

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: October 14, 2020

Attendees

Sara Nomellini, Chair, County 2
Kurt Wiesenberger, Vice Chair, Charlotte
Phillip Gussman, City 1
Darren Crosby, City 2
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Megan Walton, County 5
Mark Loflin, County 6
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Bob Cameron, Davidson
Sam Stowe, Gaston
Bob Lemon, Huntersville
Walter Ballard, Lincoln
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Kevin Vesely, York
Sean Muckenfuss, York (Central)

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Dan Gardon, CLT
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Amber Leathers, CLT
Mark Wiebke, CLT
Melissa Treadaway, CLT
Ted Kaplan, CLT
Andreese Davis, FAA
Ashli Hale, FAA
Reggie Davis, FAA
Pearlis Johnson, FAA
Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Summary Minutes

❖ Meeting started at 6:00 PM

❖ Open the Meeting

- Nomellini: Guest attendee from SeaTac, Seattle-Tacoma airport – JC Harris who is a city council person in Des Moines, Washington. He is listening in to see how we do things and hopefully will learn how we do things.
- Nomellini: Welcome Megan Walton, new ACR member, to the Community Roundtable. Thank you for volunteering and contributing!
- Gagnon: *Went through the mechanics of WebEx.* Participate through chat, phone, and we are going to use the “raise the hand” feature. Dan will monitor - you will be recognized. You can also send an email to Dan or me after the meeting. Please introduce yourself when you speak.
 - The meeting is being recorded, as is the chat. Structure of Handout: This document is larger than normal. Please note the page numbers at top, not bottom. The PDF that was sent yesterday is almost exactly the same. There are some modifications that I will point out. *Went through the packet.*
 - Ground rules: Healthy meetings, productive, and brief/concise points. Be effective in making noise improvement in our community.
- Nomellini: Approve Minutes: Wiesenberger moved to approve. Vesely seconded. All voted to approve.

❖ Review Public Input

- Gagnon: *Went over guidelines for public speakers: 3 minutes.* If more time needed, it is up to chair. ACR may or may not respond at time of meeting. The following citizen was given three minutes to address the ACR:
- Person #1 - Henry Santos

- ACR participants shared initial feedback from the speaker.

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

➤ **Monitor: Share FAA Slate Review/Implementation Checklist**

- Gagnon: First item is Share FAA Slate Review/Implementation Checklist - Page 3. FAA Decisioning Map that we have created: It started with some information that the FAA gave us in August 2018. We created the first Decisioning Map and finalized it in March 2019. Made a small addition in March 2020 based on additional FAA input. On page 3 of the handout there is a checklist of the process - based on the Decisioning Map - that the FAA goes through when they review a submittal. Sara and Kurt suggested that we put it in the format that you see in front of you, which is just like the FAA submittal checklist we used for the 6 months or so preceding the submittal - so we understand where we are in the process.

➤ **Monitor: FAA Progress**

- Johnson: Good evening, everyone, and welcome, Megan. Introduced himself – Deputy Regional Administrator in the FAA Southern Region. Summary – the ACR gave us 6 recommendations. We decided that we needed to form a matrix team to deal with the recommendations. Still in data gathering mode. Two of our team members are on this call: Andreesse Davis is program manager for this package and Reggie Davis, who is the flight procedures guy. We are still looking at those recommendations, and I will ask Andreesse to share what we have been doing the last couple of weeks.
- Davis: I am a member of the operations support group in the eastern service center in Atlanta. We handle air traffic-related flight procedures, etc. I will share where the FAA is with the ACR’s recommendations. Just several weeks ago, we formed that core group that consists of Pearlis’ office, which is the regional administrators’ office. They facilitate the communications within the group and external to the group. Typically, the regional office is where you will get most of your information. Another member is the Atlanta Air Traffic district - a general manager and assistant general manager. The reason they are on the team is to help with a holistic air traffic perspective to get things through the process more quickly. We have the Charlotte air traffic manager on the team to provide air traffic issues that are unique to Charlotte, which is important. My team – the Airports division – that helps decipher and get through some of the technical aspects of the recommendations in order to come up with good solutions - including flight procedures, creation/modification of instrument flight procedures, safety requirements, environmental requirements, etc.
 - Core group consists of upper management that reviews appropriate feedback for you all. They help forge a path forward and determine what is achievable, the technical justification of each recommendation, the complexity of implementing not just each one but all those together, and the prioritization and potential grouping of the different recommendations. This group is also the conduit for all communications to and from the ACR. So, if there’s a need for a comprehensive conversation, you’ll see some or all of the core group represented. Core group members are there to receive and provide feedback regarding the more technical aspects. They will have regular interaction with a group of technical experts. The group is represented by a number of offices within the FAA - there will be people from my office, environmental protection specialists, air traffic control, terminal flight procedure specialists, etc. - many will help the core group in making decisions.
 - We are early in the data gathering information phase. In a couple weeks, we will meet with the Charlotte Noise Abatement team to see what they have to share in terms of lessons learned, identify obstacles, etc. in order to proceed in the most efficient way. The obstacles can be a number of different things, but at this point we are trying to gather all the information to be able to move forward and to be able to provide substantive feedback.
 - This project should take some time, although we commit to providing quarterly updates in trying to be transparent.

- Johnson: I think you covered it. We are looking forward to the discussion with the airport. The last Thursday of every month we plan to have a meeting about this project. The airport was going to be invited to that.
- Vesely: Thank you for getting back to us. When you say you will interact with the airport, do you mean just the airport or with the surrounding communities as well?
- Johnson: We will meet with the Noise Abatement Team. We will be working closely with them to understand concerns of the past and issues that we have had in the past. We'll work with Dan and Stuart and his team.
- Vesely: What about South Carolina and surrounding places that are far from the airport and are affected by airport traffic?
- Johnson: They will let us know about areas within 30 miles of the airport. We have run into obstacles before, like lawsuits. Dan, do you think we can cover those communities? I think if we need to call in ACR members, we will. I don't see an issue with that.
- Gardon: At this stage in the game, we are taking into account the entire region, including SC, including up North. Kevin, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but I think you are talking about prior to implementation, when will these communities receive notification or be worked with? Hopefully this is the case. I think it is too early to answer that part of the question.
- Vesely: That's what I was wondering – correct.
- Wiesenberger: Also, thanks to FAA. On the checklist, what is concerning to me, there is no timeline. While the FAA has said they've formed a group and will do research, do we have milestones as to when things will be completed? With reference to the Noise Abatement Team, that is specific to the Charlotte Airport operations. That excludes the ACR until those 3 entities are together. If someone could address those points, I would appreciate it.
- Johnson: I don't think I can give you a timetable yet. Right now, we are data gathering. We were looking at the arrivals and departures that you all gave us to consider. Right now, we are trying to understand if it would be better to look at all 3 arrival options at the same time or do them individually, and the same thing with departures. We do not have all that understanding right now. We are learning from the Metroplex project that was just put into place in Charlotte 3½ years ago. We do not want to make mistakes that were made in the past.
 - On your second question, we do not have an issue working with the ACR at some point. We are not at that point now; we are still gathering data. We want to make sure that we have legal review and environmental people involved. It is a large effort that we have to scope out. The Metroplex project took over 10 years before implementation. This will not be a quick fix.
- Cameron: Does the FAA have access to the various data that Gene developed for the ACR?
- Johnson: We have Gene's information and we're hoping to get some briefings with Gene once the team is at that point that they can schedule something, so that's what we plan to do - verify it and make sure we understand what they did and how they did it.
- Nomellini: Dan, who is the Noise Abatement team?
- Gardon: Me, Kevin, Stuart, and our legal and environmental people.
- Wright: Is this considered the quarterly report, so we can't expect another update until January 2021?
- Johnson: We hope to have something to tell you at the December meeting. If we have something to share, we will share when you have meetings.
- Davis: We mentioned that it takes time and education. Pearlis mentioned that the Metroplex project went from the planning stage to implementation stage – it took about 10 years. We are hesitant to throw out timelines in the early phases. We're avoiding sharing any timelines. We can commit to quarterly – if there is anything significant to share, we would. Our goal is to be transparent. This is part of our process, both environmentally and policy concern, when it

comes to creating and even modifying flight procedures. We can share some information in December. So, reviewing and data collection is an important piece of it.

- Wright: I know I have asked before. Bob Sz. from FAA. What about the proposal he sent to FAA? Is that a part of our Slate?
- Gagnon: It was incorporated into the Slate. He – in working with the FAA – redefined it a bit initially. The ACR submitted moving the CAATT and EPAYE waypoints back to the pre-Metroplex locations. His work with the FAA that Spring and Summer translated into raising the altitudes at CAATT and EPAYE by 1000 feet. It was put in submittal as one of the Slate items.
- Wright: Thanks.
- Walton: I have a comment/question. Back in 2015 the city of Phoenix did sue the FAA for similar issues and won because it (noise) was happening over sacred ground – Indian burial land. That was the only reason they could change anything. I am brand new to the group, so it's frustrating to hear a bit like we are kicking the can to make people happy. I have a toddler who won't go outside because of the low flying airplanes. I can assure you that our home price was not adjusted for that. We just bought our house in March 2020. Additionally in 2012, we had issues in Cameron Woods. I'm in SouthPark now. The planes were extremely low. A lawyer – friends with my husband – started an initiative, and I know that the FAA did not take years to change things because people made a lot of noise. The planes were flying 2000' above our homes - like 11 miles from the airport. I'm wondering - why does it take so long? What kind of data are you gathering? Is it going to take a lawsuit to get things to move - I believe that is the intent of this committee is to avoid a lawsuit. No one has enough money. I know NY and DC are filing lawsuits against the FAA for this exact same problem, and they are not even winning. Forgive me if this has been discussed before. What does the FAA have in mind? Do not mistake my words for a lack of appreciation.
- Johnson: There is a lot of data to digest and I know this group - the ACR - has worked almost 3 years putting together these recommendations. It is not an easy task to do. I am not going to speak to Phoenix because that is a different issue there than here. There are multiple ACRs around the country. We don't have an unlimited number of people. We are trying to use the same resources, but safety is the number one issue that we deal with. We try to prioritize all the work that is being done around the country. A lot of the same team working every area. Data gathering is required in order to make sure that we don't make another mistake. I cannot just raise one SID or STAR. I may have to look at raising 4 or 5, and then I may have to look at the whole area around the airport.
- Davis: To Pearlis' point, the FAA is taking a more integrative approach to creating and modifying flight procedures across the nation. We have learned a lot over this time. This meeting is an example of us taking these things seriously. We have monthly meetings. I hope you don't think this is us just showing up for legal reasons. It is not. Couple of variables we look at: How does it fit into the NAS? Charlotte airspace, Atlanta airspace - it is all interconnected. How do you get airplane A from here to there? Local operation. We look at the environmental piece. How does it apply with NEPA? Safety is paramount. Can aircraft at that airport, can they even fly what we are recommending? I have been a part of several different groups to address some of the noise issues or environmental concerns. Our perspective has changed drastically over the past 3-5 years. Even in this current environment, we have found creative solutions to put this core group together and to start moving things forward. We are taking a real focused approach to address the problem. Unfortunately, the complexities take time. We definitely are focused on reviewing and coming back with a response.
- Gagnon: Based on raise the hand, I will see if Megan has a follow-up then go to Tracy, then Sean.
- Walton: Thank you. I am excited to be on this board and learn more.
- Montross: I wanted to offer up American's support for your data collection process. We are also internally looking at some of these recommendations and the impact on efficiency, so we

may be able to support some of your work and are happy to participate in that data collection process.

- Johnson: We will definitely be working with you, Tracy. We want to make everyone as happy as we can, but there will always be somebody that is affected by noise. Until we have electric engines, that will help. A lot of the older aircraft are being retired as a result of COVID, and they are not efficient.
- Muckenfuss: Thanks to FAA for providing update for us. We do understand that you all are working with a math problem. Every airspace is different. As Megan alluded to, there seems to be these issues across the US. While I understand that every airspace is different, is there any level at the FAA that is looking horizontally across the country for approaches that may work in multiple places?
- Davis: There is no one solution to the whole NAS. Some airports benefit greatly from performance-based navigation, and some benefit greatly from diverse headings, where air traffic turn aircraft right off the runway. Some benefit from optimize profile descents. There is no one solution. PBN implementation across the NAS is something that we have attempted to do, to take advantage of new technology, but it does not fit for every airport. Quick answer is yes, we are looking at different solutions for airports, but Charlotte has its own set of variables that makes its throughput great. We can look at throughput and technology along with the environmental piece.
- Muckenfuss: I understand there's uniqueness in every place. It is concept of continuous quality improvement throughout industries where there is a group (high up) who look for commonalities.

➤ **Engage: Government Engagement**

- Gagnon: There is an update in the Written Updates section of the handout from the Government Engagement project team. We'll look at that later. As a reminder, the Project Team has compiled a listing of local and state government officials. You are populating it by assigning different team members.
- Cameron: I have been thinking through this. It is obvious to us on the Government Engagement team that there are only half a dozen of us, and there are many government representatives and staff members. I would like to send the Excel file that Dan and our group developed to Ed, and he sends it to the group at large. ACR group members are asked to sign up next to where you are. If you are in District 37, and there is a District 37 representative, maybe you can sign up to help. It doesn't mean that you have to give the briefing, but it would help when we are reaching out to that representative, we could say that *We have someone in your particular district*, so it's not just a group that we are representing. We would like to engage those representatives. Soliciting help because we will definitely need it.
- Wiesenberger: I agree. Sounds good.
- Gagnon: Bob, please send me the file and give me a deadline when you would like to hear back from members.
- Gagnon: Still in Government Engagement: Request of HMMH at last meeting, the ACR was curious as to what other roundtables do to engage with elected officials, in particular. Gene put this document (p. 4) together for you all.
- Reindel: Roundtables usually write letters and reach out to elected officials to make them aware of it. Occasionally, an elected official will attend a roundtable meeting. They are recognized and thanked for coming – that usually results from a letter. Hopefully this document will be of some use. I can help you reach out to other roundtables if you would like to talk further.
- Vesely: On the 3rd paragraph, it states that elected officials are members of forums with 4 named exceptions. That is quite a difference from ours.

- Reindel: Yes, forums are set up differently around the country, so I wanted to point out for some of them they are members, and for other forums like yours they are not members. Some of them are setup where they have reached out and the elected officials have assigned people to be members representing their community. Our ACR is community-based, like the 4 listed.
- Vesely: This also puts us behind the 8 ball with contacting elected officials, and that is a huge factor.
- Gagnon: This document would be good for the Government Engagement team to take a look at and see if there are any lessons to be learned.

➤ **Engage: Community Engagement**

- Gagnon: Phillip provided a written update – like Bob did – that we will look at later.
 - On Pages 5-6 is a Gaston Gazette article. Dan, Sam Stowe, Sara were all quoted in the article.
- Stowe: *(Problems with audio) Sam shared comments in the chat:* I thought the article was fair in its presentation. Dan and I discussed it; there were some things he preferred would be different, but overall a good presentation of what is going on.
- Wiesenberger: Sam was the one that got that article in the Gaston Gazette, and it is very well-written.
- Gardon: I had very limited involvement in the article.

➤ **Improve: Update on CLT appearance at the LAX Roundtable**

- Wiesenberger: I was invited to participate along with Sara. It was about a 2-hour call. I was completely impressed at the level of sophistication, involvement, and professionalism of the group. The roundtable has been operating for over 20 years, and it has over 35 members. Population is approximately 12 million, and the airport operates about 2000 flights a day. It is a smaller footprint of an airport than ours. It is landlocked with everything around it developed and an ocean to the left side. 15 regional airports surrounding LAX - very complex. History with different airport noise initiatives. Very connected throughout the country. At this call, meeting participants included representatives from FAA, LAX operations, United Airlines, and there was a representative from one US House of Representative office. I highly recommend you look at their website. *Listed on page.*
 - No criticism to our group, but we are crawling, and they are walking. Gene is an active member to the group and is also facilitator as well as air noise expert. HMMH publishes a quarterly LAX noise newsletter.
 - They have concerns of long-term health effects from excessive noise and emissions. I did have follow-up with the chairman of the roundtable. The LA noise roundtable is very involved – they have federal and local officials. They have been most successful in getting local jurisdictions – other city governments – to participate.
 - Suggestions: Lots of publicity, like Sam Stowe’s article. We need to keep pressing on that. They collected 200,000 voter signatures – at one point – to only endorse candidates who supported noise management and not airport expansion. They participate in a network of airports sharing issues and resources. Work with Quiet Skies. Interact with San Francisco roundtable. UC Davis – school that is a leader in publishing the environmental impact of airport noise. When meeting with government officials, be prepared, bring data, and be persistently polite.
 - Next Steps: I would greatly recommend benchmarking more with other roundtables. I learned a tremendous amount of information - things that we don’t discuss.
 - I learned there is a national noise and emissions symposium in February next year. I believe some participation would be valuable. Any questions? *None.*
- Gagnon: Thanks, Kurt, for participating and writing this up. We also appreciate the additional documents that you have provided the ACR.

➤ **Improve: Review Noise Improvement Idea Generation Survey Results; Form Team**

- Gagnon: Looking at the Idea Generation Member Survey that was conducted from August until today. I will talk about how this is going to be used and the team that Sara and Kurt would like to form to start acting on this information. I will not go through it all – pages 8-14. Page 8 – this is a simple process flow that I have set up for how this ideation process will work as it relates to the survey. First – 9 members responded to survey. Two questions we suggest handing off to the 2 Project Teams: #4 should be for the Community Engagement team to consider, and #5 for the Government Engagement Team.
 - After getting these ideas from the survey, it was suggested that we form a Local Operations/Improvement Team. Form a team of you all – a sub-group – evaluate and refine these ideas down into potential solutions relating to each question. CLT - Kevin and Dan - offered to look at some of these ideas to vet for viability. Next, identify some potential strategies that can be shared with ACR in less of a raw data format than you are looking at today. Based on those strategies that you want to investigate, we will determine the best way to do that – determine where we need input in assessing these strategies and implementing them.
 - Questions #1, 2, and 3 would be best to go to the new team. The first one talks about unnecessary engine run-ups. All the raw data from the survey is listed on page 9. Question #2 would also best go to this new Local Operations/Improvement Team. Ways to ensure adherence to noise procedures by pilots, air traffic controllers and others. #3 would go to this team - what are ways to increase or improve the noise monitoring network and metrics beyond DbA thresholds?
 - Question #4 would be good for Phillip’s group, the Community Engagement team – see if there are ideas for consideration.
 - Question #5 is geared more toward use by the Government Engagement team. These are different ideas along with what HMMH shared today and along with what Kurt shared today from LAX.
 - Question #6 is overall set of responses. Potential new project team could address this.
 - Plan is to have new team to go along with the Government Engagement Project Team and Community Engagement Project Team – Local Ops/Improvement Project Team address #1, 2, 3, 6, and potentially some others as well. This would ensure we are not only engaging and monitoring, but actually improving as we go along.
 - After this meeting, I will solicit a request for participants on this new team. We could share a request for participants through email and help set up time to meet for first time.
 - Any thoughts or questions about this? *None.*

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

➤ **Unfinished Business**

- Gagnon: Note written updates on Motions/Requests for Support
 - Last meeting Requests/Motions Document: Made the motion to modify the schedule; request for action – North vs. South Flow Decision-Making; FAA intending to share Update and Seek Clarification from ACR after the last meeting – and several other things on page 15.
 - Pages 16-17 are Written Updates - Feel free to read on your own. The first item is updated from yesterday.
 - Page 17 - North vs South Flow decision-making. Pages 18-19 – You will see responses from FAA in September of last year where the ACR asked how FAA decides whether you are in North Flow or South Flow. After FAA provided answers, ACR followed up with 8 additional questions – Sean Muckenfuss led this effort – seeking clarification and additional information. This information might be beneficial for the new Project Team.

- Muckenfuss: This is what we have after pursuing answers.
- Gagnon: This could be something for the new team to be included with other questions stated for them.

➤ **New Business – Meeting Schedule**

- Gagnon: Based on discussions at the Agenda Planning Call, it looked like there might be a desire to cancel the November meeting and hold the next meeting in December. However, CLT got information relating to the Environmental Assessment, so I will ask CLT to update.
- Hair: We are in the midst of an EA related to the closure of the crosswind runway and its replacement with a 4th parallel runway. That process has been ongoing for a couple of years now, and it is reaching a pivotal point and public meetings are being scheduled for December. We want you all to be engaged with that. For sake of simplicity and scheduling, we suggest no ACR meeting in December and to meet in January. We would like for you all to be involved in the EA meeting, and that is why we are making this suggestion.
- Gagnon: So, his recommendation is to cancel December 9 - we already had November cancelled - and to meet in January on the 13th. Any thoughts on that?
- Nomellini: Needs to be a motion. Do I have a motion?
- Loflin: I make a motion to cancel the December meeting and move it to January.
- Gussman: Seconded.
- Nomellini: Any discussion?
- Cameron: When is the environmental meeting that you would like for us to attend?
- Hair: They have not set those dates yet. Probably in the 2nd or 3rd week of December based on whatever action ACR takes tonight. They didn't want to schedule them the same week as the ACR.
- Cameron: Is the reason for putting off our meeting because you think we would be too busy in December, or because you folks cannot get the agenda filled out? If it would not be the same week, what is the conflict?
- Hair: Biggest concern is FAA traditionally asks us to not do multiple public meetings in the same month on multiple topics.
- Nomellini: How will you notify us? I am assuming you would send an e-mail about meeting date and time and location.
- Hair: Traditionally they do 2 meetings, one physically in north and one physically in south. Do not know if they will be virtual or in person – or both.
- Wright: That was my question as well. Are they Zoom, and will they occur during evening or day?
- Hair: Traditionally outside of business hours - mostly 6-8ish.
- Wiesenberger: Couple of reactions to schedule change. Ironic that we will cancel an ACR meeting to enable a meeting to open a new runway that will cause more noise. I am in angst about that. I would prefer to have an ACR meeting, whether in Zoom or otherwise, to update on our progress. And thirdly, the FAA said that they did not want to participate until January, so I don't know why our having a meeting will bother them.
- Hair: Amber Leathers who is heading up this effort is on the call. She can share more details on where they are in scheduling those meetings.
- Leathers: As the project manager of the EA, we had committed to 3 sets of public meetings. We are targeting the end of the calendar year for the 2nd set of public meetings. We know that it will not be in person because of COVID. We will provide different times. We will have open public comment period for 30 days. We are still looking at how that public meeting will happen keeping in mind the safety of our community. Still going through the details. We expect to be able to have an open forum. More details coming from our group.

- Nomellini: Any other discussion points?
- Vesely: For Amber - are there any informational handout materials we can access before these sessions?
- Leathers: Yes, normally we would have a set of boards, along with someone with them to answer questions. But we can send out that information for you to start reviewing.
- Wiesenberg: I recommend that we have some form of ACR forum in December, based on some information Sara will share; it's important for us not to wait until January. It could be shorter agenda.
- Nomellini: All in favor to change the meeting? Please say Yes (*most in favor; Vesely, Cameron and Wiesenberg opposed. Wright abstained*)
- Nomellini: Motion passes. The next meeting will be in January.
- Nomellini: I am moving and retiring. In January, we will need to have a new chair and with what Kurt wants to do maybe a new vice chair. If you have any desires, reach out to me or Ed.
- Gagnon: We had talked about doing a formal resignation at the start of next meeting and formal vote for Chair and Vice Chair. That is what we did for Sara and Kurt. In chat, Thelma said Congratulations Sara.
- Loflin: Was that one of the reasons you wanted to meet in December, Kurt?
- Wiesenberg: Yes.
- Loflin: Would it be appropriate to rethink meeting in December?
- Wiesenberg: I want to clarify. I would suggest we find a date in December that doesn't conflict with EA meetings, and so that we are not behind in our timeline.
- Loflin: I would entertain making a motion to that effect.
- Wiesenberg: I make a motion that we reschedule our December ACR meeting to December 2nd instead of the 9th.
- Gussman: Second that.
- Nomellini: Any discussion?
- Gagnon: To clarify – we are talking about keeping the January meeting but holding a meeting on December 2, and the focus would be on the chair transition or a brief update meeting?
- Wiesenberg: It should be both – nomination vote and update on progress on Government and Community Engagement Project Teams. Hopefully, short meeting – 30-60 minutes.
- Nomellini: Want to be clear on why the change. You are concerned about losing momentum because either way I will be doing this meeting outside of Charlotte. So, we are clear on why you are proposing the change.
- Wiesenberg: Yes, that is exactly why - don't want to lose momentum.
- Gagnon: If this is an abbreviated meeting, would that alleviate concerns from FAA?
- Hair: If we do it for chair transition – that's internal business – we're not wanting an FAA update and need an FAA representative, because there won't be one - I don't think that would be confusing for the general public.
- Wiesenberg: I would like updates from project teams. I think we need to keep the ball rolling.
- Nomellini: I have a motion and a 2nd from Mark. We will close discussion. *All in favor*. Based on that, the motion passes.

➤ Gagnon: Any other new business? *None*.

❖ Adjourn

➤ Vesely motioned to adjourn. Wiesenberg seconded; all in favor.

➤ Meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm