 seconds at 70 dB. That is annoying. This baseline doesn't represent that. Or does it?
  - Reindel: It doesn't. I think number above 70 dB starts to do that. Although that number above is for a 24-hour period. I think that would be difficult to do. I don't know that we can affect the frequency. As we are going through this, I will keep that in mind – if there is some way to get that besides number above. I get it. It is the frequency.
  - Reindel: **Noise Abatement Departure Profiles:** The FAA allows for the airlines to only have 2 noise abatement departure profiles in their toolkit - what is available for pilots to fly, per aircraft type. You have the standard and then the noise abatement departure profiles, and there are 2 of them. The 2 are NADP-1, which is a close-in profile, and NADP-2, which is the more distant profile. The close-in (NADP-1) has its cutback sooner in its departure and NADP-2 is the distant and that means that the thrust cutoff is farther from the airport.
  - Nomellini: What that means is when there is cutback sooner, they are not climbing as fast. So, there is a tradeoff.
  - Reindel: Yes, and there is also an area where they have to reapply the power. There are tradeoffs there, too.
    - Slide 10: For the NADPs, we looked at the 2018 aircraft operations and modified for all departures for aircraft type to utilize NADP-1 or 2 where NADP profiles are in the model. That is important. If they are not available in the model then they are not available in that aircraft type. Not to say they couldn't be

available. Majority of aircraft that operate here, that are causing the higher noise levels, most had a profile that we could use. I don't think the effect would be much greater if we could model them all. We compared those results to the baseline. No difference to grid points for number of daily flights over grid points. Still same flights.

- Slide 12: I don't think this slide is very useful but can be compared to the baseline.
  - Slide 13: Lmax 2018 operations with NADP-1 compared to baseline. Hard to see differences.
  - Slide 14: What is more important is what is different. Same tables but the green area is an area of reduction and the red is area of increase in Lmax at grid points. On the map you are looking at the green dots and yellow dots. To summarize – 131 grid points (approximately 16K people) would experience less noise with NADP-1 and 48 grid points (approximately 14K people) would experience increased noise levels with NADP-1.
- Reindel: There is no red on the grid graph. The red in the table is represented by the yellow on the map.
  - Wright: On the legend, on page 14, which one of the changes on the Key we were given at our seats is this representing?
  - Reindel: It's the bottom right, although I am not seeing the yellow, so that bottom right needs to be updated. Bottom right is the same as middle bottom, and they should not be the same.
  - Nomellini: Can you address what the difference is in level of noise? What was the starting point?
  - Reindel: So, in actual noise level? We can go back to the Lmax. So, it is on the lower end at those points 60-70 dB. So, it went from a maximum level of somewhere in the 60s to 62-66 or so.
  - Nomellini: We need to say yay or nay on this, and with this format I am uncomfortable if I'm making a decision by looking at the maps. Is there another way for us to tabulate this information so it is more precise? For me it feels like if we are going to do something to people, we need to know exactly what we are doing.
  - Loflin: Are we pushing an element over a certain threshold?
  - Nomellini: It seems a little imprecise.
  - Reindel: I get it. Going from 80 to 81 is much different than going from 60 to 61.
  - Brown: Does anyone know what 60 sounds like? Do you know what it sounds like when an airplane flies over you at 60 decibels? (Member(s): Yes). I have a sound level meter, and I measure when a plane comes over at 3000 above the house, and it registers between 40 and 60. Different planes. What we are saying is we are going to allow 65 when it was 60? (Member(s): Yes). I cannot discern the difference between 60 and 62.
  - Nomellini: Can we bring a device in? So, we can actually hear it?
  - Reindel: It would be difficult to do precisely. You have room acoustics, etc. Rule of thumb is less than 2 dB on an instantaneous noise level that is what an Lmax is, it is hard to determine that the sound level is any different. It is somewhere between 3 and 5, which is why I went from 1-5 because it starts to be noticeable. Somewhere in that range it is starting to be noticeable.
  - Brown: The repetition is the problem.
  - Gagnon: Just a couple of points: Bob Cameron is going to go through a methodology looking at different ways we can determine what is comfortable vs. uncomfortable; what is acceptable noise to unacceptable, including frequency. Then we'll hand out what a dozen of you provided as noise levels.
    - Question for Gene since there were questions about colors: Slide 14: If the green grid points are the green on the table, and the yellow grid points are the red in the table, we are saying that the green grid points had a reduction in noise, and the yellow had an increase. And as a reminder, HMMH highlighted certain areas as they were impacted by Metroplex. At the top is Mountain Island Lake, to the lower left is Steele Creek, and to the right is SouthPark. Look at these areas to see if they are being positively or negatively affected by this change.
  - Reindel: One last thing to point out. It is a more densely populated area where the increase is happening. The grids that increased in level, there are more people.
  - Nomellini: You are also dealing with 2010 data, right?
  - Reindel: Dealing with 2010 census, yes.
  - Nomellini: My guess is the density showing in Steele Creek is not accurate anymore.

- Hennessey: Not just Steele Creek. It is everywhere.
- Nomellini: The density of uptown is not as tight because of land use. Just an assumption.
- Reindel: Slide 17: Number of events above analysis. What we are calling the N70. 2018 operations with **NADP-1** – close-in – compared to baseline. It is about seeing the differences. The yellow and reddish dots are areas that have increased in number of events above 70 with NADP-1, and the green represents areas where the number of events has decreased. So, you can see that if you went to NADP-1 profiles, which does a cut back close-in, it is actually a little bit worse than with the standard procedures today. In my opinion, you would not want to do this as 255K people would experience more events above N70 and only 3K would experience fewer events above N70. Looking at DNL. It did change slightly. 16 grid points would experience reduced noise levels with NADP-1, and 15 grid points would experience increased noise levels with NADP-1.
- Reindel: Now **NADP-2**. Similar analyses to NADP-1. Slide 23: The differences are 23 grid points/2600 people would experience reduction in maximum noise levels. 30 grid points/2100 people experience increased noise levels with NADP-2. Number of events above analysis is on slide 25. Hard to see but look on the difference grid – Slide 26: Almost 25K people would experience fewer events above N70 using NADP-2, and 9K would experience an increase. This makes sense because the increase would be nearest to the airport. There is no change in DNL.
- Reindel: Summary of analysis. Slide 30: Results are consistent with prior ACR analysis of NADPs. NADP-1 – maximum sound levels decreased on initial departure close to the airport compared to standard. Maximum sound levels increased as aircraft navigated away from the airport. With NADP-2, it is the opposite. Give and take between the 2 NADPs. It's about where do you want to get your benefit, and you do want to look at where the population is and the noise levels are when evaluating NADPs - I think this analysis shows what's expected when evaluating NADPs.
- Gagnon: Two slides that were beneficial to me for comparing were slide 17 (NADP-1) and slide 26 (NADP-2) because they show total number of events over 70 and how that changes for the better or the worse and also – in the map – shows you where positive and negative changes are. The handout that I passed out earlier has the questions from slide 32. First question: Do the reported changes for the 2018 baseline to NADP-1 or NADP-2 meet the goals of the ACR? Thoughts about the first question or the data that Gene presented?
- Nomellini: I think the 1<sup>st</sup> question should be – Who is comfortable making decisions with the data received, and if (I'm projecting my own opinions here) the answer is no, what do you need to see to make that decision?
- Wright: I believe the airport is currently using the NADP-2 profile, so is it an option?
- Reindel: The airport is not. Many airlines choose to fly NADP-2 rather than the standard.
- Nomellini: Is American flying it?
- Reindel: If American flies a NADP, it is 2. I'm sure they don't fly it on every flight. There are reasons that they do or don't. I think Tracy did say that they tend to fly NADP-2 out of Charlotte.
- Nomellini: So, is the intent that this is something that is mandatory, it is something that can be enforced or highly suggested?
- Reindel: It is more the latter – highly suggested. The airport would do analysis like we have done in order to decide if they want to do a NADP and then, which one. Send out a notice to the airlines, whenever possible use this profile when flying out of Charlotte.
- Nomellini: What would determine if they did not use the profile? If the airport put out a statement like that, a recommendation, why would they choose not to use it?
- Reindel: Some aircraft may not have the capability, may not have that procedure available. Maybe something with the winds. Typically, once an airport puts that out, they tend to do it. Airlines like NADP-2 because it is a fuel savings for most (not all) aircraft types.
- Gagnon: In October when you all did the evaluation of NADP, you noted that with some types of planes, there would be no difference in NADP. Can you talk about how airplane type relates to the procedure?
- Reindel: Sometimes the standard procedure and the noise abatement departure procedures are the same. The manufacturers always put together recommendations on how you fly. More than not the standard meets the NADP-2. The older the aircraft type, that gap is bigger.

- Cameron: Is the profile – NADP-1 or 2 or standard – selected by the pilot before takeoff in the computer system, or is this a hand flying technique?
- Reindel: Today it is almost all done by computer.
- Cameron: So, AA flight #123 taxiing out can choose NADP-1 or 2 or standard?
- Reindel: Correct.
- Cameron: When it comes to ‘are we ready to make a decision’...for me, the number of events over 70 is a meaty statistic. Looking at the grid points, we don’t know the level of reduction except it is 5 dBs. But it might be from 45 to 40, which is not noticeable to me, but if it is 70-65, that makes a difference. So, I would like to see that analysis discarding the population that is under a certain level. If we could only see those from 50 on up, I think that would be best because under that it really doesn’t matter. Does that make sense?
- Reindel: I’m not sure I understand. You were first talking about number of events above 70 and that was compelling to you. But then you went to Lmax, maximum levels. Those are not the same thing.
- Cameron: On slide 14, 14k people got worse, and 16k got better. Can you redo that page for only folks above 50? If that could be done, it would be a more convincing argument for me.
- Nomellini: A bigger question I have is how many planes at CLT are flying this profile. Is it even worth going through all this for this one change? Because this has to go before the FAA, right? If it is part of our bundle, maybe it doesn’t really matter, but if we are going through all the effort to evaluate this, how many flights are we talking about?
- Reindel: We are doing a study in Orange Co. Some air carriers prefer NADP-1. I would say here you have some flying each of the 3 profiles. AA prefers NADP-2 when possible, but hard to do further analysis.
- Nomellini: No one has that information?
- Reindel: We would have to survey all the airlines to get that information.
- Gardon: Slide 31 - In comparing NADP-2 to baseline, there is no change in DNL. What that tells you is that the vast majority of planes currently are flying NADP-2 at CLT. We know that because AA told us except for a few planes. To be honest, of all the Slate items this one has the least bang for buck. We may change the events over 70, but the DNL will not change.
- Nomellini: When you live under it, DNL doesn’t matter.
- Wiesenberger: When we talk about baseline, is that the same kind of mix, NADP-1 or 2 and standard, that we have today? What is baseline?
- Reindel: We assumed for the baseline, standard procedure for all aircraft.
- Nomellini: But that is not true.
- Reindel: You are right. If you don’t have the standard to compare it to, you can’t know how the NADP-2 will work. But if they are already flying it, who cares? But you might care, because if they start flying NADP-1 you can see what it does the other way and if you want to avoid NADP-1 or the standard and you want to force people to fly NADP-2, this is the vehicle to do that.
- Nomellini: This is the way to formalize it so it doesn’t get worse.
- Miley: In theory, wasn’t NADP-1 to help people closer to the airport and NADP-2 to help those farther away? If you choose to live close to the airport, you choose to get flights.
- Reindel: It is not more or less flights; it is the levels. How they came about was because of where people live - for instance: San Diego. Lots of people live close to the airport. And getting farther out, you are over the ocean. The distant does not make sense there because you’re benefitting people who aren’t in the ocean. NADP-2 is better overall because people are not typically living close to airports. Most airports in their Part 150s recommend NADP-2.
- Gagnon: Sara was asking the question: Will this give you the information you need to make a decision about potentially including this in the Slate? HMMH would need to know whether or not you want to include this in collective analysis. Before getting into the handout questions, having information like seeing how much population is affected, DNL or - in this case - number of events above 70 - does this give you the information you need? Do you need something in addition?

- Nomellini: I think Bob had a good point. If we are going to make it worse for someone, we need to make sure we know what we are doing to them before we do it - not that we won't necessarily do it.
- Reindel: Maybe we can do it down to a certain level. Look at the key, and look at the maximum sound level values, the clear is less than 60. That is an easy place to cut it off. We can evaluate changes in Lmax at greater than 60, or there is probably a way to put this in an Excel spreadsheet and look at where are the differences.
- Nomellini: I still think the 60 level is too high. I think we have to look at lower values, like 50 or 55.
- Schofield: I would support what Sara is saying. I have been using a meter at my house. I would like to ignore the 50 and under. When I measure 50 at home, it is not really relevant. The birds singing this morning was registering at 45. I care about the higher levels and frequencies. Those 2 variables are what cause the greatest disturbances.
- Wiesenberger: The least meaningful metric is DNL. For our purposes, it doesn't matter.
- Reindel: DNL is bookkeeping. Slide 6, there are 0 grid points less than 60 for Lmax during the day.
- Gagnon: What I'm hearing in the basis for evaluation, in addition to what Gene is providing:
  - 1. Who is specifically negatively affected? And how?
  - 2. Is there another or different noise level evaluation point?
    - Are these the 2 main decision points that we are adding?
- Wiesenberger: Yes, I think so. I think they apply to each of the Slate items. I feel positively about the NADP-2; however it is one of 8 things. There may be something that has a bigger effect.
- Nomellini: I don't think we have to pick.
- Reindel: Since there are 2 NADPs, I think we need to at least like to pick one NADP or remain silent.
- Wright: Population question. If we are using 2010 census, would we be able to get new population data?
- Gardon: We are using slightly elevated data. It is federal census with some county records and state records mixed in. Basically, any data we could find. It's slightly better than 2010 data, but not exactly 2018 data.
- Gussman: I sit on a planning commission in the Mountain Island Lake area. I have watched over 1,200 homes approved for construction. If this is the data we have, we need to use it. Lots of housing developments going in – in Steele Creek, I've probably seen 5,000 units go in.
- Nomellini: Can we get permitting data to get more accurate data?
- Gardon: I can check.
- Gagnon: Can I do a quick show of hands for a quick poll of the group. 4 different options (leaning toward NADP-1, leaning toward NADP-2, leaning toward recommending neither, or Unsure). Gene, would that be beneficial to HMMH - knowing what people want in profiles, etc.?
- Reindel: Yes.
- Gagnon: Does conducting a quick poll sound beneficial, Sara?
- Nomellini: Yes, but going back to what Bob said, I really want to understand what that difference is added to.
- Reindel: Even though we know that everywhere Lmax is greater than 60?
- Nomellini: That's fair.
- Wright: Question about the new planned runway. Will it be departure and arrivals? How and what will that affect?
- Reindel: There is an EA being done now. So, that is a separate project. But we cannot have blinders on either. We know that the new runway will affect noise.
- Nomellini: From what I received, I thought the additional runway was a safety feature, because of wanting to separate departures and arrivals.
- Gardon: That is my understanding, and we will have a brief update on that.
- Reindel: You do have a new runway. It is in a location that one isn't. I assume there are people under those flight paths.

- Gagnon: Taking a poll for all ACR members' preferences: NADP-1 (0 votes); NADP-2 (11 includes Blair on phone); Neither, stay with the Standard (0); Uncertain (2)
    - Any questions for Gene before we move on?
  - Wiesenberger: What's next on the Slate? What are you going to do next?
  - Reindel: Continuous Descent (CDA).
  - Wiesenberger: I would recommend low hanging fruit, big bang for the buck as soon as possible.
  - Reindel: Part of the problem, like dispersal headings, is one of those that we are interested in, and it takes the longest to do.
- ❖ Additional Business
- Unfinished Business
    - **Written updates on Motions/Requests for Support**
      - Gagnon: Request updates - handout in packet. AA has new contact. Bernie Davis, Manager, Air Traffic Operations, Charlotte – Southeast Region. CLT has his contact information. Any questions before Tracy returns in August go to him.
      - Nomellini: Can we get information from airlines that have not responded favorably to the curfew?
      - Gardon: Somewhat disappointing but we haven't had any airline responses. Currently we have about 12 responses from GA and operators. Hopefully we will hear back from the airlines; I think we asked for deadline of June 30.
    - **Overview of Noise Threshold Methodology – Bob Cameron, ACR Member**
      - Gagnon: (Introduced Bob Cameron. Noise Effect Evaluation Approach). Don't get too caught up in the specific metrics and measures that he is about to share. At the end of the presentation, I will ask for your comfort level and confidence in using a similar methodology for you all to evaluate recommendations going forward, and secondly I will pass out a handout where 12 of you voiced your opinions of what is an acceptable level of noise.
      - Nomellini: I found this intriguing because it brought in the frequency part.
      - Cameron: Noise effect evaluation approach. Here is a chart of noise equivalents (what dB level means what) – Gene has one that is similar. Ed had asked us to tell us how loud is loud - acceptable vs. unacceptable level of noise. Frequency is an important key. Also, it is all subjective. If I was moving into a neighborhood with the graph of green, I'd be comfortable moving in there. If I was looking at a neighborhood with noise like the red line, I'd not move there. The graph corresponds with the first chart - 1 event down through 90 events at different levels. I just used numbers randomly to show a point. I think we said that 10 dB is twice as noisy when looking at increasing levels. You could change the numbers on the spreadsheet. If we could agree as a group, we could see if an area is in the comfort zone. Somewhere between the **concern** and green which is **comfort**. I could email the file so you can play with the numbers yourself. Any questions?
      - Schofield: I like the approach. I am interested in per hour.
      - Cameron: It is hard to grasp what the best time period would be. So, I ended up going per day.
      - Wiesenberger: At the risk of being redundant, per hour is a more painful metric that we suffer from.
      - Cameron: Which hour do you pick?
      - Wiesenberger: Does it matter?
      - Cameron: If it's an average hour, then you get back into the day night average in that you are averaging in 2 o'clock in the morning along with 2 in the afternoon.
      - Wiesenberger: No, I think it is a maximum number of flights per any hour.
      - Nomellini: If you can send out the Excel and have people comment on what their thresholds are. Start thinking about how you think this will work. What is tolerance level?
      - Gagnon: Kim has a DVD that is an audio recording after 1015pm.
      - Hardee: It was the frequency - every 90 seconds or less for 2 hours.

- Nomellini: Maybe we need to respond to duration and frequency.
- Miley: Yes, exactly. If you are getting flights at 10:30 to 1:00 and every 60 seconds, would you change that for 30 second flights at 80 dB? There is a difference in the time of day.
- Gagnon: Let's confirm. Sara is asking is to look at this methodology. Are we all comfortable using some semblance of this methodology – a combination of frequency and noise?
  - ◆ (Passed around handout) This is the results of what noise levels are acceptable or unacceptable from some of the group. We are asking for you all – thinking of the methodology that Bob supplied – feel free to tweak it. Give us feedback. Take your data and roll it into the methodology.
- Loflin: Would it be appropriate - if Gene or Dan has seen this - to ask for any comments they have on it?
- Reindel: What Bob has provided here is number of events per day. This is the same evaluation as I have done, just looking at more of the noise levels.
- Wright: Last month when this was asked, we went outside measuring and wondering what is 90? The planes going over this building was 90, which was surprising. I thought it would be a lot louder than 90. But then where I live, directly overhead 75 is the number that I get.
- Gagnon: I remember you and Gene had that conversation. 140 shows up as airplane noise but that is literally standing right next to the aircraft. Anything else before we move along? Great.
- **Motion Update and Next Steps – Return the CAATT Waypoint** (on the CHSLY3 arrival pattern for arrivals to the 36 parallels) **to Pre-Metroplex** (Raising Altitudes on Downwind Leg) – Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA
  - Gagnon: Going on into a Waypoint update (Passed out handout). Bob of FAA will comment. Front page includes update, and back page is particular request that Bob will comment on.
  - Szymkiewicz: Last time we met, I said that I thought we had good news. Since that meeting the air traffic managers and some of the representatives got together and agreed on the changes they would like to make. It is exactly what we had portrayed but for one exception. There is a fix that's upstream on arrival that is (9k-12k that also needs to be changed to 10k-12k) that will have to be amended. We are technically at Phase 1. We are at 20 days. It usually takes about a month to get an answer back. I am riding a fine line between being a pain and trying to get information. Design Phase would be in the future.
    - ◆ Sonya and air traffic manager are trying to find an interim solution. That entails deciding the procedure, determining risks, developing training. Do you do it with a small sample size? It seems like we are not moving forward, but we are. We are in the first steps. We are making progress.
    - ◆ The request on the back is the email and what it looks like when we actually put this in place. This is proof. We are now waiting. I feel confident that we will get a yes, but we have to wait.
  - Wiesenberger: Good work. Thank you.
- **Requests for Support – Update on Overall Communications Strategy and Near-term Actions** – CLT Staff
  - Gardon: General reminder that we want to acknowledge the successes of the ACR. As well we want to notify certain areas that are affected, negatively or positively, of changes that come out of this room. It is a slow process - today marks 2 years since the ACR began, but we are getting things done (Gardon began talking about getting a consultant to come up with a communications strategy for the ACR). I met with Sara/Kurt a few months ago about what they want in the communication plan. We are looking for ACR members who would like to support communication planning; we've heard from several already (Sara, Kurt, Mark).
  - Hair: To expand on that, we had a consultant hired and a contract, and they left the firm. So, we are back to square one. The strategy is not just for our communication with the ACR; it is for all around community engagement.

- Wiesenberger: Are there things that ACR members can do to move forward before the consultant is in place?
- Hair: The best thing that you can do is to be the subject matter experts that you are. Be the community voice, and tell the story to anyone who will listen.
- Gagnon: Loren is also interested in being on the communications committee. Relating to the idea of community meetings, especially when you all have decided on what you all want to submit as ideas – in looking at the Work Schedule – the general timing is to hold those meetings in October 2019. What CLT has advised is that 2 months in advance will be promoting of those meetings - so, August timeframe.
  - ◆ Two asks: The first is informing your groups (towns, neighborhood associations). We need folks to come to these meetings in the Fall so we can have their feedback. Second: Relating to email lists and communication - maybe your neighborhood has an email list. Acquire that list so CLT can communicate to the contacts on the list or maybe take the CLT promotional communications and funnel that information to your groups so they can get the information out to their constituents.
- Nomellini: It would be helpful to send out a separate email after this meeting regarding this.
- Washington: Can we use social media, like Nextdoor?
- Hair: We are not on Nextdoor - the airport is considered a business. We are on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and YouTube. We plan to promote this event on those arenas.
- Nomellini: We can put a link on Nextdoor.
- Cameron: Knowing that there is an EA for the new runway, I think that will be a topic of interest to the people we represent. We should let that be a point of communication as well.
- Gagnon: We will have to coordinate with the EA group. FAA doesn't like to have our meetings and EA meetings in a close timeframe.
- Lauren Scott (The planning and environmental manager at CLT): It was formally an EIS. In February 2016, the FAA contracted to complete the EIS. February of this year, the FAA converted the EIS to an EA. The runway length was reduced from 12K' to 10K'. FAA always conducts the EIS. When it comes to an EA, the airport will do the EA – but still approved by the FAA and the participating agencies. We have selected Landrum Brown after an RFQ, who did the master plan in 2013 that produced this runway. We are discussing fee now; FAA approved the Scope of Work. Hoping to go to council in July and then start the project. A lot of opportunity for community involvement. We will have 3 separate meetings for the public. One is an update on converting from the EIS to an EA, 2 others will be at key points throughout the process. I am expecting 12–18 months before final determination from the FAA.
- Brown: Is the EA less restrictive than EIS?
- Scott: For this one, I will say no. We look at the exact same environmental categories. There were parts of the project at 12K that required EIS.
- Nomellini: Those impacts were to streets and neighborhoods, right?
- Scott: Yes.
- Brown: Was wondering if they reduced the length because of the fuel carrier area?
- Scott: South side is where we took the 2K feet off.
- Nomellini: In essence, it has something to do with West Blvd., right?
- Scott: With the 12K runway, the plan was to relocate West Blvd. Now, we are able to relocate that road on existing roadways.
- **ACR Strategic Framework Update/Review – Kurt Wiesenberger, ACR Member**
  - Gagnon: Need guidance from Sara and Kurt. 3 more agenda items. Passing out the Noise Improvement Matrix. The other items are ACR member survey and additions to ACR. How do we want to continue?

- Wiesenberger: I was going to address Noise Improvement Matrix. Between last meeting and now, I did update a number of items on pages 4 and 5. I don't think there is much to review. Those items are highlighted in blue. They will be addressed in the communication plan. Please review it. I would like us to update some items associated with arrivals on page 2, give the number of requests and Slate items. We need to keep them consistent.
- Gagnon: So, updating motions database and reflecting that here?
- Wiesenberger: I think it needs to be a macro view of all the work we are doing, to keep it current and consistent. If anyone has any additional suggestions on things we could be including (for example, benchmarking other airports), we can include that as well. Folks should provide those to me personally. I am happy to foster this along.
- Gagnon: Any comments about the Matrix? This Matrix is a strategic approach for addressing causes of noise.

➤ New Business

▪ **Upcoming ACR Member Survey and Subcommittee Development**

- Gagnon: Sara, would you talk about the upcoming survey?
- Nomellini: Yes. Trying to determine interest and where you are willing to help more – particularly via subcommittees. The Matrix may be another subcommittee; another would be communications. We will give examples of subcommittees and allow for other interests in comment box.
- Gagnon: The idea is to expedite some of the work through the subcommittees. We will send the survey out in the next couple of weeks.

▪ **ACR Membership Additions**

- Gardon: At last meeting, we had a gentleman speak from Sherrills Ford area. He asked about membership, how it was determined, and if there would ever be change to that. Under guidance from Sara/Kurt, I looked at areas that I felt were underrepresented. I looked at areas with high numbers of overflights, high numbers of complaints. There were 2 that stood out outside Mecklenburg County.
  - ◆ Lincoln County - lots of complaints from Denver and Iron Station. The east side of that county is affected by arrivals to 18R. We have no representations under that final approach right now.
  - ◆ The other is an addition to York County. We have a York County representative. York County is shaped weirdly. We have heard from a number of residents in Tega Cay. So, a 2nd representative from York County. The ACR charter would need to be updated, but these are two to be considered.
- Nomellini: Does anyone have any objections? If there are no objections, I think we should just do that.
- Gagnon: Since we're changing the charter, we'll need a formal motion.
- Wiesenberger: I make the motion that we include additional memberships.
- Gussman: 2nd.
- Nomellini: Any objections? All approved.
- Gardon: I have people in mind already.

❖ Adjourn

- Loflin motioned to adjourn. Lemon seconded; all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.