

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: September 8, 2021

Attendees

Kurt Wiesenberger, Chair, Charlotte	Sam Stowe, Gaston	Tommy Dupree, FAA
Phillip Gussman, City 1	Wendy Burkhard, York (Central)	Sonya Busch, FAA
Bobbi Almond, City 5	Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)	Matt Felton, FAA
Alan Sauber, City 7	Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA (ex-officio)	Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Sayle Brown, Cornelius	Pearlis Johnson, FAA	Dan Gardon, CLT
Doug Pray, County 1	Michael O’Harra, FAA	Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Natalie Rutzell, County 2	Melissa Rivera, FAA	Chris Poore, CLT
Mark Loflin, County 6	Reggie Davis, FAA	Mark Wiebke, CLT
Bob Cameron, Davidson	Andrese Davis, FAA	Theodore Kaplan, CLT
Greg Chase, Huntersville	Kishawn Griffin, FAA	Melissa Treadaway, CLT
Walter Ballard, Lincoln	Chip Gibson, FAA	Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Kim Hardee, Matthews	Tony Liman, FAA	Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg	April Rowe, FAA	Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Summary Minutes

❖ Open the Meeting

- Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- Wiesenberger: Welcome to the September meeting of the ACR. This is the bi-monthly meeting of the Airport Community Roundtable. I will call the meeting to order. Please introduce yourselves.
- Burkhard: I’m the new member from Fort Mill, SC near Carowinds (representing York County). I’m on final approach; been in home 32 years.
- Gagnon: *The ACR members introduced themselves. Then CLT, FAA, HMMH, American Airlines.*
- Gagnon: Meeting flow: Participate via phone or WebEx. We will save and incorporate the chat comments. Please use the raise your hand feature. When you are sharing, please state your name. We will try to have a 90-minute meeting.
- Sauber: We have a great representation from the FAA. I appreciate everyone coming.
- Gagnon: *Walking through the Agenda.*
- Wiesenberger: It is always important, especially with guests, to clarify our Mission Statement. So it is here in the Agenda. We have 25 members and have been meeting since 2017. We’ve been hearing of noise problems for a while - since NextGen came into effect.
- Gagnon: Ground rules: Healthy meetings, productive, and brief points. Effective in making noise improvement in our area.
- Wiesenberger: I will ask for approval of the Minutes, but first I have a correction to the Minutes. Page 3 - talking about our reaction document – in the third bullet point, delete “to increase.” *Loflin motioned to approve. Cameron seconded.* The Minutes are approved with the correction noted.

❖ Receive Public Input: No public input tonight.

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

- **FAA Response to ACR Reaction Document – Pearlis Johnson, FAA**
 - Johnson: We’d like to respond to some of the questions that you wrote us several weeks ago. In regard to the document that we responded with, I don’t think we intend to go through the entire document that we sent. I would like for Michael O’Harra to make some opening remarks.

- O’Harra: Good evening. It is good to be back. I want to express my appreciation to how you all engaged and responded with us. The FAA hears and is sensitive to your noise concerns. The ACR response back in July provided some helpful clarification that prompted us to do some additional exploration regarding possible amendments to existing procedures. I remain hopeful. This team and a broader team is meeting routinely behind the scenes. I remain hopeful that one of the options that we are looking at may well end up aligning with some of the ACR’s objectives - generally, on arrivals to keep the aircraft as high as possible and on departures to distribute or disperse – spread that traffic as much as possible. We are hopeful to have an option to do that at times of low traffic or night operations, which was a direct result of some of the feedback. A lot of this comes from dialogue. FAA has our mission - safety and efficiency of airspace - that is literally what we exist to do, but in that context we are trying to find solutions and common interests with the ACR. We respect that there are challenges proposing solutions to a complex airspace in Charlotte. To respond to one of your comments, we are engaged. We are familiar with the goals you have, and we want to continue the discussion. Andreesse will walk through the status of our current efforts and hopefully provide some clarification. We still consider on the departure side, those 3 departure recommendations are alive. They are not non-starters, and we expect those will be considered in the upcoming Part 150. We will talk with you about why we think that framework is appropriate. I’m pleased with where the FAA team is in terms of what we’re looking to on the horizon.
- Wiesenberger: First of all, Michael, I appreciate the efficiency with which your response was made. The other comment is about the FAA goal of safety and efficiency. We don’t argue with that. I would also think environmental impact to citizens is important; I wish that was a louder message from the FAA. I believe that the CLT airport has a goal of quality of life for its citizens. I would hope that the FAA is sensitive to that as well.
- O’Harra: It is a key part of the function of my office to engage with communities. It is a key part of our structure, and we are doing better than historically, but we have room to grow. I would rather have conversations with you all than writing letters. But, documentation is important. I appreciate your comments.
- A. Davis: Thanks for inviting us out. I believe this is my 5th or 6th visit. There are a lot of people in attendance, and it is a representation of the intellectual capital that has been invested in analyzing and also responding to the recommendations that you all provided.
 - I’d like to frame the presentation by saying we will not be answering each of the questions that were outlined in the reaction letter. Our intent tonight is to provide a high-level update to the ACR recommendations while referring to a few points in the reaction letter.
 - FAA slides: Activities to date: These are milestones that we have hit along the way. There have been many discussions, reviews, analyzation since July 2020 when we received the Slate of recommendations. We came up with a strategy to efficiently address the recommendations so our resources could be best used to address or validate or manage your recommendations. As of yesterday, we provided a response to your reaction to recommendations.
 - Next slide: Recommendation #1 Greater Use of Continuous Descent Approaches – We remain unable to address CDAs to the operations as they are defined. However, we did note in your reaction letter, requested focus for off-peak time, higher approaches, and we are exploring possibilities that could potentially meet the intent of the request.
- Rivera: Did not want to rehash the CDA and how it was evaluated. The determination was made by communication and several reasons why it would not work. It is defined process for not only ICAO but also FAA definition. That was the focus of that at that time. With the reaction document, we did have a different look at what the intent of CDAs are verses what the definition is in the airspace. We could look at it differently to develop some conceptual designs to get near what the ACR is desiring as possible.
- A. Davis: We went outside of the definition of CDAs and are trying to explore the intent of the request. You will find more in the response letter.
 - Recommendation #2: Maintain 6K Arrival Minimum Altitude until Final Approach Course. That remains unable to implement because of the high potential of increased risk being introduced to the Charlotte operation. No alternatives being explored at this time. Air Traffic requires a full range of options or altitudes for safety and separation of aircraft. The complexity of the operation, the need to separate aircraft in a manner that allows for stable approach would not allow for aircraft to maintain 6K until final approach course. Next slide shows the typical operation, typical flow into Charlotte with a focus on when those aircraft typically descend below 4000’. Aircraft do not descend below 4000’ until after the downwind leg turning inbound towards the runway on the dog leg and typically 10 miles of the airport. The reason we illustrated this slide because it shows the typical traffic over 3,400 tracks into Charlotte, and if you look on the downwind they are all over 4000’. Bob, did you want to expand on that?

- Szymkiewicz: We pulled a lot of data. One of the assertions is that we, the FAA, say that we are at 4000 feet and the community sees the aircraft at 3700 feet. We pulled data from different weeks and different years to see where the discrepancy is coming from. We are just not seeing what the citizens are saying. The airplanes are staying at 4k, with very few exceptions, until about 10-11 DME when they are on the dogleg to final.
- A. Davis: The data we pulled was random. Nothing special about the weather environment or anything to that effect, just a typical week at Charlotte to show the altitude range of aircraft descending into Charlotte.
- Wiesenberger: The crux of this recommendation was that people who live on the downwind leg as far as 20 miles south of the airport are experiencing flights at 3700, 4000 feet. They are not on final approach, they are downwind. So, the request was, can we keep those flights before they turn at 6K altitude. I'm not hearing that particular answer. Can someone help me clarify?
- Brown: I talked with Bob Z. about this. I was using flight tracker during instrument conditions. All the downwind aircraft were at least 4000' – that's correct. But they would go down 15-20 miles out (Mooresville) before they would even turn base leg, and they would stay at that until they intercepted final approach course. So I was saying if we can do that during instrument conditions, why can't we do that during VFR conditions? I know it would slow down the arrival process a little bit, but it would be more noise-friendly with the community.
- Chase: On your charts that you have laid out, you show the fixes about EPAYE. I think an example would be on FLIPZ arrival shows at 210 and 6000 feet. I noticed your chart here shows between 4000' and upwards. What is the expectation of the aircraft crossing VALLL at 6K because from the response letter my understanding is somewhere on the midfield downwind you might direct the airplane down to 4K. I think that is the question. If you have 6K in a fix south of the field, how does it get to 4K? Thank you.
- Szymkiewicz: When Charlotte's optimized profile descents were designed, they stopped at 6K because the air traffic controllers were not comfortable with the aircraft descending into the finals airspace. There are airplanes coming from the west or the east depending on which it is. The controllers wanted to manually control the descent below 6K feet. It is essentially a paper stop. Historically the air traffic controller on the west side will descend the aircraft as soon as they can to 5K, the air traffic controller on the east side will descend the aircraft to 4K as soon as they can because they have to maintain that vertical separation. And build in enough separation in case there is someone going to the center runway. It is procedurally designed to be at 6K, so that 6K was if you could design a true descent from top of descent to threshold, those points are points where most aircraft that came into Charlotte could make a stable approach. There was never really an intent for the airplane to be at 6K. What 6K does is that if something happens and the aircraft loses radio or something, the airplane will fly southbound but stay at 6K to be separated from other traffic.
- A. Davis: Does that help?
- Wiesenberger: Yes, that answers my question about altitude.
- Brown: During instrument conditions, you are not cutting the corner but clearing guys to GILGE or QUWED on 18L on the downwind. In VFR conditions, that is where they are turning them in. They are turning them in short, they are cutting the corner and coming right in over the Peninsula, which is approximately 10-11 miles north of the airport. We were asking to go ahead and extend the downwind, and if you have them intercept the final approach course more around SNACK, which is about 15 miles, that would put them over the main channel of the lake, and it would reduce the noise track on the ground north and northeast of the airport. When I sent that email to Bob, that is what I was watching in flight tracker. Why can't we do that in VFR conditions? The efficiency would be affected but not the safety.
- Davis: I want to make sure I am capturing your question correctly. You are saying that during VFR conditions to extend aircraft on the downwind for noise, is that correct?
- Brown: Yes, make it like instrument conditions. You have to have better separation in instrument conditions than VFR conditions, I'm sure.
- Chase: To piggyback on what Sayle is saying is if you go up higher to a 15-mile final, then you don't have to have a higher power setting as you descend down from a 15-mile final on a 3-degree slope all the way down.
- Busch: We are talking about Charlotte and the concerns around Charlotte. Anything we do at Charlotte impacts the national airspace system. If we add to a final from 10-15 miles, that will stack them up. If they are stacked up in Charlotte, they are stacked up in Atlanta center, etc. On an IFR day, Sayle is correct – separations increase. The efficiency is still a fine-tuned machine, and we cannot cut those corners when we are running instrument approaches. It is all connected.
- Gagnon: Thanks, Sonya. I hope that helps with that particular recommendation. If there is any follow-up or additional information that would be beneficial to share with the ACR for that recommendation, that would be appreciated.

- A. Davis: Recommendation 3 - Return CAATT Waypoint to Pre-Metroplex location. As it was proposed, we were unable to implement, but we offered the alternatives to potentially raise the waypoints. Because of the other requests, there may be some connectivity, and it may be more complicated to implement, but this was the alternative proposal that we offered to the ACR.
- Wiesenberger: I believe that recommendation was originally the (CAATT/EPAYE) waypoints to be increased to 1000 feet from what it is. That was something that Bob, I believe, suggested as a possibility. The FAA came back and said if we do the (CAATT/EPAYE) waypoints, there probably would be some other waypoints that should be affected as well. So, I am confused. I thought it was something promising. I'm not sure where you stand on this now, and frankly 1K feet reduces the noise about ½ dB, and that is not a lot. Can you help me to understand this better?
- A. Davis: Moving the CAATT waypoint is something that we were not looking to do. We were exploring raising some of the waypoints.
- Szymkiewicz: If we try to move the waypoint, it opens up the entire procedure. It creates a very long process. We recently had a meeting, and it appears that through an abbreviated amendment if we raise the altitude by 1000 feet, it effectively creates the same situation. I believe that puts the airplanes slightly higher than pre-Metroplex level. I believe that fix was 2.7 miles away. If you raise altitude by 1000 feet then raise the anchor point by 1000 feet, it looks like that can fit into an abbreviated amendment. What the Charlotte facility would like to do is to do that all around. Procedures that come in from the NW would be similarly redesigned as in 10K and 7K, the ones from SW would be 10K and 7K, as well. It seems that would be able to be done as an abbreviated amendment. I think one of Andreese's team members was on a call with flight procedures folks at Oklahoma City last week to discuss that. Rather than try to make a change that is never going to happen and is going to create a really long delay, these changes may be able to happen through the abbreviated amendment process.
- Wiesenberger: That helps. I'm glad there's a positive direction for this recommendation.
- Rivera: The big difference is that moving the waypoint would not achieve as much as raising the altitude. We evaluated just as presented by the ACR. Since we were able to achieve specifically something better by raising the altitude and not moving the waypoints, which has a lot of unintended consequences, raising the altitude actually achieved a higher altitude on the same track than what was previously there pre-Metroplex. That was a win to me. Secondly, with the idea of the conceptual designs now added to the scope, we have other work that we believe will create a benefit during the time that now is being reviewed as part of the scope – which is during those low traffic times or at night. Basically, those are basically achieving alternatives to recommendations 1 and 3 by just looking at it in a completely different way. Presenting this to all stakeholders and getting some buy-in once they are ready even if it does take a little longer will be a better outcome than just doing a small change that really doesn't remove some of the noise that we think the ACR intends.
- Davis: Thanks Bob and Melissa. Moving tracks is not what we want to do. Raising of the altitudes is hopefully less of an impact environmentally than moving tracks from one place to another. Next slide: Departure related recommendations are still on Slate to be analyzed during the Part 150.
 - Recommendations 4/5/6 – departure related Recommendations. Still on Slate to be analyzed during the Part 150 study. Tommy, did you want to expand on that?
- Dupree: I think how it should be addressed is that since 4/5/6 are tied to the airport's existing Part 150, to amend the Part 150, the airport will initiate that process.
- Wiesenberger: In our reaction document – our concern was these Part 150 study analyses will not really be completed for two more years - sometime in 2023. So, basically we're waiting for this study to be completed to hear anything back about these department procedures, which we thought were the most viable solutions to people getting (relief from) these departure rails over their homes. Is there nothing you can do short-term over this?
- Dupree: The Part 150s are a voluntary program, and once airports initiate that with the input from the communities and the FAA lines of business to amend those, there's a procedure put in place to allow any change to those. That is the process put in statute by FAR Part 150. Any change to those have to go through that process. I would leave that up to the airport in terms of timeframe and when that process starts, length, what's involved. The airport is best to address that issue.
- Wiesenberger: Tommy, I appreciate that, but there are people in Charlotte selling their homes because of the repeated departure planes over their homes - and same with arrivals. Two years from now is a long time in people's lives - it's killing people.
- Rutzell: I'm one of those impacted by departures, so I just want to get a little more clarity because I thought you'd review these policies and given the assessment, then you would go to the Part 150 because we already have the assessment performed. We had the assessment that said this is a viable solution, we can remove the 2-mile

restriction, and it would be blessed. Then you would go to the Part 150 as opposed to waiting for the Part 150 to start the assessment process. It just seems more efficient to me that you would approve these recommendations and then implement, then design a Part 150 knowing that these plans and proposals are approved.

- Dupree: I assume the assessment you talking about is the assessment done by your consultant, HMMH, correct?
- Rutzell: We put together an assessment. What I'm looking for is the FAA's assessment on whether or not these are viable plans that can be pursued.
- Dupree: So the Part 150 is an airport-initiated process that the FAA oversees; communities can have input and involvement, and we would consider those recommendations that the ACR or community groups come up with, and those would be a part of the airport's and the FAA's review of the Part 150s and see if they meet the requirements for noise abatement. So, we would take those and evaluate those in the Part 150. We wouldn't just take those and say that is that is all we're going to take a look at. Those are outside; so the data that your consultant generated may be considered – it's up to the airport and their consultants. But the Part 150 will generate its own set of data and requirements and scope that will be overseen by our office.
- Rutzell: The way I thought about this happening is that you would assess these proposals. Then from your assessment and your feedback from them, then as the ACR and the airport design their 150, they can take into account these plans. Right now, it just seems a little awkward that we would have to wait to design a Part 150. The only thing that's part of the 150 right now is the 2-mile restriction. So, that's the only thing in scope if the Part 150 that we would probably remove. The other plans in general are more comprehensive, so I thought we would get better clarity from the FAA on these proposals before we moved into the Part 150; because we could take into account your feedback as we design the Part 150.
- Dupree: Your proposal would be considered in the process of the Part 150.
- O'Harra: Kurt, if I could respond to part of your comment, and Stuart may want to jump in. Stuart, I'm not trying to put you on the spot, but part of our understanding as recently as a few months ago was the Part 150 would kick off this fall. I believe the ACR's heard some updates on that. Part of our strategy going into this was that we would look at the arrivals and then the departures would fit nicely into that 150 framework. I don't want to speak for the airport, but I'm willing to share I've been briefed that that's more likely early in 2022. I'd rather you hear that from the airport. Having said that, that process is going to kick off sooner rather than later. Yes, it's been delayed a little bit from what I was anticipating not that long ago, but at least in my mind, the start of that is not that far away. Stuart, I want to pause and give you an opportunity to clean up anything I said. I just want to speak a little bit frankly from my perspective on that.
- Hair: I appreciate that Michael, and thanks for jumping in on that point; we had planned to provide an update during the third point of our Agenda. I am good for us to go ahead and provide that update. Mark Wiebke, our planning director, is on the call. His team is the point of contact internally on the Part 150 update process. Mark, go ahead and provide an update.
- Wiesenberger: This seems like a nice transition point to the next item on the Agenda.
- Cameron: Before we get to that, we started talking about all three of these, in general, and got more specific over the years. But we were talking about removing the 2-mile restriction in 2017. I am curious to know why the airport has not initiated that process as our partner in the ACR prior to this.
- R. Davis: We can ask that question once the airport gives their briefing. So, let's finish slide and go onto the next steps. The next steps for the conceptual design is to present to internal stakeholders and the national air traffic control association and the airline industry as alternatives to recommendations 1 and 3. Afterwards, the FAA will present agreed upon conceptual designs to the ACR; once we present the designs to the ACR, you'll follow your process, do your voting and things like that and get back with the FAA via the Charlotte airport with written correspondence on the conceptual designs – whether you want the FAA to pursue – whether it be yes or no or other options. After that, we'll follow our process on those designs.
- A. Davis: We can take a couple more questions.
- Wright: There was a question from Sam in the chat describing the Part 150 study.
- Gagnon: Sam stated in the chat: Would it not be beneficial for those who are new on the ACR describing what a Part 150 study is. Just briefly.
- Hair: Mark, could you provide an overview on the Part 150 and an update?
- Wiebke: First we're going to start with an update on the environmental assessment. We are in the process of making a slight change to our EA that is now with the FAA to review and comment. The small change is moving the runway 100' closer to the center runway – 36C. That would give them a separation of 1100' from 36C. By doing that, that eventually puts the runway in a prime spot for future use of the airfield and gets it in a much better

place for efficiency in the future. With that shift in the runway - which brings it closer to 36 center - we have to go through a revision to the final EA, which is now in the FAA's hands. They are now reviewing that. There will be another public meeting to go over that change; then that will get published around the first week or two of October. Anticipating getting the record of decision for the finding of no significant impact (FONSI) sometime February 2022. That's when the Part 150 would kickoff. We have the Scope of Work nailed down with the consultant, are going through the contract row, and preparing to go to City Council to award that contract – the latest update was November – to award that contract.

- A Part 150 Study is a voluntary program that the airport does to help minimize/mitigate impacts to the surrounding community that are caused by aircraft noise. When first implemented in the 1980s, we had a lot of different style of aircraft, a lot of noisy impact that was impactful. Since then, we're up to Stage 4-type aircraft. They're more noise efficient. The Part 150 looks at the community impacts of the aircraft noise on the surrounding community - typically to a 65 DNL level. Since we have implemented that back in the late 1980s, we have pretty much mitigated everything out to the 65 DNL – which is what a Part 150 covers. It is to cover the folks in communities around the airport. Part 150 can also look at other procedures that try to mitigate overflights – is aircraft dispersed or on a rail? That's what gets studied in these Part 150s - how to best mitigate those impacts to the community. It will go not only with efficiency of the aircraft and how it flies and the fuel usage and safety, but also the community impact. It really depends on what the noise analysis comes back with as to what are the best options out there? So, it's not just the noise; it's going to factor a lot of different things - the safety of the aircraft, efficiency of aircraft, the ability to arrive aircraft, and to have the capacity we need to have at the airport. So, balance is everything.
- Brown: Moving that runway 1300', is that going allow there to be lower minimums on the instrument approaches?
- Wiebke: It's moving it to 1100' from 36C.
- Brown: OK, but why do they need to move that?
- Wiebke: It increases the separation from the West runway.
- Brown: So they can use lower minimums, use both those runways at the same time, and increase efficiency?
- Wiebke: It could allow for more independent arrivals on those runways. Right now, we need 3 independent arrival streams.
- Brown: So you can increase that to 4 independent arrival streams, correct?
- Wiebke: No, we'll still have 3 independent arrival streams.
- Gagnon: Any questions for clarification on what the focus of a 150 is or on some of those initial timelines that Mark provided?
- Wiesenberger: I just wanted to clarify between Michael and Mark, there are couple of discrepancies on timing. It seemed like, Mark, your focus is really about getting started in early 2022. Michael, it sounded like you thought things would really be moving and done by early 2022.
- Wiebke: Let me help clarify that; I think Michael said he got some new updates, and he thought it may have slipped to starting sometime in February 2022; that's the first kickoff with the consultant and we start this process of gathering data. We've already negotiated the scope of the contract, going through the fee analysis with the consultant, and have started some preliminary simulation modeling ahead of time with the concurrence of the FAA in Memphis and Tommy. So now we're just having to go through our approval process with City Council.
- Wiesenberger: Mark, I think I spoke to you in July - I asked you a question, and I think you said it usually takes about two years to complete a Part 150; is that right?
- Wiebke: That's about right because there's a huge amount of community involvement and engagement with this, and I'd have to go look at the scope; I don't know how many public meetings and public hearings that we will have, but there's a lot of data gathering/analysis/public meetings, we'll get feedback from you, and we'll go back and tweak, get your input again.
- Wiesenberger: One other thing you mentioned – the 65 DNL zone being the primary focus. Is that still going to be the primary focus going all the way out to 2024?
- Wiebke: That's for folks that live in those areas. In the early days we bought, purchased insurance, sound insulated. It was a totally voluntary program, so there are still a few people that still live in those impacted areas.
- Wiesenberger: Let me point out for the record that I believe all but one member of the ACR group lives outside of the 65 DNL zone. We're affected by repeated noise over shorter period of time; we don't get 65 DNL day after day; we get 65 DNL for 2-3 hour concentrations. It's a different sound experience; just for the record, I just want to make that statement; thank you.
- Gagnon: Any other comments on the Part 150, Stuart or Mark, that you want to share?

- Rutzell: I'd like to just get clarification; is it the airport's goal to present the proposals that the ACR came up with as part of the 150? Because generally it doesn't impact the area. What is the overall outlook? How would we include it in the Part 150? Is it just the removal of the restriction, or we also included destination-based turns? I guess I'm just not clear how that would be incorporated in the Part 150.
- Wiebke: We will take a look at the 2-mile restriction because that's been hounding us for a number of years. That would help air traffic. Divergent headings will help air traffic and get airplanes out quicker to a certain point. Part of that is all design looking at those studies - what does that do? Where the noise is currently, where does it go, what does it impact? Does it impact more folks/less folks? There's a lot of analysis that goes into this; those are some of the first things that they will look at.
- Gagnon: To Natalie's point, Mark, they will look at all three departure recommendations?
- Wiebke: Yes.
- Gagnon: And they will look outside the 65 DNL as well. Is that correct?
- Wiebke: Yes.
- Sauber: I really think what Natalie is saying is, is the FAA approving of those recommendations if the airport approves it in their 150, or do they consider it their 150, the airport signs off, and then the FAA has to approve it. I think that is sequence were looking for, but correct me if I'm wrong, Natalie.
- Rutzell: That's good clarification. Thank you.
- Gagnon: Andrees, Michael, or Pearlis - Do you want to respond to that process and the timing of those FAA-related decisions?
- Johnson: Tommy would be the better one to answer.
- Dupree: The airport considers all alternatives in their Part 150 with the community's input. They'll prepare that, submit that to the FAA. We would review that, and we'll be the office that either approves or disapproves those recommendations. So, the process is they consider the recommendations, they evaluate the Recommendations, and they make a final report to the FAA. We make a final rec of approval on those recommendations.
- Sauber: Natalie, that should answer your question. The FAA doesn't even get involved until the airport goes through their 150.
- Rutzell: Help me understand how the destination-based turns fall into the Part 150. I understand how the removal of 2-mile restriction is part of the 150, because that's part of the existing 150 plan. But I don't understand how the other parts of the proposals are incorporated in the 150. It's not that the airport is going to come in and say 'part of our noise abatement program is that destination-based turns.' That's not a standard Part 150 language/term/condition, that is not - from what I can tell - part of normal Part 150 descriptions.
- Gagnon: Could somebody clarify that for Natalie - why outside the 2-mile restriction the other two recommendations would be evaluated or would need to be evaluated as part of the Part 150.
- Dupree: The airport has an existing Part 150 that has been approved by the FAA. It includes the existing arrivals and departure tracks, and any deviations from those existing arrivals and departure tracks that have been approved already, have to be amended or updated in a Part 150. So, beyond Recommendation 4 (2-mile restriction), 5 and 6 are deviations from the existing Part 150. Those have to be evaluated in the Part 150. Any new proposed departure has to be evaluated and updated in a Part 150.
- Johnson: Those were put in in one of the earlier Part 150s around 2010 or 2009, something like that, correct?
- Dupree: That's correct.
- Johnson: We cannot deviate from those until we change the Part 150.
- Dupree: That's correct. Once you have an approved Part 150, the changes have to be done in subsequent updates or amendments. The 2-mile restriction with part of the 1996 Part 150, and subsequent changes in 1998, 2006, 2008, and so any changes have to be done in the Part 150 process.
- Rutzell: The change from Metroplex that changed the flight path and departures were part of the Part 150 process and went through that process? Because Metroplex changed the paths and the way that they turned. Was that part of the 150 and went through this 150 process?
- Szymkiewicz: In the Metroplex, we worked with the aviation director. Basically told him what conceptually what we're doing, and the aviation director at the time told us that he did not care what we did as long as we waited to 2-miles to do it. He said as long as we stuck within the confines of that 2-mile restriction, he did not care what we did, knowing that we did an Environmental Assessment. As we did the Environmental Assessment, anytime we conceptualized a procedure that might bring us into EIS category, we were told we had to back away from that. So, we complied with NEPA and complied with the aviation director's wishes. FAA is just the service provider. The aviation director tells the FAA how we can use the airport, so that's how we design procedures around that. So, we

complied with NEPA by doing an EA. I'm not completely sure of all the intricacies of the 150, but I do know that we met with a 2-mile restriction, and that was the direction from the aviation director. Basically, they didn't care what we did as long as we did it at two miles, and we fulfilled our obligations with regard to NEPA.

- Gagnon: Kurt, we're getting near an hour and a half. We still have a few items left to cover, but in terms of discussing next steps, how the ACR is going to take the information that's been provided via e-mail, take the presentation information that's been shared today, and determine a next step - do you have a preference for how you would like to segue into further discussion with other ACR members about reviewing, analyzing, and responding to what the FAA has provided today?
- Wiesenberger: I would just like to go back to the last slide that Reggie provided about next steps. I don't know if you could pull that back up, and then, Reggie, could you review that slide again? The question I had was if we get some clarity about our next steps – a little bit more about a timeframe.
- R. Davis: [Slide 10] So, basically, Kurt, for Recommendations 1 and 3 when we mention the conceptual designs – we are going to see if they are feasible. There's no timeframe to give at this point, as we are just taking a look at them. But once we determine there are feasible, we would then bring them to the Charlotte ACR after we do our internal process, present to you all, again - no timeframe on this - and once we present to you, you will follow your process - whether that be voting - and then once you approve/disapprove or say go back to the table, then we need written correspondence. If it's a thumbs up, we will follow our FAA internal process. Again, there's no timeframe because the designs are in its infant stages. I know you are looking for a timeframe, but we can't give one at this time.
- Gussman: Months or years even? Can you just indicate the scale?
- R. Davis: I can't even tell you a time.
- O'Harra: I'd like a timeframe as much as you all would, and we've had that conversation; but we could commit to keep you updated at each ACR. You could make the determination if you're seeing suitable progress or not, but I underscore what Reggie said. I don't want to make up a date, and frankly, we don't want to bring a recommendation then we pull our own rug out from under us. We can give an update at the next...[technical issue for a member]
- Gagnon: Michael, you had mentioned you could give an update at the next meeting, and there's not a specific timeline, but the ACR can obviously make a determination if they feel like they're not hearing progress the way they would like; then they would respond appropriately at that point. That's sounds like what you're committing to at this point. Is that correct?
- O'Harra; That's true, and I think we do have an action to provide some information to HMMH on the alternative for Recommendation 3. I think we can do that sooner rather than later.
- Gussman: So, there is some further communication about your analysis and the noise impacts that we'll be able to have Gene and HMMH help us on understanding, right?
- O'Harra: That would be our preference. I will speak for the FA on that; I think rather than us bring - please don't take this the wrong way - but rather than us bring a different kind of analysis and then the ACR says 'this isn't like what we've seen, where we're not sure that this makes sense,' our recommendation from the FAA is that we have that conversation with HMMH, and they present a product that the ACR is used to seeing for other recommendations.
- Gussman: I think your methodology is excellent on that but just wanted clarification.
- Gagnon: Kurt, in terms of next steps, we had talked before the meeting - obviously not knowing what would be presented - that there might be a desire to convene some of the ACR members or find ways to get input similar to after the June presentation of the FAA. Is that what you foresee as the next step? Kurt, Phil, and I have our debrief meeting late tomorrow. Is the next step - game planning on how to get input and define a direction for follow-up to this presentation? Is that what you would see or something different, Kurt and Phil?
- Wiesenberger: Let's discuss it tomorrow, but I would suggest that the ACR have a conversation to just hear everyone's reactions and make decisions at that point. The other thing I would just add, Reggie, to your timeline is that the ACR will probably be on a 30 days max timeline. Really anxious to move forward. Folks have been dealing with this for 4 or 5 years, and it's getting personal for people on this ACR. They want to move, and they want to take more serious action that what we're taking right now with this roundtable. So, I'm sorry to reemphasize the timing, but you can count on us turning things around quickly once we hear other things from you. And we hope to hear an update in our next meeting in two months in November. Dan – what's the date?
- Gardon: It's November 10.

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

- Gagnon: For the sake of time – I know we’re past our preferred time – I’ll move fairly quickly. I’m going to go to the Agenda and ask CLT to continue providing their update, and when I say providing the update, obviously we’ve talked a lot about the Part 150. Stuart, I wasn’t sure if there are any other updates either on the EA or other things going on - existing initiatives within CLT - and we do have a page from Dan on operations.
- Hair: Two quick updates for the ACR. We’ve added bench depth to our overall community engagement program with bringing on a new Community Affairs Manager in February. Then she helped me hire a new Community Affairs Coordinator who started last month. Chris Sanders is our Community Affairs Coordinator, and Melissa Treadaway is our Community Affairs Manager. You will see them attend ACR meetings; they’re going to be helping Dan – who will remain our main point of contact for the ACR, and he is our noise specialist. He knows the technical stuff better than any of us. In addition, they are working on a long-term project with our strategic communications team. CLT does not have a great track record of talking about our community engagement program. It’s more event-based and less an overall comprehensive strategy. We have been building collateral to have an overall strategy of talking about how connections aren’t just made at the airport. We want to talk about how CLT is doing community engagement on a proactive basis. Chris Poore and our community engagement team is helping with this.
- Montross: I thought maybe you might want to make sure that this group is aware of the timing of the Part 150 contract in front of council. [From the chat: *It might be helpful for the ACR to attend the City Council mtg and speak in support of the Part 150 contract; and to note the ACR’s support for the 2-year long public engagement process*] I would suggest the ACR send a representative to public comments for that meeting and express support for the Part 150 and your commitment to support the public engagement process. I know Council will appreciate that, and it will bring great facility to the work of the ACR. Our next meeting is 11/10/21, and that contract may occur around that time. Just want to prepare the committees and ACR for that opportunity.
- Hair: Thank you for that, and we’ll make sure that you know when that contract is going to Council.
- Gagnon: On Page 9 is a draft dashboard of CLT ACR key measures that Dan put together. Dan, do you want to share this and its purpose?
- Gardon: This is just a list of some measures that the ACR is looking for see, with timeframes - primarily January 1 – September 1 of 2019, 2020, and 2021. Average daily operations, number of cargo flights, and runway use data. Column D – Year-to-date 2021, our daily coverage operations are coming back up. I will say that over the last couple months we’ve been close to about 1,600 daily operations. Averaged out over the course of the year, we’re closer to 1,400, so things are almost back to pre-COVID numbers in terms of daily operations.
- Wiebke: That Council date is November 22.

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

- Gussman: Community Engagement Project Team. Relevant to this meeting, we will be putting out a quick information piece to update our media and community groups on where we stand. Should be out next week.
- Cameron: Government Engagement Project Team: *No update.*
- Wiesenberger: Local Operations Project Team: We have been working on the overall ACR response to the FAA. In regards to local operations, we are benchmarking with other roundtables. Thelma, you participated in an airport community solutions summit. Do you have any comment about that?
- Wright: The 2nd meeting that I attended did not provide any more details than was provided before. Legislative actions are the emphasis as well as the environment impacts on children and communities. It is not just about the noise. Forming more partnerships politically to support change.
- Wiesenberger: This team is connected with UC-Irvine Annual Symposium on Airport Noise and Environmental Impact. We received an invite to a summit that they are holding in late 2022. In terms of benchmarking, I had a call with the leader of the airport working group of Orange County, CA - Mel Beale. We shared experiences and talked about best practices. We are trying to reach out and learn about what other airports and communities are doing.

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

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

- Gagnon: Page 10 in our handout. These are informational. This is summary that we do after every meeting. In July, ACR passed the 2 motions and the request for guidance that HMMH provided on the wording. The ACR Response Document was obviously submitted to the FAA. There has also been a sub-group formed to talk about some of the

concerns that were shared at the bottom of the initial draft document that were not sent to the FAA. Kurt, Phil and I will talk about these tomorrow afternoon. Then determine the best course of action and follow-up with the FAA.

- Page 11. Written Updates Document. Not much new. Tracy from AA is showing continual progress on the retrofit of the Airbus Aircraft. You can see some tweaks to the total number that have to be updated. The due date is still March 1, 2022.
- Other Unfinished Business item is not in handouts. It is a late addition from Kurt, and it relates to the Agenda item - Status Update on ACR Collaboration Communications with Stakeholders.
- Wiesenberger: On August 30, we had a phone call with Haley Gentry, Ted Kaplan, Stuart, Phil, and myself. It was a nice conversation that lasted about an hour. Spent the first bit getting to know one another. Talked about how to better work together and trust one another in terms of communication. It was a frank conversation, and I think it was positive.
- Gussman: It was reassuring to hear from CLT management that there is interest in continuing to work with us, be innovative, pay attention, acknowledge that CLT may not agree with everything we come up with, but feeling that commitment and appreciation for all of the members. There was recognition of some of our contributions. Those topics that we keep bringing up, Part 150, we will play a significant role. Our voices will be heard. The timeline - of course we want it faster - but it was a good conversation.
- Wiesenberger: We talked about our goals. CLT has major business goals. They are the economic engine of Charlotte. They want to increase the capacity and passenger throughput. In 2019, the goal was to move 50 million passengers through Charlotte. One of their goals is to maintain a high quality of life in Charlotte. We found some common ground. We shared that our goal is to reduce noise problem. We talked about future ways that the airport can support our efforts, as Phil mentioned the Part 150. The ACR should be involved more in that - we did not determine what role we should play. We discussed CLT website. We believe that noise should be higher in the menu and have more data and information. We also agreed that we should move forward with ways real estate noise disclosure should be handled. When a person moves to Charlotte, there is no information about how airport noise might affect where they are buying. That might be part of the Part 150 as well. We want to maintain and grow the relationship and stay connected. Doesn't have to be just Phil and myself.
- Hair: The meeting has sparked some internal conversation.

➤ **New Business:** *None*

❖ **Adjourn**

- Wiesenberger: Thanks for all on the call. *Loflin motioned to adjourn. Wright seconded, all in favor.*
- Meeting adjourned at 7:54pm.