

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: May 11, 2022

Attendees

Kurt Wiesenberger, Chair, Charlotte
Phillip Gussman, City 1
Darren Crosby, City 2
Nakia Savage, City 3
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Doug Pray, County 1
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
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Jacob Pollack, York
Elaine Powell, County Commissioner District 1
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Dan Gardon, CLT
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Chris Poore, CLT
Amber Leathers, CLT
Ted Kaplan, CLT
Mike Pilarski, CLT
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Call-in Participants (non-ACR members)

Pearlis Johnson, FAA
Charles Gibson, FAA
Tracy Montross, American Airlines

Summary Minutes

❖ Open the Meeting

- Meeting started at 6:03 PM
- Wiesenberger: Welcome to our first face-to-face meeting of the ACR in two and a half years. It has been a long journey. Ed is our facilitator, and I would like to call the meeting to order. *Stated the ACR Mission Statement.* First time doing a virtual and in person meeting. It is new. Be patient and supportive.
- Gagnon: To start with introductions. *Went over the use of the microphone on table. Two participants – Mecklenburg County Commissioner Elaine Powell and new member, Nakia Savage (City District 3) – introduced themselves first. Facilitated introductions of ACR, FAA, CLT, HMMH, CSS.*
- Gagnon: There are 5 vacancies on the ACR. There are 2 maps that Dan made to illustrate what areas are covered (pages 4-5) by the ACR.
- Gardon: Since these maps can be somewhat difficult to read, let me know if you have questions.
- Gagnon: In general, where you see the lines from bottom to top - that is where the vacancies are.
- Wiesenberger: *Noted the legend.* Hard to see on the screen, but it is easier to see on handout.
- Gagnon: *Reviewed handouts.* Use the numbers at the top of pages in handouts. If you are participating remotely, Kevin is monitoring. Send chats to him.
- Gagnon: *Reviewed Ground Rules* – goal is to have healthy discussions (Be respectful and not making or taking things personal), a productive meeting – staying on-topic – be brief but brilliant, and effective in addressing the goals for noise improvement. Mechanics of the meeting - using Microsoft Teams. Use the “raise the hand” function if you’re participating remotely. We will record the meeting and save the chat.
- Gagnon: Note what is on the Agenda: Approving the Minutes, Updates, Additional business, written updates, etc.
- Wiesenberger: I would like to add to Ground Rules. We are following Robert’s Rules of Order. We are all passionate about the cause that we are here to support.

- Approve Minutes from March and April – the Special Meeting of the ACR: *Loflin made motion to approve minutes. Almond 2nd. All in favor. None opposed.* Minutes are approved.

❖ **ACR Officer Transition**

- Wiesenberger: ACR Officer Transition: I am passionate, but I do not feel like I can do the job that you all need. I've been with the group for 4 years. I need to make a choice. At this time, I need to resign as chairperson. But stay on as a member.
- Gussman: Need a motion to accept Kurt's resignation. This doesn't mean that you are for it, just that we accept it. *Wright made motion to accept resignation and Washington seconded. All in favor. None opposed.*
- Gussman: We have one person that has been nominated for Chair – Natalie Rutzell. There is an opportunity to nominate from the floor. Seeing none. *Wright moves that the nomination be closed. Loflin 2nd. All in favor.* Nomination has been closed.
- Rutzell: Kurt has been a wonderful leader and an inspiration. We share the same type of passion. Trying to move the ACR forward. The reasons why we have the code of conduct is that before it was contentious. Kurt - you led the way in saying that we need to be productive. I hope that I can fill your shoes. At least I can hold the wheel and make sure that we move forward.
- Gussman: With only one person running, the vote can be an affirmation. *All in favor of electing Natalie as Chair. None against.* Natalie, welcome, and I look forward to working with you.
- Brown: Kurt, thank you for your direction. You have been a wonderful leader. You took over at a time when we needed it.
- Wright: So, it does not change any of our current vacancies?
- Gagnon: That is correct. Any other comments before we move forward?
- Hair: We want to thank you for your service, Kurt. As a tradition to ring in a momentous event, we provide a Challenge Coin. CLT presents Kurt with a Challenge Coin. Well-deserved.

❖ **Receive Public Input**

- Dan: No one signed up to speak tonight, but Commissioner Powell is here, and we are happy to make an exception for you to speak.
- Powell: I am so touched to be in this room with people who care so deeply. Nothing matters more to me than citizen input. Hearing how long some of you have been serving reminded me of when I was growing up - my mom told me to only complain about something 2 times, then tell me what you are going to do about it. So, you all are doing something, and I am here to make sure that your voices are heard as much as I can help, and I am just so proud. I am Kurt's County Commissioner. Thank you for not giving up. Quality of life matters. Noise impacts quality of life. I was in some of your meetings during COVID. Reach out to me. I am touched. I love that you care and keep showing up. Don't give up.

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

- **Monitor: FAA Update on Status of Recommendations**
 - Gagnon: Next item on agenda. Page 7 of handout. Overview of the Slate Process. FAA to provide update on progress of the different initiatives that have been discussed. Pearlis, I will hand it off to you.
 - Johnson: We are in receipt of modification Recommendation #3. That has to be put into the system - the Gateway. I'll let Charles explain what happens when it gets in the system and is fully understood.
 - Gibson: As far as input, when a Recommendation is put in the system, it goes into either flight procedures team or airspace and procedures team, depending upon the action. It is reviewed for criteria. I am not a airspace and procedures specialist or flight procedures specialist. Once criteria is developed - by criteria I mean the types of aircraft that fly the procedure, the number of aircraft that will be flying the procedures – those are criteria, very similar to building codes, if you will. Once those are penciled down and set up for criteria and approved through the procedures group, it will come over to my team, which at that time there are several things done – environmental requirements with regards to complying with NEPA. We will also do noise modeling and noise screening. Once that is done then it will go back to AJV-14 decision to next phase. Getting the publication, flight checking. I hope that helps.
 - Wright: It might be helpful since we have a new member to summarize new amendment.
 - Gagnon: Can you describe the alternative to Recommendation #3, in laymen's terms, and the amendment – could you define that?
 - Johnson: I would describe the Recommendation basically as keep the flights up as high as we can, as long as we can, and then bring them in safely.
 - Gibson: I agree with Pearlis. The Recommendation is to raise the waypoints on the arrival procedures.
 - Gussman: So, you are of the opinion that this is an acceptable amendment, correct? Question for Pearlis.

- Johnson: We are not the final decision-makers. We have discussed it with this group before, and we will see what comes out of it.
 - Gussman: Thanks.
 - Wiesenberger: We discussed this based upon your (FAA's) suggestions on this Recommendation. Given the flow chart of the process, can you give us indication on the timing that we can expect over the next few months?
 - Johnson: I cannot, and I do not think Charles can give you an accurate indication of that, but it will take a couple of months to get that done.
 - Wiesenberger: Since we meet again in July, do you think by then will have some additional information from the FAA about whether we're moving the right direction. We need a little momentum one way or another.
 - Johnson: I'll leave it up to Charles. I cannot do that.
 - Wiesenberger: I know that you are not in the guessing game.
 - Johnson: We don't want to set false expectations. I don't want to make promises. It could take some time.
 - Gussman: Thanks for that honest feedback.
 - Pray: I would like to ask an additional question of Pearlis. I notice that on the Phase One process map there are "Go/No Go" where there is a determination of whether or not to proceed. Is there any point in that flowchart where the ACR would be brought back in to review any kind of changes or Recommendations to make changes to the amendment, or is it simply what we have now on paper is going to be approved or not?
 - Johnson: I am not an expert in the process, but I believe before we would reject, we would have more discussion with the ACR about our findings.
 - Crosby: One question. Was this not the FAA basically submitting this back to the ACR? Would that change the process?
 - Johnson: Let me describe what happened. You all submitted a Recommendation to us, and we said we did not like what you submitted and gave a better solution than what you submitted, and we are looking into that. This seemed to be a better option than what you submitted to us.
 - Brown: For Pearlis. Since we received your Recommendation saying if you change it and make it this way, it would work better for us, we went and we made another proposal and resubmitted that proposal to you. Does that start the whole process again, or can we be inserted somewhere along the way and it won't take as long? I think we are looking to find if a shorter timeframe is possible.
 - Johnson: I cannot give you a guesstimate. There is the review process that we don't control. Safety is always #1.
 - Gagnon: Any other questions or comments on this alternative Recommendation or on alternative Recommendation 1a, which is the Descent Procedure Amendment on night or off-peak hours?
 - Pollack: I thought that 1a was rejected, not possible right now, or is it still open?
 - Johnson: I think 1a is basically not open right now. We don't have a good option right now for 1a. This is 3a as I understand it.
 - Gardon: Matt Felton from FAA in March 2022 meeting said Recommendation 1a is no longer feasible and had asked the ACR to come up with any other ideas to result in the changes from Recommendation #1 occurring. Recommendation #1 refers to CDAs or OPDs – Optimized Profile Descents - into the airport. So, if the group would like to take that into the next meeting to possibly brainstorm some ideas or differences that were not in Recommendation #1, that is probably the way to go forward.
 - Gagnon: Just as a reminder, the ACR made a request of the FAA as well about that Recommendation to seek clarification of the reasons why they would not be able to move forward. Those were some other points that came out of that March meeting.
- **CLT Updates – Environmental Assessment and Part 150**
- Hair: Thanks for your patience on this. This is all new to us in this hybrid world. This is the biggest meeting that we have facilitated like this since COVID. Appreciate the grace.
 - Leathers: Happy to give these updates. The Environmental Assessment has been completed. That EA looked at the 4th parallel runway and expansions to concourses B and C. That came also as the decommissioning of our crosswind runway 5/23. Those are all processes, and they all take time. Starting the processes to go through that. The EA was going to be the next thing that kicks off the Part 150. The last time we talked we said that Landrum & Brown - the consultant - would be here to talk about Part 150 – an educational session, a 101. They are not here tonight but will be here July 13. Kevin and I have been

working together to get our information and data requests to Landrum & Brown so that they can start their analysis. A second part is making sure that we have the special interest groups, the ACR, as well as our Technical Advisory Committee put together. We will start taking additional Recommendations, not only what the ACR has put forward, but also anyone else in that Technical Advisory Committee that may have additional suggestions related to noise mitigation. As part of that Technical Advisory Committee, we are looking at air carriers, other community, and any other stakeholders that may be out there as well.

- Rutzell: *Asked for a description of the ACR's role.*
- Leathers: You are a part of the Technical Advisory Committee as well as the special interest groups. You will have the opportunity to put forth other Recommendations if you would like in addition to the ones already submitted to the FAA.
- Rutzell: So that has already been submitted, but there will be an opportunity to do another round of Recommendations or suggestions?
- Leathers: Correct. That will be with the Technical Advisory Committee, called the TAC. Together you can submit as many Recommendations as you would like. It would run through the same FAA processes which is understanding the impact within those contours, and if it continues to meet those needs and goes through that cycle, it will continue to be analyzed in that process.
- Pollack: As far as questions/suggestions/recommendations to be a part of the Part 150, what is the most efficient route to submit those?
- Leathers: The first formal meeting as part of the Part 150 will be late summer or early fall. They will start taking and analyzing the formal Recommendations. The way that we make these Recommendations is - the consultant will be here at next meeting to give you all of those ways to get your Recommendations together.
- Rutzell: Is HMMH going to be a part of the analysis?
- Leathers: HMMH is staying on as the consultant for the ACR. It is important that they maintain the relationship already started with the ACR.
- Wiesenberger: They are not doing anything for the Part 150?
- Leathers: No. The Part 150 is being completed by Landrum & Brown.
- Rutzell: We already submitted our proposal, which included HMMH's analysis of the noise impact. Will that be included in the evaluation?
- Leathers: What we are following with Landrum & Brown as part of the Part 150 process is the FAA's specific process. Related to the contours and the 65 DNL, things are very restricted when they are looking at things as part of the Part 150 process. That is what we will be following.
- Rutzell: I think the HMMH analysis for our stuff is more expanded than what is probably required for the Part 150.
- Leathers: Yes.

➤ **CLT Updates – CLT Operations**

- Gardon: This is a document - page 10 in your handout - that I created at your request about 6 months ago, and I provide on an updated basis. In the top 3rd of the document, we have information about overall operations. We have operations per day - all flights in and out of the airport. We also have % flights in north flow operations and the average number of cargo flights per day. In 2022, we are well on our way past our 2020 average # flights but still below 2019. Departures and Arrivals – what % of use each runway gets. Lastly, we have complaint statistics: for 2022, we have 43,000 noise complaints year-to-date so far. While that is the highest number of complaints, it is the lowest number of complainants.
- Rutzell: One of my favorite analyses. When you say year-to-date, is the comparison the same period?
- Gardon: Yes. January 1st to May 1st for each of those 4 years.
- Rutzell: Do you have any thoughts on why the complainants have dropped?
- Gardon: No. It is easier to see trends for number of complaints. Looking at years past, we are in north flow less than last year, so that could lead to some of those changes. In terms of actual number of residents making complaints, that is much harder to hypothesize.
- Rutzell: Did you see any known complainants drop off the list in a certain area? I know that you did the breakdown by zip code.
- Gardon: I did not notice anything real specific or significant. Sorry.
- Wiesenberger: You have mentioned that the process for making a complaint was being streamlined. If you had filed a complaint previously, then it was not necessary to fill out all that information again - location, email. Is that corrected now, because I did not have success the other day?

- Gardon: I believe that is still underway. The main thing that is holding us back is an update of the CAPTCHA form. So, when you submit a complaint, you go through a series of checks to determine if you are a robot or not. We are upgrading to the latest form of CAPTCHA that operates in the background so it does not require the user to do that. It is my understanding that the newest version of CAPTCHA has some sort of conflict with air/noise complaint system. We are working with our developer so we can have this new CAPTCHA and have complaints from air/noise still.
- Wiesenberger: We don't publish the # of complaints publicly other than with this group, correct?
- Gardon: Generally that's correct.
- Wiesenberger: Compared to a TripAdvisor app or restaurant review app, we don't make it easy to file a complaint or file a positive experience, and we don't communicate those results.
- Gardon: I agree to a point. We want to make the complaint process as easy as possible within reason. In terms of transmitting these numbers, we do if the news people want to see them. Everything from the ACR is publicly available. I'm not sure if there is a benefit to outwardly display these statistics at all times for anybody.
- Wiesenberger: I am getting at transparency. My goal is that the airport can be transparent, and we publish wonderful reviews that the airport is doing everything possible to manage noise, and people are minimized in their complaints. That is my goal.
- Gardon: There is a group of about 20 people here who could be talking to their communities about how the airport cares about noise. I believe that later in the meeting Phil will be talking about attending a symposium surrounding noise. Charlotte is continually held as a shining light for noise abatement, but we are always interested in greater transparency, always trying to tell our story of the extra lengths Charlotte goes to relating to noise. We are also looking at you guys for that.
- Wright: My question is on the average number of cargo flights per day, that is an increase. Cargo planes are bigger and noisier.
- Chase: I would say that is because of e-commerce. There are new players in the cargo world of e-commerce. Amazon is one that started their own flight operations, and that probably plays a lot into it.
- Wright: So, that could potentially increase our arrival noise levels?
- Chase: They are kind of big airplanes – some are still 737s. Maybe the cargo concern is the nighttime hours. As a pilot, when I am operating I am only using the charts. I don't always have local knowledge of everywhere I operate into. So, if there was some way to change the off-peak hours or get something in the charts that the pilot reads, like “during nighttime hours we would appreciate it if you'd try to stay higher on approach”. Those are the things I can think of off the top of my head. Cargo is traditionally arriving 5a and leaving by 10p.
- Pollack: For complaints, it looks like 500 complainants and that seems like a really high number per individual. Second point: The policy or thought of discounting people who complain a lot might not be the right way to look at it. It may be someone who is really suffering, and I suggest that we not discount people who are complaining a lot.
- Gardon: We treat complainants equally - that is why we look at the number of complainants as opposed to the number of complaints. Last year our #1 complainant complained 40,000 times. Most of our complainants complain one or two times. The number is heavily offset by a small number of residents. That is the case at every major airport in the country. Second point - we like to look at every complainant as an individual. They get the same response.

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

- Gussman: *Community Engagement Project Team*. We still have not had a solid meeting, but I have put together a work plan so that we can look at what we have going for the rest of the year. Historically, did we approve through this body or through committee?
- Gagnon: It depends on what information is going out and wanting to have certain data or stats communicated for review by CLT for accuracy.
- Hair: I believe the question is: Are we creating a record or is a member speaking from it? We are sharing documents from the Agenda packet, so we have a record. But if you put together a PowerPoint like this information and speak on it as an individual, we are not approving that.
- Gussman: Hopefully we will be adding a few more people to the group. Next meeting will be the first part of next month.
- Cameron: *Government Engagement Project Team*. Page 12. Our group has not met since last ACR Zoom call. We did brief NC Senator Natasha Marcus who was very engaged. She does not represent Steele Creek

anymore, but she used to, so she was very aware of the problems there and concerned with the problem overall. During that briefing we did not come up with solutions. She did appreciate being kept up to date, and she asked that we continue to communicate with her as the process goes on.

- Wiesenberger: *Local Operations/Improvement Project Team* - Page 13. Frankly very little has been done in the last month or so. Mark Loflin was going to take the lead but is not able to at this time. I will stay on. Would hope for additional support. This team is tasked with finding local solutions to unwanted noise that are outside the scope of Government Engagement and Community Engagement. Looking at other airports and seeing what they are doing successfully to manage this. We will get back on track with a meeting in June.
- Brown: For Government Engagement Team – Two weeks ago Commissioner Powell and I had another meeting, and she is very engaged in our situation. Hopefully we can get in touch with Congresswoman Adams to help get her reengaged. Thanks to Commissioner Powell for being so involved.
- Wiesenberger: With the Government Engagement team. we have talked about how to be more proactive. Would love to see a game plan on how we can share and communicate with our neighbors - making this a more easily communicated issue.
- Cameron: You make sense. I think that our project teams have let ourselves be silent. Those 3 teams need to be working together. We've been trying to make the contacts that we can. We really appreciate Commissioner Powell being here. Between news releases, newsletters, briefings to staffers, etc., I don't think the 3 teams have gotten together on that.
- Rutzell: I think you have a template of a presentation to give. I believe you have an overview.
- Cameron: We have a backbone briefing that can be tailored.
- Rutzell: Next step may be have a form letter so residents can send to their representatives.
- Gussman: May I suggest that we have the leads of the 3 teams together once a month or every 2 months?
- Cameron: Or at least a dedicated kickoff.
- Gussman: We can work on scheduling that.
- Hennessey: Kurt, Jacob Pollack and Darren Crosby said they could help with your group.
- Wright: This is a Stuart question and it is kind of going backwards: In the past, and I guess I am a paper person - we would get things in the mail announcing environmental assessment meetings, such and such is happening. That might be a process - doing a mail information.
- Hair: I think we forget that the old stuff does work. Thank you for bringing that back up. We will put that back into consideration.
- Loflin: What about an ACR press release? Would that be possible?
- Hair: In the past the airport has not had a proactive communication around noise complaints. It is not part of our outward communication strategy. Our outward communication strategy - and this is Chris' world - is around the operations of the airport historically. We do have the "Connections don't just happen at the terminal" campaign, which is widening that messaging. We soft launched that campaign in January. The story behind that "connections" is that the airport is more than just the operational facility, more than just the airplanes and the terminal. Things happen around the airport that are broader and deeper. That campaign is in its first phases. We are always looking at "What does Phase 2 look like" for these types of campaigns. I think there are a lot of opportunities. We are trying some new stuff now, and I do not think that precludes us from doing some old stuff also.
- Rutzell: I do see that you communicate with the Steele Creek residents, and that has been very helpful.
- Hair: Thanks for that feedback. Dave Wingo is on our neighborhood group - Airport as neighbors. Follow us on social media - Instagram. Retweet them. I'm glad that our outreach to Steele Creek residents is engaging.

❖ Request/Address Additional Business

- Unfinished Business - Note **written updates** on Motions/Requests for Support
 - Gagnon: Note written updates on Motions/Requests for Support. Page 14 - Requests from the March meeting. First request – Clarification/specifics on activities and status relating to Recommendation #1. Next item, provide CLT summary and HMMH analysis on FAA's alternative to Recommendation #3, which was provided just before and during the April meeting, which enabled you all to vote and approve the alternative Recommendation #3a back to the FAA. The 3rd item is Investigate Opportunities to support ACR member participation in symposium. We are going to talk about that later in the meeting. And the last item is something that Amber alluded to in regards to providing the Part 150 overview in the July ACR meeting.

- Page 15 is Written Updates Document. The only major update is the American Airline Retrofit of Airbus Aircraft with Vortex Generators. That project has been completed.
- Cameron: Can you remind me what model of aircraft was retrofitted?
- Montross: It was the Airbus 320 model that arrived without the protection when it was delivered. All of the aircraft that are being delivered now have it as part of the package.
- Cameron: Do we know if it was a particular 320 model that had the whistling effect or all of them?
- Gussman: The early models - the Airbus did not offer vortex generator until Boeing made it standard on their equivalents.
- Cameron: Do we know if anybody else flies those older 320s in Charlotte now other than American?
- Chase: Possibly Spirit. Delta might have some.
- Cameron: I heard whistle in my neighborhood the other day. It reminded me of this. I couldn't see what type of aircraft it was.

➤ **ACR Mission/Charter Revision Update**

- Gagnon: Next on the Agenda (Pages 16-19) - ACR Mission Statement and Guidelines. I know that there has been work done by Dan in conjunction with Kurt and Phil. Many months of discussion were put into this revision.
- Gussman: We as a leadership group and a couple of members early on suggested a few changes. This is the fruit of that effort. All of this came from us. There were a couple of technical things that came from CLT.
- Gardon: Most of this came from some members with basic suggestions to the Mission Statement and Guidelines. Prior to this we had been operating with original Mission Statement from 2017 that had some unusual artifacts in it, such as term limits, some older positions that had been qualified. One of the biggest changes is the general tonality towards working collaboratively with both the City of Charlotte and the Aviation Department – that is us – and the FAA. That language has been added, for example in the first paragraph. There have been some additional changes to the roster that is on Page 3. We added another seat to South Carolina. We had added a seat in Lincoln County a couple of years ago - a lot of it is modernization. On page 2 we added a segment about the Slate and the work of the ACR moving forward. One important thing to note is the original Mission Statement, after the ACR submitted a Slate, the Mission Statement could be read that the ACR Mission had been fulfilled. That is not the case, so we added a future direction for the ACR that we've been working on for about 2 years now since June 2020. About 70-80% of this is the original document with just a few changes.
- Gagnon: This being a new document, you will need to go through the voting process.
- Gussman: Does anyone have any questions?
- Chase: Talking here about the parties and the added counties, would it be possible to consider adding representatives from American pilot union? American has a huge pilot domicile here. You have AA, a couple of other regional airlines that are your main CRJs that are operating in and out of Charlotte. You could also have representative from Air Traffic Control because I feel that is a voice that would be good to hear from.
- Hair: I would call attention to handout Page 17. About halfway down, we try to articulate in broad terms the exact point that you are making. We did not want to necessarily pin it on someone from a certain union - that they had to have a representative here on the ACR, because it is a voluntary body. We want to engage with stakeholders with this so that is why the language on that page is vague. If United wanted to send someone, they could. AA always wants to send Tracy because she loves working with the ACR. We always get somebody from FAA involved, but if others wanted to be involved, they could be under the language there.
 - From the Mission/Guidelines Document: *Due to the technical nature of the subject matter, the FAA, airlines, airline/aviation-related industry groups, and representatives from the Airport will join the ACR at its meetings to provide technical guidance, answer questions, and provide constructive feedback as needed.*
- Chase: Is it even appropriate? I think there a lots of airline crews, and it doesn't occur to them. I think they would have interest, as well.
- Montross: My responsibility is to report on all of this discussion to leadership in American that develops flight procedures, that schedules crews, that designs our schedules. I have a robust list of those in the company that makes decisions regarding our fleet, regarding our schedules. There is a lot of knowledge in our decision makers in the company of what takes place here. I understand the benefit to the ACR to engage more frontline key members because as residents they have interest in this discussion. Beyond that

they are really not able to affect the flight standards and operating procedures that American takes into Charlotte. I am happy to take this offline. I do want to offer confidence that lots of people that I report to are taking notice of the ACR members.

- Chase: I appreciate that. What I get from that is that you are very focused on safety and efficiency here at the airport. That is pretty much what we hear at the airport as crews. I am just saying that if we let people know that there is more of an issue here with the noise. For instance, the off-peak flying at night. If we raise these altitudes on the downwind, the controller, if there is no one in the airspace, can let them down to a final altitude – 3500 or 4000 feet to make that turn to base. I am just saying if they knew of the interest, I feel like we don't get much interaction from the community about noise – those of us in the cockpit.
- Brown: We have been talking about keeping the airplanes higher. Especially up in Davidson and Cornelius, what they do is they get them on the downwind and they drop them down to 3500, the MSA. They are coming over our house at 3500 MSA, which is actually 2800 feet. And it is very efficient and safe. For American that is great, saving fuel and it is safe. If the controllers would keep them a little higher and take them down to base over at Mooresville at 6000 feet and take them down over the main channel of Lake Norman, they would be on the glide path coming down the middle of the lake. That wouldn't bother anyone. That would add one or two minutes to their flight time, and that is cutting into their efficiency.
- Chase: That is why it is an off-peak discussion that we are having.
- Montross: That is a comment for ATC. That is not a pilot decision.
- Brown: I agree. We used to have a tower chief at our meetings - including Bob Sz. That would just be giving the controllers more leeway to keep them higher and not turn them in so early. Just a different technique, nothing that would have to go through an analysis process.
- Chase: The pilot is always in command of his aircraft. When he is issued instructions by ATC, we are to follow them, but sometimes ATC issues us “at your discretion.” They might say “you're at 6000 feet, descend to 4000 feet at your discretion”. The pilot then analyzes what needs to be done. The pilot is still very much in control of a lot of these decisions and may not know what they are affecting.
- Gagnon: This is a really good discussion. On Page 17 (the paragraph noted in *italics* above), does the Mission Statement need to be modified as written to reflect some of these suggestions that are being made, or if there was a desire to have others want to attend and participate, will this allow that to happen the way it is written?
- Gussman: I believe we have the ability to bring in additional people - periodically or all meetings. We are here to try to approve that this is our Mission. Does this paragraph help?
- Chase: It leaves the door open.
- Gussman: If it turns out we need more people, please bring it to leadership. If it turns out that we have missed a part of our community that has not been represented, over the years we have added people to the body. If we need another advisor in the room, CLT has been very supportive of us adding people as we need.
- Pollack: Regarding the Mission Statement, I look forward to taking a look at it. I think it would be nice if it specifically referenced ATC, particularly local union representatives. I don't think it needs to stipulate that they come every meeting, but that they can. In the short time that I have been here, I think that these folks have a lot of influence on what is going on around the airport, and I worry that they are not necessarily considering the noise impacts - mirroring some comments that folks have said. I'll give 2 examples: When there is crosswind, I don't understand what is leading the airport to go one way or the other, or who gets to make that call. Another example: When I look at the flight track of the airport, I often see examples, particularly during non-peak times, I see lots of arrivals coming into 36L or 18R, and the other 2 runways are not that heavily used. It looks like some could roll out and depart. I understand from the efficiency standpoint, that might not be easier on the operations of the airport, but maybe they aren't taking that approach. Taking away some noise from under those rails by using other runways. I did just suggest another representative from the area of people living under the western runway. You have a lot of people living north of the airport. You need equal sentiment from north people and south people. I really encourage adding some people.
- Gagnon: The ACR has the authority to add new positions, as they have done in the past, even without having to go through a formal update of the Mission/Guidelines. CLT helps determine need or demand to add positions. If you all wanted to add positions later on, there is the opportunity to do so.
- Wiesenberger: I think this has been partially addressed by Phil and Jacob - we have had some of our best discussions when having pilots and others that are involved in the airline business in the room and conversation. They have the technical expertise to help us determine if what we are talking about is even

feasible. Whether we can invite them on a periodic basis or have them in-person, I am not sure how that works, but those are stronger discussions when they are here. Sayle and Greg, thank you for what you have done.

- Gussman: I still feel good about the document and am interested in hearing a motion about adopting this document.
- Wright: I see that this has a revised date but not an adopted date? This would be our first adoption of our Mission Statement, is that correct?
- Gussman: There was one initially. This is the amendment of it.
- Pollack: Are we voting now or another meeting?
- Gussman: We sent this out in the minutes beforehand in the hopes that we could review. This has been in front of us a few times.
- Wright: So, this is version 2.1. When was the original date? And now it is being revised May 2022. I don't know when it was adopted.
- Gussman: The first one was in 2017 when the body was first created.
- Wright: Seems like that would be a part of the revision because you don't have a referral back to when the original was created.
- Gagnon: So, the suggestion is to add the originating date at the bottom and then the revision date in the footer.
- Pray: In a contract, it would be a legal preamble, it would say – This is an amendment to the original contract or Mission Statement drafted and ratified on this date, and it is amended as such.
- Gussman: I accept that as the amendment to the document.
- Pollack: When was this document sent? I can't find an email with this attached.
- Gagnon: After the March meeting, I sent it out to all the members requesting feedback and asked for that feedback by April 8. I sent a reminder email on April 1 about the feedback. The revisions were added into this document that we are looking at today.
- Pollack: Was there a recirculation of the edited document since that first document that went out?
- Gagnon: This was sent out yesterday in the updated form. I don't know if the updated form had been distributed earlier than that.
- Pollack: I would like to ask that we defer to the next meeting. I haven't had a chance to look through it. I did not see it.
- Gussman: Are you making a motion? It would be appropriate to make a motion for deferral.
- Pollack: I make the motion to defer until next month.
- Gussman: The motion is: To defer the ACR Mission Statement and Guidelines. Is there a 2nd? [Pause] Seeing none, it does not move forward.
- Loflin: I make a motion to approve the Mission Statement and Guidelines.
- Gussman: With the friendly amendment of additional documentation about revision and initial adoption date.
- Washington: Second.
- Gussman: Since we have potential opposition, do we need roll call? Any additional discussion?
- Pollack: So, we are going to vote on something that was distributed yesterday?
- Rutzell: I think it was distributed on April 7?
- Gagnon: It was distributed in March in draft form. Distributed in final form as we are looking at it today when I sent out the email yesterday. Some changes were made from the draft that came out of the March meeting to the final version that we are looking at today.
- Wright: In my sent email I have one where I responded about the revision on April 8. So, this document was sent out for review. Unless there are names/emails missing.
- Gagnon: I think that Jacob's point is that there have been changes made that are reflected in this final version.
- Pollack: And this version went out yesterday, right?
- Gagnon: Right.
- Wiesenberger: This original Mission Statement was developed in 2017. It was very basic - established this group to formulate and develop a Slate of Recommendations and then stop. Now this group has evolved. We have done that initial charter and developed an ongoing role to maintain level of noise pollution management, and this document has reflected those changes. I feel this document is 95% of what we are

doing today. We have come a long way in describing what this group is trying to do. If there are a couple of omissions, revisions, we are so close.

- Cameron: One more comment, if we do approve this tonight, and we find something we need to change, we can.
- Pollack: What would be the downside of waiting one meeting so folks can read through it?
- Wiesenberger: I think the things that have been changed in the last days have been minor. I don't mind delaying it, but we have been working on this for about a year.
- Gardon: A version of this did go out in early April for revision. Final revisions were finished yesterday. I will say that this document was changed quite a bit over the last few weeks.
- Brown: The original document did not give relevancy to continue after FAA Slate. This document gives us relevancy to continue as an ACR as it is stated right now. I think it is extremely important that we pass it now.
- Pollack: If we don't pass this, is there no meeting in 2 months? I don't understand the rush. *Reiterates previous comments.*
- Gussman: At this point, we have to call for a vote.
- Gagnon: You don't need a roll call.
- Gussman: Everyone that is voting in affirmation please say "aye." All but one member votes aye. Jacob votes nay. Motion passes.
- Wright: Are there any abstentions? *No.*
- Gussman: The motion passes.

➤ **New Business: Share ANE Symposium Results: Key Takeaways**

- Gussman: Darren did a great job of putting together a document. I only sat through 2 sessions. They were informative. Charlotte was held out as a good example of an airport and how they work with the community. We might not all agree with that, but apparently there are places that are much worse. Darren did a good job of putting together the takeaways.
- Crosby: This is a 3-day seminar. Lots of interesting things. They went through a lot of information, a lot of people selling products. Our ACR is one of the best in the country in terms of continuing a dialogue. Maintaining the dialogue with stakeholders regardless of sometimes not getting what we want. A case study, moving forward with something provides positive results. My takeaways:
 - Aircraft noise is bad for your health – cardiovascular health, stress, etc. Aviation industry is adding to the climate change, so focusing on electric. Noise needs to be studied differently.
 - Electric aircraft will cut out emissions, and that is what they are pushing for. As a passenger who is flying out tomorrow, my concern is how long the battery will last. Vehicles – like a drone – air taxis, that will take you to an airpark - like The Jetsons.
 - They defined what stakeholders were. Discussed rezoning property or land use.
- Gussman: We will be able to have recordings in a couple of weeks.
- Crosby: Hopefully we can get it and make it available. Some of the future things are really interesting.
- Gussman: We will make sure that the rest of his document is made available.
- Crosby: Lots of jobs tied to it. Quite fascinating.
- Gussman: Next year, let's have a few more people participate.
- Gagnon: Thanks, Darren.

➤ **New Business**

- Gussman: Any other new business? *No.*

❖ **Adjourn**

- Loflin motioned to adjourn. Almond seconded, all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 8:09 pm