

# Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

## Unapproved Summary Minutes: March 9, 2022

### Attendees

Kurt Wiesenberger, Chair, Charlotte  
Phillip Gussman, City 1  
Bobbi Almond, City 5  
Natalie Rutzell, County 2  
Sherry Washington, County 4  
Mark Loflin, County 6  
Sayle Brown, Cornelius  
Bob Cameron, Davidson  
Sam Stowe, Gaston  
Greg Chase, Huntersville  
Walter Ballard, Lincoln  
Kim Hardee, Matthews  
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg  
Charles Soussou, Pineville  
Jacob Pollack, York

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)  
Matt Felton, FAA  
Rob Adams, Landrum & Brown  
Sarah Potter, Landrum & Brown  
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)  
Dan Gardon, CLT  
Kevin Hennessey, CLT  
Amber Leathers, CLT  
Chris Poore, CLT  
Tracy Montross, 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 March 9 ACR meeting. We have a full agenda. I'd like to talk about the ACR mission statement and what it includes – To provide the City Aviation Department and the FAA with broad-based community input and practical, realistic solutions and Recommendations for those citizens that are feeling the effects of airport noise. We have existed for about 5 years.
- Gagnon: *Facilitated introductions of ACR, FAA, CLT, HMMH, CSS, and Landrum & Brown.*
  - Mechanics of the meeting: WebEx, phone, please state name when speaking, especially when screen sharing. Chat and meeting will be recorded.
- Wiesenberger: Are there any government officials on the meeting or members of the public to speak?
- Gardon: It looks like there are none of those. I'll drop the link in the chat for your constituents.
  - From Chat: If the resident wishes to address the ACR - <https://charlottenc.seamlessdocs.com/f/KRTK3p>
  - From Chat: To file a complaint - <https://www.cltairport.com/community/noise/file-a-noise-complaint/>
- Gagnon: *Reviewed Agenda and handout.* Ground Rules: Healthy meetings, productive, effective. Solution-oriented. Stay on task. Brief points. Effective in making noise improvement in our area.
- Wiesenberger: We are following Robert's Rules of Order. We are committed to having a productive, healthy, respectful conversation. That does not mean that we are not passionate about the cause.
  - Approval of Minutes: *Loflin moved to approve, Sherry Washington seconded. Vote to approve the minutes.* The minutes from January are approved.

#### ❖ Receive Public Input – *No speakers registered for today.*

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

- **Monitor: Reminder of FAA Slate Review/Implementation Process; FAA Update on Status of Recommendations**

- Gagnon: FAA document. Page 3 in the handout. With this document, we are trying to understand where the Recommendations are in the FAA process. This is a flowchart of Phase One in the “.41” process that was explained to us last meeting. We made some updates at the request of the ACR. The bubbles that you see represent the Recommendation numbers and where it currently is, based on the January Meeting. #1 is the OPD or CDA Recommendation for the optimal profile descents. #3 is raising the altitudes at multiple waypoints. Originally it was raising the CAATT and EPAYE waypoints by 1000 feet. We defined some of the acronyms.
  - In January, Matt mentioned that #3 was in the Initial Review stage; however, if the ACR was to send it back to the FAA and recommend the additional waypoints that FAA was recommending to be raised by 1000 feet, it may be considered an Amendment and, therefore, #3 might be expedited through the rest of Phase One and portions of Phase Two.
  - Before we end this portion of the Agenda, for Matt, is this a correct reflection of where we were in January, and – second – some of the members wondered “What is the definition of Amendment?”
- Felton: Yes, this does capture what we discussed in January, but this might be semantics, these are alternatives to Recommendations 1 and 3. In our conversations we have been calling them 1a and 3a. Originally, the FAA had stated that they could not implement Recommendations 1 and 3. So we were trying to continue the conversations with alternatives to those Recommendations. On the question of what is an Amendment, I believe I need to get a good definition on that from our flight procedures specialists. I know that I forwarded to the airport the “.41” order. It is long document - technical words. In that order lies the answer. I wouldn’t want to exactly say what an Amendment is and stick my foot in my mouth.
- Wiesenberger: It’s new information that Recommendation 1 now has an Amendment.
- Felton: I think there was a letter from the regional administrator back in September replying to a number of questions from ACR. Referencing that letter - Recommendation #1 was not something that the FAA could implement. But we are looking for something that might meet the intent. I believe it was referenced in that letter as to what the FAA’s stance was and why we could not move forward with Recommendation #1 as it was presented.
- Wiesenberger: My question was Alternative 1a – can we get a brief description of what the FAA is looking at in terms of an alternative?
- Felton: I’m here to convey what our subject matter experts are doing and to take back questions to them or to bring in people to future meetings. I believe that segues into update of status of Recommendations.
- Gagnon: I want to make sure this is clear. It sounds like the way the FAA is viewing Recommendations 1 and 3, is that some modifications to #1 and the alternative suggested to #3 are considered as 1a and 3a in the Initial Review box. Is that correct?
- Felton: That is my understanding.
- Gagnon: Next, update on Status of Recommendations. Feel free to share whatever updates you have on progress, and then we can open it up to the ACR for questions and/or clarifications.
- Felton: The quick one would be - Alternative to Recommendation #3. We need that alternative to be formally agreed upon by all parties and submitted to the FAA as a formal Recommendation.
  - The alternative to Recommendation #1 - a good number of people have spent a good deal of effort looking at and trying to find suggestions that would meet the intent of Recommendation #1. It is like peeling an onion - as we look at options and suggestions, we keep finding other layers. It has been difficult. Moving/changing one aspect affects many other aspects of the arrivals. What is being conveyed to me is we are at a bit of a loss to find something. At this point, we don’t want to set any expectations and then not be able to follow through. The general consensus that I am hearing is that we are really at an impasse, and we are not finding a real path forward, we would like to lean on the ACR, with the help of the airport and HMMH to provide or come to us with suggestions and what exactly you want to get out of it and suggestions. We are at an impasse and cannot find an alternative.
- Hair: Can you go over what #1 and #3 are so that everyone is on the same page?
- Gagnon: Recommendation #1 is greater use of Continuous Descent Approaches – there was the initial discussion about CDA vs. OPD. Recommendation #3 initially was to return CAATT and EPAYE waypoints to Metroplex position, but the way it was submitted to FAA was: Raising the waypoints at CAATT and EPAYE by 1000’. And FAA came back with an alternative that raised 7 waypoints by 1000’.

- Gussman: At its core, Recommendation #1 is about, I think pretty obviously, increasing the utilization of CDAs or anything like CDAs or lower noise generating approaches when possible. We understand that during high traffic times, that might not be what we get. The intent of this was really to use - during less busy days and times - the more efficient and quieter approach methods. Our research and work over years seemed to show that the CDAs were one of the better ways to do it. I will defer to the experienced pilots in the room.
- Pollack: I am new here, but I've looked at the proposals and I understand option #1 would give some relief to folks on arrivals. It would be helpful to see a more detailed expectation - I have not seen the letter. It is hard for me to see what the problems that FAA is seeing if there's no explanation. Having that detail (unpeeling of the onion) would be helpful to understanding the issues. I do wonder how the decision-makers balance the noise concern v. other competing concerns - what they value more highly.
- Gagnon: Additional comments? *None*. What I am hearing is that there is a desire to understand what is the current state of Recommendation #1a? What has happened to-date that stems from what the FAA said in September about looking at "conceptual designs" - FAA's words in September. What does that mean, what has been looked at? What are some of the details that Jacob mentioned that are causing the reasoning behind not being able to move forward at this point? It sounds like the FAA is looking for additional ideas or analysis that the ACR or HMMH can provide, as well. Does that capture some of the discussion so far?
- Gussman: Are you saying #1 is DOA (dead on arrival) at this point if you are already looking for an alternative to 1?
- Felton: Yes. Reference back to that letter. CDAs are not something the FAA will implement.
- Cameron: Can you clarify the disconnect between the FAA not doing CDAs and what we are seeing on Page 12 of handout for today - which calls it an Optimized Profile Descent, but it actually takes that descent all the way down to landing, which is what we understood a CDA was. The FAA told us years ago that the OPD was terminated at about 8000 feet, which really did not do us much good. So, we had clarified that we were talking about what we called a CDA. I am sure that we would be fine changing our own lexicon here. Page 12 is an article by the FAA saying that they had already implemented this in Charlotte, and I don't understand that document or the disconnect between what you are saying tonight and what that document is saying.
- Montross: There is a difference between CDAs and OPDs. FAA does not use CDAs; airlines use CDAs. That is the process that occurs from the arrival path. CDAs do not exist in US airspace. They exist in Europe. OPDs are at that higher altitude and are from 30K down to 10K-12K feet.
  - When you descend into your terminal airspace, it is that approach. CDAs happen where you have circular motion to keep airlines in the queue before they arrive onto the runway, and that is the stepped descent that happens all the way to the approach, which is not possible at Charlotte because of the amount of traffic we have here. If you would move to CDA you would disrupt all the capacity.
  - I know there is confusion between OPDs and CDAs. My understanding is that the OPD is what the FAA, and as you can see in this article, has been working towards related to the airspace coming out of your 30K foot transfer airspace, when you are into your descent, to get rid of that thrust on your way down to the 10K feet.
- Cameron: So, diagram on Page 12 - which goes all the way down to the runway - is misleading or incorrect?
- Montross: I know that is an FAA press release, isn't it?
- Cameron: It says OPD, and it sure looks like a runway to me. This is exactly what we have been wanting and what we asked for in 2017. I am still confused.
- Gussman: Regardless of the name of it. We can change the name so we can at least discuss it fairly.
- Chase: Airports like LA and even Atlanta have some of these OPD arrivals. That is where the confusing terminology between CDA and OPD comes from. They will connect you to a fix on a localizer, and there may be a short level-off, but it is pretty much direct routing all the way at this arrival fix where you join an OPD arrival hundreds of miles from the airport and then join a localizer and continue on this routing. In Charlotte, I think, most of the concern is with the rails and the long base leg at lower altitude.
- Montross: The added concern in Charlotte is the turn. So, if you're coming from Miami and you are on the north flow arrival - you can have an OPD on that arrival path the majority of the way to the runway. The

problem is when you have traffic leaving New York coming into the downwind and making the turn into that north flow arrival, they need the opportunity to make quick turns into that flow, and they are not able to make CDAs/OPDs to the runway because they are not on a straight path. That downwind turn limits a lot of the traffic and their ability to use the OPD.

- Chase: I guess what we may be asking for may be leading the nation, but why can't we have OPD arrivals that blend the traffic from certain points already with times and spacings?
- Montross: I'll let the FAA respond to this, but I understood it to be controller flexibility and needing the autonomy to be able to change flow patterns.
- Felton: I cannot speak to that because that's not my purview, but I will take it back when I have discussions. I believe that you all know Bob Z. Charlotte does have OPDs in place, but it sounds like they are higher in altitudes.
- Montross: And for certain traffic that is on straight arrival. Something like 60% of our traffic out of CLT is East Coast traffic. A lot of northbound flights. There is something to be said about the flow of traffic that has to make a turn into a runway rather than south departures coming straight line north to CLT.
- Brown: We suggested CDAs years ago, and we understood that we were running into a problem with that because of the amount of traffic coming into Charlotte. That is when we came up with maintaining 6K feet until on final approach which puts you basically at the initial approach fix for every runway. And 6K feet would put you on a glide that would be very minimal power coming into the airport landing south or landing north.
  - But the problem with that according to the FAA was that it would not give the controllers the flexibility to cut the corner and go to the final approach fix. A lot of the regional jets are coming from up north. The controllers send them right down the minimum 3750, which is actually 3K feet above us, and they are dirtied up and powered up, so we get a lot of noise.
  - Instead of sending them up over Mooresville at 6K feet and turning them onto final and bringing them down the main channel, basically on the glideslope. Can't take the flexibility away from the controllers. They want to increase the traffic, and that is the only way they can do that.
- Gagnon: I want to make sure we're all on the same page in terms of what you all are asking for before we move forward. I pulled up the FAA PowerPoint from September. Basically regarding #1 being a "no," that was because Recommendation 1 was defined as a CDA, and the FAA thought it was a 24-hour request. There was clarification that went on, and in September the FAA came back, and I will read from their PowerPoint from the September meeting.
  - "The FAA acknowledges the ACR's clarified focus on night or off-peak-time utilization." It talks about CDAs not working, and at bottom of that slide on Recommendation #1 it says "The FAA is committed to renewed effort to explore possible Amendments to existing instrument flight procedures that would meet the ACR's intent during night operations, during midnight shift hours or times of low traffic."
  - I just wanted to share that information. This is what the ACR has been expecting the FAA to have been reviewing since that September meeting. That is how we ended the meeting on Recommendation #1 in September.
- Wiesenberger: Matt, I know you're the Community Engagement Officer. I don't know what your relationship is with press release group, but this on Page 12 looks pretty misleading. Showing buildings downtown, and this OPD being a continuous slope down to the airport - that is not accurate at all. I suggest that you improve that.
- Montross: I want to make a point on the airports that are acknowledged here. What is unique about most of them listed is they are surrounded by water. There is something to be said about the ability at certain airports to manage a longer OPD.
- Wiesenberger: We were a bit misled by CDA and OPD. My second point, which is more important, is - we put forth these Recommendations almost 2 years ago, and now we are noticing that the September letter rejected Recommendation #1 wholeheartedly, when we were under the impression it was still in stage one of analysis. My point is we need to have a better dialogue with the FAA if we are going to move anything forward. This waiting 2 months to decide one thing is slow-walking the process. I understand big airports, big governments, safety, everything else; I wish we could have phone calls every once in a while.

- Cameron: Let me read from that document. End of page 12 into 13. “With optimized descents, aircraft descend from cruising altitude to the runway in a smooth, continuous path with the engines set at near idle. Since 2014, the FAA has developed OPD procedures at airports in Atlanta, Charlotte...and more will be added in 2022.”
- Gagnon: There are some takeaways:
  - Matt made request if there are other suggestions, particularly related to Recommendation #1 that the ACR, in tandem with CLT/HMMH, can suggest, that would be beneficial.
  - The ACR has asked:
    - ◆ For details about what specifically is going on with the conceptual design work with Recommendation #1a.
    - ◆ If there are concerns that are getting the FAA to feel like they cannot move forward, get clarification on what those concerns are.
    - ◆ Going back to what was presented in September by the FAA in terms of what actions they would take, what has been done regarding those procedures – what are the details on what’s been looked at what what’s the status?
  - That is what I have written down in terms of requests and next steps, and obviously all the comments and concerns and insights that you provided will be in the Minutes.
  - Before we move on in the Agenda, are there other comments?
- Chase: One comment. I have in the past couple of months been flying a few more flights into Charlotte. I’ve been operating on the current OPD arrivals, specifically from the Midwest - the FLIPZ arrival – about 4 times in the past month and a half. It is my experience that even hundreds of miles out – Knoxville area – when still up at altitudes, all of the restrictions on arrival are superseded by ATC instructions. I guess if we are talking about conceptualizing things, I don’t understand why we cannot include, if it is a true OPD, what we have right now does not even seem to be meeting that. Just speaking as someone that has operated on one of them.
- Pollack: On the alternative of 6K feet - when the FAA is considering things like that, do they just say “no,” or do they consider other levels between the altitudes?
- Felton: In reviewing and looking at alternatives to #1, the flight procedures team are looking at varying altitudes and looking at anything to bring to the table that meets the intent of the Recommendation. They were looking across a range of altitudes. Not just focusing on one.
- Pollack: It’s hard to believe that there’s not some distance between 6K and 3K - a balance could be struck.
- Felton: I can reiterate what I just said. I would have to go over prior responses. I cannot speak on it right off the top of my head now.
- **CLT Update - Update on Evaluation of FAA’s Alternative Proposal to ACR Recommendation #3 (Raising the Altitudes)**
  - Hair: Thanks for the good, respectful conversation. FAA did bring forward a primary alternative for Slate Recommendation #3. We tasked Gene and the HMMH team to work on it. They kept rerunning the analysis and have spent a lot of time on it. This Sunday afternoon, we got a rough draft of the analysis from HMMH. Kevin, Dan, and I spent time on Monday going through that rough draft. We had some questions, and we gave them to HMMH. The analysis that HMMH did, we think is just about there and my hope is that we can get there in the next couple of days, and we can help our executive leadership team here at the airport understand what the analysis shows. We can then flip that analysis back out to the ACR sometime in the coming weeks. If you remember, we had similar statements in January and in November, but we had not gotten the rough draft from HMMH. I think it would be realistic for it to be ready for everyone to review the analysis in the next couple of weeks.
    - Once that is ready to go, I think it may be appropriate for a motion to be set forward by the ACR, based on that analysis. You all vote on it via some virtual platform. Then we get the Recommendation back to FAA - not waiting until next meeting in May. The alternative that was put forward does provide a large benefit and a small disbenefit. I think it is a good alternative that has been put forward. What questions do you have of me, of Gene, of the CLT team?
  - Gussman: It sounds like you are offering us a way to move forward before next meeting.

- Wiesenberger: Give us a window of time to have a virtual meeting and vote? One week, 2-4 weeks?
  - Hair: Gene, you know more than I do in terms of resolving the questions. I think in a month it would be a reasonable deadline.
  - Soussou: I was wondering if we could know what the alternative that was given by the FAA?
  - Hair: The alternative is raising the arrival altitude at additional waypoints.
  - Wiesenberger: I read 7 waypoints.
  - Gagnon: That is correct.
  - Pollack: What would be the best resource for me to educate myself about this change?
  - Hair: Dan Gardon will be your resource.
  - Gardon: Over the next few weeks we will put together a detailed refresher, which will include a full write-up of the request, what is currently happening, and the differences between the alternative. For some of the newer members, we are definitely due for a refresher.
  - Brown: If you put out a summary, can you do a picture of the airport with all the arrival waypoints that you are talking about raising? Show the positions of the downwinds, bases, the finals - stuff like that. If you could do that, it would probably make it a lot clearer for people to understand.
  - Gardon: Yes, for this one in particular, that is definitely a must. We will definitely have graphics.
  - Gagnon: I see thumbs up from some. In New Business, we can discuss virtual ACR meeting in a month.
- **CLT Update - Part 150 Updates**
- Hennessey: The ACR had asked for a “101” on the Part 150. We haven’t forgotten about that request. We have been extremely busy trying to wrap up the EA; we have a couple of members of the consulting team that will be running the Part 150 here.
  - Adams: I am with Landrum & Brown. We will prepare the Part 150 study for the City. I will serve as the project manager for the Part 150 update. I have over 25 years of experience preparing Part 150 and other noise and environmental studies for airports in the US and some outside the US. More importantly I have been involved in preparing noise and other studies for CLT starting in 1997. I have been working in Charlotte ever since. Most recently, I was involved in the noise exposure map that was completed in 2015. That map is one part of a Part 150 study. I have a lot of experience in the noise environment around the airport. We will prepare a Part 150 “101” for everyone. Looking forward to working with the ACR and other stakeholders. I’ve been impressed with the conversation tonight. I have worked with roundtables in other areas, and I see lots of good people and experience/knowledge about aviation here, passion as well.
  - Leathers: The critical link in all of this is the Environmental Assessment - the final EA has been with the FAA for their final review. They are drafting the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) Record of Decision - that determination. And because they have not completed that, we cannot formally kick off the Part 150. We are hoping to have that Final Determination next week. The reason why the 101 has been pushed back is because of this and the need to comply with all of the rules.
  - Rutzell: When we get the update and when we think about the Part 150, think about how we are going to integrate the departure proposals. In my neighborhood, we are being as patient as possible, but there is no indication of a timeline that this will be addressed. I know there is a lot on your plate, but I want to make sure we don’t lose sight of the departure requests – don’t want to do the Part 150 and THEN decide on departure recommendations.
  - Leathers: There is a federal process that L&B will follow. FAA wants to make sure that the departures Recommendations were looked at as a part of the scope. It is following that process. Whatever comes out of the Part 150, it has to be environmentally reviewed again by the FAA - there is a timeline. We expect the Part 150 to last anywhere from 18-24 months. Are there some things that could be done concurrently? I do think that could happen, but I would think the FAA would need to confirm that on this call.
  - Rutzell: That is what I am advocating for - some sort of concurrent process, so we don’t have to submit a new proposal after the Part 150.
  - Leathers: With it being a part of the Part 150 process, all those recommendations would get evaluated.
  - Wiesenberger: My question is - I understand that your team did the noise exposure map previously with the airport and looked at the 70 DNL. In consideration of the FAA’s neighborhood environmental study that was conducted a couple of years ago across 30 airports - which showed that a threshold of 65 DNL

was highly annoying to a lot of people, is there some consideration of doing another noise exposure map with the new Part 150 study that looks at a broader perimeter?

- Adams: We will be updating the noise exposure maps as part of the Part 150 study. You are correct, the FAA did release the results of the neighborhood environmental study which indicated a higher annoyance level at 65 DNL than what they had originally released. However, at this point they have not translated that research result into policy. As Amber mentioned, Part 150 studies have very specific guidelines. At this point, there have been no updates to those guidelines. I think it is a question to ask the FAA.
- Wiesenberger: Thanks. Seems like a proactive effort for the airport to take on.
- Soussou: What is going to happen with the new runway? Will we have to do a completely new request to the FAA?
- Leathers: When it came to the 4<sup>th</sup> parallel doing the EA, there were assumptions that had to be made on the runway use because we are adding a runway. It is intended to be a departure runway, and because of its proximity to existing 18 Center and 36 Center, there are some dependencies there. While it did take a look at what some of the procedures would be in terms of what the airport needs – we need triple simultaneous arrivals at least 12 times in every peak period. When that happens, the way that the airfield is set up, that 4<sup>th</sup> parallel runway would be required to be a departures runway.
- Soussou: Will there be a change for the current paths of the planes? Will the new runway begin affecting people South of the airport? Southwest? Or if it is departures, will it be north or northwest?
- Leathers: When you do the EA, you have to evaluate all those environmental categories, of which noise is one. What that noise modeling evaluated is “what are the new impacts going to be?” So, when it was part of that process, the major change, if any, and impacts were evaluated in the EA. When we look at the DNL lines that Rob was referencing earlier, all those things were taken into account. I think it would be helpful if we shared the contours and more about the noise that came out of the EA. There is a full report of what was evaluated – I’ll share that website in the chat so you can review.
- Wright: My question is for Amber. Did you say that you were waiting on a No Impact response or that there was not an impact?
- Leathers: When we talk about these environmental reviews that are done by the FAA, we follow a policy – it is called the National Environmental Policy Act – NEPA. Any type of new project done at an airport has to undergo some environmental review. At one point this was an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and later turned into Environmental Assessment (EA), because of runway length changing from 12K’ to 10K’, it was changed to EA. A normal final determination is what they call a FONSI – Finding of No Significant Impact. All of this is following NEPA standards. Anything that could be mitigated as part of what they consider a significant impact would be mitigated. When I say FONSI, that is what they usually call the final determination for an EA. Because ours is a little bit different, we follow some policies that were related to the EIS. The final determination is also referred to as a Record of Decision. You may hear the terms FONSI ROD, but it all means the environmental determination.
- Pollack: Did I hear correctly that with the new runway when the runways are operating triple simultaneous – whatever the term was – was it the new runway that would be receiving the arrivals?
- Leathers: It will be a departures runway - because of the runway centerline separations that are required to meet the FAA order.

➤ **CLT Update - CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations**

- Gardon: Page 6 – Key Measures. This document is familiar. This is an update of documentation that we have shared over the last six months or so. We have added a year-to-date column for 2022. This is updated to March 1, 2022. Not a lot to report or explain.
- Wiesenberger: Can you give us a brief description of the mix of north flow and south flow 2022 so far?
- Gardon: Quite a bit of variance. In 2019 and 2021, we are much more predominantly in north flow than today and in 2020. Often there is not a lot of reason that we can draw for that. Traditionally in winter, the winds are more predominantly northern but as we have discovered in the group in the past, that is not always the main reason for directional flow. So far for the year we are getting closer to that 50% that we like to see, but there seems to be a predominance in north flow.

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

- Gagnon: Project team updates. Pages 7-9.

- Gussman: Community Engagement. Had our first project team meeting, and no one attended. There will be one on April 7 at 6pm. I will be sending out a notice to the entire group. I went ahead and put together our objectives that I am suggesting for this year. I am hoping to share them with the team in the meantime.
- Cameron: Government Engagement. Since our last meeting, I have updated the Davidson Town Council with a brief PowerPoint presentation; many members are new, and 5 of 8 had never heard of the ACR. They were very receptive. I know that Sayle Brown has had discussion with the mayor of Cornelius. We had said that we would rebrief government groups that we had already briefed as well as reach out to new ones. On Friday, I will meet with State Senator Natasha Marcus who represents District 41. She covers Davidson as well as Steele Creek. She was already somewhat familiar with the group. She said that we should contact Alma Adams, Congresswoman. I let her know that we had already done that. We will be pursuing other folks to engage in the next couple of months.
- Wiesenberger: Local Operations Team. This team is to identify and implement additional locally-controlled noise and other environmental improvement opportunities that are not covered by the Community Engagement and Government Engagement teams - broad catch-all category.
  - We had a call yesterday – Sherry and Thelma are members of that team. Sorry to see Greg leave as he is a great contributor. Some of the things we have talked about doing in 2022:
    - ◆ Being proactive in communicating with other local, regional airports around the area - including Concord, Rock Hill - and sharing our experience that we have had with the Charlotte ACR.
    - ◆ Doing better about working with real estate industry to forewarn potential buyers about airplane noise.
    - ◆ Working with CLT with the Part 150 for additional sound proofing – if that is so deemed – schools and homes.
    - ◆ Continuing to benchmark and collaborate with other airport groups, particularly there is an opportunity with the UC Davis Air Noise Symposium in May. I have spoken briefly with Dan about some ACR members participating like we did last year.
- Montross: Question for Kurt. I am wondering to what extent Land Use and Planning is a focus of this group? There continue to be a number of issues that come before City Council, Planning Department, Real Estate Community. To what extent do you see the ACR potentially weighing in to help inform conversations around noise when it comes to Land Use and Development?
- Wiesenberger: We have yet to explore that aspect. Our bandwidth is too limited. We have some lack of clarity about Part 150 study and what geographies are going to be impacted by that. Perhaps Government Engagement team working with City Council and Land Use and ourselves, we can do more certainly.
- Montross: I think you have an important voice to bring to the table. I would maybe ask to the extent that CLT is aware of particular issues that are coming in front of Planning that are headed to City Council related to compatible land uses around the airport that it would definitely serve this group’s interest, to be a participant in that process or to speak at public hearings, to provide comments. There is still a lot of interest from many members of City Council to build and develop residential housing and often affordable housing within the layout plan of the airport proximity. As we think about the future of neighbors with potential to be impacted, it might be worth this group leaning in to help bring attention to the challenges they may experience once they move in. I know realtors are sensitive to required notification. There might be an opportunity to learn about their sensitivity. The airport and AA regularly talk about the airport’s growth with that community. There is missing advocacy when we think about how Charlotte will grow and become more dense. Are we really talking about future neighbors and the impacts they may experience if zoned under flight paths, which is very much a consideration as we look at housing supply issues. For example, RDU recently went to battle with the town of Morrisville, who wanted to build a multi-family development at the end of a runway. Morrisville ignored (my words) RDU’s plans and moved forward anyway. There were not strong community voices or advocacy speaking against. I would encourage this group - because you do have power as you have been impacted by noise. You can defend and speak out about how airport noise could impact others’ futures in close proximity to the airport.
  - From Chat: <https://www.newsobserver.com/news/local/article246562448.html>
    - ◆ Wright: Tracy, tried link but it said for subscribers only - maybe you can print and send to Dan.



- ◆ Gardon: I'll send it out to the group. CLT is in a good position to advise ACR when there are issues coming up at City Council that you could be aware of and potentially engage in.

- Gussman: I am currently the chairman of the Planning Committee of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission. We are in the middle of creating and working with CLT on recreating the place types - which will lead directly to zoning that can accommodate being adjacent to airport. There is a very real effort, and it is well-connected to CLT and to Stuart's group and what they are planning for the future, as well as my personal role in overseeing the process. I have asked staff so many questions about airport noise impacts and highlighting that - if we are going to build these things - they will become a problem. We have continued to broaden that area - that we are taking that into consideration. Now that doesn't do much to stop residential that is currently in the path, and there is a limit to how far out we can take it.

#### ❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

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

- Gagnon: Page 10. These are the requests and motions that came out of the January meeting. You had requested an update on the complaint process, there are some updates there.
- Gardon: At the January meeting, some very specific requests were made of CLT to update the complaint system and make it easier for residents to submit complaints. We did implement those with our complaint system provider. There was a glitch that has been causing issues, and that has been rolled back temporarily. Not much of an update except to say that it is underway, and I think the group will be happy with the changes once they are made.
- Gagnon: The next item was the FAA release - which we talked about. Part 150 Overview - that is something that Amber talked about being presented at an upcoming meeting. In terms of the other updates - American, as of a month or two ago, only has about 3 aircraft left that need to be retrofitted with the vortex generators.

##### ➤ **ACR Mission/Charter Revision Update**

- Gardon: This is a process that has been underway for quite some time. This is just an update to the roundtable now that the group has grown. Biggest change is the removal of the 5-year term limit. Minor changes such as the position from Lincoln County and York County, and some notes about the future of the roundtable. The initial Mission Statement was concerned with getting the list of Recommendations to the FAA. Mission Statement did not share guidance for the group after the Slate was sent to the FAA. The airport does not feel that the ACR is finished, and I feel sure the ACR does not feel that way either. Ed, what is the next step?
- Gagnon: What I discussed with Kurt and Phil was seeking the input of the ACR members over the next month, and by the week of April 4, provide feedback on and edits to this document to Kurt/Phil/Dan. The plan is - by the May meeting - to have an updated version you can vote on.
- Gussman: This would be great to have it updated. We think we have a good document here. If something does not seem right to you, point it out.

##### ➤ **New Business - ACR Member Leadership Transition**

- Wiesenberger: I feel that I am unable to continue as Chairperson of the ACR due to some family-related medical issues. I am not resigning my membership on the ACR. I feel a new Chairperson would be best. I will step down effective at the May meeting. At this time, we will open the floor for nominations.
- Gussman: I nominate Natalie Rutzell.
- Wiesenberger: I nominate Mark Loflin.
- Gagnon: Nominations will be open until May.
- Wright: I thought that Phil and Kurt were co-chairs.
- Gagnon: Technically Phil is the Vice Chair.
- Wright: Would Phil retain that role?
- Gussman: That is my intent. With my activities on the Planning Commission, I do not feel that I have the bandwidth for the position of Chair, but I can assist in helping new Chair in transition, etc. We need a good person who is passionate, has time, and is already knowledgeable and ready to know more.

- Wiesenberger: Ed, can you explain how people would nominate themselves or another person?
- Gagnon: If you have an interest, reach out to me. Reach out to Kurt and Phil, and they can give insight. Formally, it would be best to nominate yourself at the May meeting. The vote would be then, as well.
- Loflin: I thank you, but I will withdraw my nomination. I think Natalie would be great, and I think we should go ahead and vote on that tonight.
- Gagnon: In speaking with Kurt and Phil, I know there was a preference to give people time to digest and think about this, to consider if they have an interest in the Chair position. It is up to you all.
- Washington: That means that we are down 2 members in the Local Operations group. I would like Mark to Chair that group.
- Loflin: I would happily Chair the Local Operations project team.
- Loflin: I formally make a motion to approve Natalie as ACR Chair.
- Wright: Second.
- Gagnon: A portion of what Mark is asking for is procedural – to hold a vote tonight. Do you want to ask for a vote?
- Wiesenberger: I think as we talked about earlier, we wanted to give people time to think about this change – do this in an orderly fashion. Some people are not even on the call. I would suggest that we wait. I am not going anywhere and am happy to serve until May.
- Washington: Kurt, you have been an excellent leader – a good example.
- Gussman: Kurt has been terrific in this effort; note that Kurt is not leaving us.
- Cameron: I tend to agree with Kurt. I have worked with Natalie, and I look forward to voting for her, but for the reasons that Kurt brought forward, especially with folks not on the call, I think it would be best to wait until next meeting for vote.
- Loflin: I'll withdraw my motion.
- Wiesenberger: For those who may be thinking of the chair role, what I have found is that we have an imbalance of participation in the ACR membership. There are a lot of activities that Phil and I have been involved in. We should all share the workload. I recommend that we think about ways to do that.
- Gagnon: To summarize, Natalie has been nominated, and the nominations are open and will be open through the May meeting.

➤ **New Business – Upcoming Noise/Emissions Symposium**

- Wright: On Local Ops, Kurt, the workshop that is coming up that is pretty detailed, and ACR/CLT was willing to pay, but I did not look at the dates. Kurt, you may have more information on that. Is that something that would need to be acted on prior to May?
- Wiesenberger: I believe that Symposium, which is virtual, is May 1-3. Dan, we have not had a follow-up call to talk about whether CLT would be willing to sponsor. Last year, I believe we had 4 or 5 folks participate in some of the 3-day Symposium. I know there are several interested members. By the way, there is an air/noise 101 segment which would be perfect for new member orientation.
- Gardon: Meeting scheduled for tomorrow morning with some of CLT management to discuss that very thing. Should have an update fairly shortly.

➤ **New Business – Called ACR Meeting for Vote on Alternative to Recommendation #3**

- Gagnon: The only other potential New Business was to have a called meeting to vote a month from now on the Recommendation #3 alternatives provided by the FAA. Do you want to schedule a meeting for potential vote on Recommendation #3?
- Wiesenberger: Placeholder for April 6 for update and vote.
- Washington: So, your Project Team meeting is April 7, Phil?
- Gussman: Yes.
- Wiesenberger: It will be a WebEx call - like this - and relatively short.

❖ **Adjourn**

- Washington made motion to adjourn. Wright seconded, all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm