

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: March 20, 2019

Attendees

Sara Nomellini, Chair, County 2
Brian Cox, Vice Chair, Charlotte
Kurt Wiesenberger, City 2
Loren Schofield, City 3
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Sam Blair, City 6
Alan Sauber, City 7
Sherry Washington, County 4
John Garrett, County 5
Mark Loflin, County 6
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Bob Cameron, Davidson
Kim Hardee, Matthews

Ben Miley, Mint Hill
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Dan Gardon, CLT
Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA (ex-officio)
Sonya Busch, FAA
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Kassinda Ross, CSS, Inc.
Call-in Participants: None

Summary Minutes

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:01 PM
 - Gagnon introduced new members Sherry Washington (County 4) and Mark Loflin (County 6) as well as Kassinda Ross (minute taker) substituting for Cathy Schroeder.
- ❖ Open the Meeting
 - **Approve Minutes:** Cameron moved to approve. Wiesenberger seconded. All voted to approve.
 - **Ground Rules:** Gagnon Reviewed (reminded members to show level of respect and orientation and focus on three words: Healthy, Productive, Effective)
 - **Meeting Packet Information:** Gagnon Reviewed
 - We will refer to multiple items in the packet. There is an updated FAA Decisioning flow. Wanted to find out process of information going back to the ACR from the FAA as they're reviewing the Slate.
 - **Announcement:** Cox announced that tonight will be his last meeting. He asked chair, Nomellini, to entertain a motion to accept his resignation and enter into a vice chair election process. Brown moved to accept the motion. Sauber seconded. All approved. Cox asked to open the floor for nominations for another chair. He nominated Wiesenberger. Cox Motioned. Hardee Seconded. All approved.
- ❖ Receive Public Input: None tonight.
- ❖ Analyze/Uncover
 - **Discuss/Decide on Slate of Recommendations to be Analyzed - Sara Nomellini, ACR Chair**
 - Gagnon: Discussed how the review of the Slate will flow. It will be very similar to what was addressed via e-mail previously. HMMH, Gene, will walk through 6 of the 7 Slate recommendations that were sent to members on Friday. CLT will then discuss the two-mile turn restrictions, which is the 7th Slate recommendation. Gagnon asked for not a lot of questions or discussion as we go over the 7. The process is after we go over the 7 and get potential recommendations, we can discuss which recommendations need more discussion and will put to the side on the flip chart to vote on as a group. If there is a clarification question as Gene or CLT goes through their presentations, feel free to ask.

- Reindel: (Referenced HMMH PowerPoint handout that addresses first 6 recommendations: Altitude-based turns after departure, Divergent departure headings, Noise abatement departure procedures, Alternating downwind arrival rails, Delay aircraft turns after departure, Alter heading for initial turn after departure) If anyone has questions on what each of the recommendations is, feel free to ask. These items are things that came from the group. On page two on the graphic, the green represents what's existing today, and red tracks are what would occur if we did a turn at 3500 feet. Aircraft would be told to maintain runway heading until reach certain altitude.
- Wiesenberger: I want to clarify - I believe this slide has a lot of red on it which tends to connote negativity. The red as I recall indicates a net or delta shift to greater noise.
- Reindel: No, the only thing being shown here is the green (the existing flight tracks) and the red (the modified flight tracks until it reaches the 3500' turn). It's just reminding you where the tracks would be and showing what the procedure would look like.
- Nomellini: The theory behind this was they're turning at a higher altitude.
- Reindel (Slide 4): There are no divergent headings, and this shows that we could delay certain ones. This reminds you what divergent headings are. You need to diverge two departure streams to maintain separation safely.
- Garrett: How many headings are there right now - 1, 2, 5?
- Reindel: When they are departing now, there is one heading for each of the departure runways. Also remember the eastern runway, they do allow them to go straight on that runway, which means you definitely need to do a divergent heading on the center runway.
- Wiesenberger: Gene, can you clarify at what distance from the airport do those turns begin?
- Reindel: Today?
- Wiesenberger: Proposed.
- Reindel: We're not saying we propose a certain place yet. We're going to work with the FAA on what's realistic. You want divergent headings to occur soon so they have that separation they need.
- Nomellini: The theory behind this solution was that would help eliminate problem of multiple planes over one area every 90 seconds.
- Reindel: Yes, multiple divergent headings turning at different headings but still allowing for divergence.
- Reindel: On Slide 5 we looked at the standard departure profile known as close-in (NADP-1) and distant (NADP-2), which is designed for more distance from the airport. We want to do more analysis so you can recommend one of these. AA is already flying using NADP-2 at CLT. While we're looking at a Slate that needs to be put to FAA for implementation, you may not need to go to FAA to implement noise abatement departure procedures. Airlines can fly those without going through the FAA. Let's continue talking to the FAA on this and keep it on the Slate.
- Wright: But they will either do one or the other but not both, correct?
- Reindel: Right, the regulation states that an airport can recommend a noise abatement departure procedure. I'm aware of one airport in the country trying to see if they can recommend 2 procedures for different purposes.
- Reindel: On Slide 6 - The red is the downwind leg of arrival to arrive south to the north. We would recommend 2 or 3 different rails on an annual basis. This would provide relief to neighborhoods under the rail.
- Blair: Was there a proposed distance for that change? ½ mile or mile?
- Sauber: How far away were the rails between each other that we recall?
- Gagnon: I believe the change was one mile. The rails we were looking at were 5, 6, and 7 miles away.
- Blair: I missed the last meeting.
- Reindel: It was from your initial pitch that we went with.

- Wiesenberger: On the downwind arrival headings further north than what this diagram shows, would there be separation above communities where I live - Mountain Island Lake for example?
- Reindel: So north of what the graphic is showing?
- Wiesenberger: Yes.
- Reindel: Where the downwind leg starts, it's curved into there already, so you would still be curving in along that route, not directly north.
- Wiesenberger: I'm on a particular rail on the south operations on the NW side.
- Reindel: Brent wanted whatever we look at to the south we also look at to the north, so we'll probably want to look at that, too.
- Sauber: This is just talking about southbound arrivals on the rail?
- Reindel: This is talking about northbound arrivals.
- Reindel: (Slide 7) This is somewhat related to #1 "Utilizing Altitude Based Turns" because you get some of the same benefit. This is looking at delaying the turn. I will say this one has more predictability, but it doesn't create more diversion, and moves it to a different neighborhood - which has a higher altitude, and somewhat quieter.
- Wiesenberger: Is there a way to combine one and five together if "either/or" conditions exist?
- Reindel: That's a really good question. Do we need to look at 1 and 5? One thing we haven't done, is looked at how it affects population. How many people are we talking about when we show an increase or decrease? Each dot will have a population assessed to it. I wouldn't combine them at this point, but it's possible we may do so.
- Reindel: (Slide 8) A suggestion was to change the heading in which they turn especially the ones turning toward the west. One question was could we look at different headings to see if there is a benefit from having different headings.
- Cameron: They have a single heading now, so you'd have a different single heading?
- Reindel: Yes, #2 was having multiple divergent headings. This would have one divergent heading.
- Cameron: If you did your deep dive into #3 would you also get information you need to answer this one anyway?
- Reindel: We may. I don't think we know enough to say let's not do one or the other. We can note that certain ones are tied together and could influence each other.
- Gardon: There's been discussion from the ACR for a couple of months now of removing that 2-mile turning restriction on south departures. The airport has identified that is something possible to be removed. HMMH would analyze that. That would affect #1, 2, 5, and 6 and will need to be looked at. (Referred to Supplemental Memo "History of the 2-mile Turn Restriction for Departures to the South") This has been in place for 42 years.
- Member: Are those residents still there?
- Gardon: Yes, a number have been brought out or mitigated, and some refuse to be bought out or mitigated. We'll have HMMH analyze that as well. It will be beneficial to have that research done.
- Gagnon: I will be working with Brian and Sara to navigate next sections. These are the 7 Slate recommendations that we just received refreshers on. Prior to voting, remember the vote today is to send them to HMMH to do analysis on each of these individually and collectively. What would be the collective effect on the population? Before we go through vote, the question is *are any recommendations items that you want to pull to the side*; if so let me know before we start voting.
- Garrett: By definition, are any of these mutually exclusive? Are the use of alternating runway rails by definition not feasible if we do divergent departure headings? Do we know that yet or not? Will we know once we get through 8 months of work?
- Reindel: Some are mutually exclusive. If you are to do divergent headings, you wouldn't then recommend turning at an altitude – perhaps – because divergent headings are going to take care of the

problem. You can't say you can't do both. We don't know quite enough yet to say that any of them are mutually exclusive.

- Gagnon: The closest ones may be #2 and #6. In #6, they all take one heading opposed to taking multiple headings off the runway (#2). Most of these you can find some combination to work together.
- Schofield: Last month we talked about a 4-mile turn limit. I'm trying to understand – first – if it's changeable and, second, does it affect any of these we should know about before we vote.
- Reindel: It does. It's something we have to keep in mind as we go through them. If you look at the 3500' turn, some will be beyond that point, and we may need to limit to that point. We don't know enough to say it's eliminating anything; that may be good to discuss with the FAA.
- Sauber: I had an earlier conversation with Ed last week. I would like to propose to the group, we have 7 recommendations that are good, but only one addresses arrival. If majority of the problem is departure, that's fine. In full transparency, I have no departure problem in Piper Glen and Ballantyne area because that geography is mostly arrivals; I pose to the group, if we're making recommendations and 6 are about departures, is that reflective of what the group wants and feels comfortable with?
- Cox: That's a good point. We do have one proposal in the hopper being looked at by FAA on the Waypoint move or some instruction changes related to that Waypoint that would adjust the altitude.
- Szymkiewicz: The shutdown really hurt us a lot. One idea was to keep them higher on the downwind to mimic what was done prior to Metroplex. The shutdown stopped everything for 35 days. The FAA at the DC level is trying to reprioritize what it is they want to do.
- Sauber: Do we want to consider including that in one of these recommendations? I need to understand that - since this is on hold - what happens to these?
- Cox: This Slate is going to HMMH for more analysis. That proposal doesn't need more analysis. Is that accurate?
- Reindel: Yes, that's accurate. By the time we submit the Slate to the FAA, we'll know more about how they're acting on that request, and we can add that back in.
- Garrett: There are very few options we have to pull on arrivals.
- Reindel: We had another recommendation (or looked to come up) with a more instrumented approach where we don't have fanning out of downwind leg. The technology is not there quite yet.
- Sauber: I would agree that we don't have many levers on arrivals. We don't want to lose sight of that if the group had concerns about arrivals, and we need to keep that at the forefront.
- Cameron: Our recommendation back in November of 2017 was to implement a continuous decent approach. This is in the American Airlines pilot handbook, and they do it at Heathrow. The FAA said that would slow things down too much. My point at the time was not to use for everybody all the time but was only to use it in a low traffic condition. It never got serious consideration. This is not on the Slate because the FAA said that wouldn't work because of their flow process.
- Sauber: I think you're onto something. I wasn't on the ACR when it first started. I don't know if that's something that can be relooked at?
- Gagnon: There is something called terminal sequencing and is on the matrix. It is being tested in Denver. This relates to what Bob is talking about. Did I interpret that correctly, Bob?
- Szymkiewicz: Yes, and Charlotte is slated to get it. With the RNP Approach, the FAA believes in the technology. I believe AA likes the technology, too. The designers said because it would be a limited use procedure, it would never get enough priority.
- Montross: I think the reason it's limited use is because our regional aircraft don't have RNP technology, and that's 50% of flights coming into Charlotte. We're designing RNP procedures in DC now. I can look into it more.
- Reindel: I thought it was also due to traffic volumes.

- Wright: My neighborhood is affected by arrivals. There is more departure activity where I'm located. It may not make much difference anyway.
- Gagnon: One key point is we need to make sure we're not ignoring arrivals. After we've gone through these 7, we need to make sure we're not focusing strictly on departure side.
- Brown: Are we trying to wait to see what FAA is going to come back, with Gene?
- Reindel: No, it's trying to help the FAA so we know how to proceed, to answer: *Out of all these things, what is it that we really want to propose to the FAA?*
- Nomellini: That's why this guiding principle work is so important. We can say *based on our Guiding Principles, this solution is fair; this one's excellent, etc.*
- Brown: We're putting proposals out there. We're exchanging ideas basically and giving them analysis of how this may look.
- Reindel: You're also giving yourselves analysis. You may find out that you prefer divergent headings over altitude-based departure.
- Sauber: You're going to rank order these 7 to figure out how strong of a case we can make against those, and the group would decide how far to go with those recommendations? That's my takeaway.
- Reindel: Almost. I'm going to provide you the information so you can rank order.
- Sauber: ACR would do the rank order. You would be there to say we're right on how we're interpreting the data.
- Garrett: Is it possible that the outcome of this would be that we come back and say it's really 4 solutions?
- Reindel: It's all on the table.
- Wiesenberger: Did we discuss if it's impractical to use continuous descent approach on non-peak traffic periods?
- Cox: I don't think we know.
- Nomellini: Can we add that to the slate?
- Reindel: It's fine to add to the Slate. It may have gotten taken off the Slate due to discouragement that FAA is not quite ready for it. That doesn't mean we can't still do the analysis.
- Sauber: I think we should add it.
- Gagnon: Is the technical way to say it is RNP CDA?
- Cox: I think we're talking about feasibility and scope. Can we do it and for how long?
- Reindel: CDA is one tool to get there. RNP (Required Navigation Performance) doesn't need to be there, but it may be an outcome of what our analysis shows.
- Gagnon: Sara, I will defer to you. Are you looking for a time now to look at 7 plus that 8th addition for a full group vote?
- Nomellini: If no other questions or objections, I'll look for a motion that we accept all these and ask HMMH to proceed.
- Cox moved to approve. Schofield seconded. All approved.

➤ Refresh on Next Steps

- Gagnon: In terms of next steps, this is a table talking about what is the overall plan for 2019. This is a dual path approach that you're taking this year.
 - One Path: We'll look at the 8 different recommendations individually then collectively. Starting in April or May, HMMH will start presenting results back to the ACR. Before the end of year, they will share which you most prefer to send off based on what meets the ACR's Guiding Principles. By the end of the year, you will submit recommendations to FAA.
 - Concurrent Path: At the same time, you'll be doing a lot of work with noise improvement, identifying actions to address locally.

- **Update on Potential Overall Goals/Guiding Principles for Evaluation – Sara Nomellini**
 - Nomellini: In talking about Guiding Principles, does everyone understand the intent and purpose behind those? What would be helpful is think about what’s important to you. How would you think about them? Send to me to put together a framework for the Guiding Principles.
 - Gagnon: Thank you to those that have submitted different ideas (Thelma, Bob C., Kurt, Loren). If anyone else has feedback on documents prior to the next meeting, please submit.
 - Nomellini: I just want to make sure people aren’t scared about it being so technical. Send in responses because I want to make sure everyone’s voice is heard or represented.
 - Reindel: HMMH is also preparing a baseline so you will know population at all those dots, noise exposure, # flights above altitude. You will have this in a month or two so you can start assigning metrics if you wanted to. We plan to give you a robust baseline so you can do Guiding Principles.

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

➤ **Unfinished Business**

- **ACR Strategic Framework Update/Review – Kurt Wiesenberger, ACR Member**
 - Wiesenberger: Ed has made some updates since our last meeting. I want to focus on the traction on the local level related to how we’re communicating with government officials as an ACR body, as an airport and having a stronger influence to get more horsepower behind what we’re doing. Dan has drafted a letter to the airlines about night restrictions. What specifically can we be doing? What can we do better?
 - Cox: Kurt, you’re right that this group will be at a disadvantage until city management and elected officials are engaged. A handful of us met with the current Mayor. We went to Robert Pittenger’s office. These were ad hoc approaches. We should make an appointment to go see the city manager to drive conversation. The strategy to get them involved is a good strategy.
 - Nomellini: Representatives from my neighborhood recently met with our new State Senator. The response we got back is they punted everything back to us – the ACR.
 - Cox: In approaching the City Manager, I don’t mean it in a fashion negative to staff – it may help staff. Cities and airports can make a request that’s beneficial to residents, even if they don’t control things.
 - Garrett: We don’t have citizen oversight of the airport.
 - Cox: That would be part of the conversation with city management and mayor perhaps. A weakness we have is that we have no formal place in the City’s government structure. We have staff that serves us well, but we have no direct accountability, and not appointed by city council.
 - Nomellini: I heard from council people that they’re punting to City Manager.
 - Wiesenberger: Stuart, I’d be interested in your perspective on this.
 - Hair: The noise improvement matrix seems like a tool to do this evaluation. Right now, it is an individual perspective but no metric around that lived experience. We’re on a good path working on the matrix. For years we had an airport committee, but it got caught up in the governance fight 5-6 years ago. There may be two separate asks that should be put forward. One is an approach around the metrics, and the second is around the ACR being advocates for an airport committee. I just reviewed a draft plan of work for a community engagement program. Continue the work you’re doing on the Matrix, and have reasonable expectations about how much Mr. Jones can affect flight procedures.
 - Wright: Kurt, I’m looking at the noise management, and I feel the same limited city information. We are designated to represent different areas. Communicating to each of the city representatives - that work is being done - is important. Citizens may not know as much in terms of information on what’s being done. Am I making sense?
 - Wiesenberger: Are you advocating that each of us as community representatives...

- Wright: No, I'm advocating as the ACR, we communicate to the city officials that we, representing our areas, have come up with this Slate that work is being done, to communicate information and it's an ongoing effort so we're communicating on a regular basis.
- Sauber: I would go a step further because the ACR has matured. We're representing the entire community of Charlotte. The firm comes back to us with results, and we come back to the manager with an ask, representing the community. How will it help them v. how will it help us?
- Cox: Here's an example of how that would work. We talked about earlier - I'm going to call it the Waypoint proposal. It would be more impactful if the City asked the FAA to make that proposal to have a higher priority than the ACR asking. Also, the City Manager and council have a legislative agenda and bring in elected officials.
- Nomellini: The key to all this is to figure out a different way to measure the discomfort of the population. Make it easy for households to say *I have an issue*.
- Wiesenberger: We talked about doing a community-wide survey. Are there others who think that might be a worthy endeavor?
- Schofield: We don't have enough outreach/communication. I shared a PowerPoint that Dan did for me with the Steele Creek Residents Association Board of Directors. They said it's the first they've heard of everything. Everybody knows people complain about noise, and others think we can't do anything about it. We all need help and outreach and making people aware there is a group working on it. We should ask where we can for support. Can you share anymore, Stuart, with the community engagement effort?
- Hair: How many of you receive Neighborhood Update? Connections? [Few/no hands raised] We have an opportunity because we are telling the story in some of our existing publications, and it's not reaching folks. Loren, your point is well-heard, and we need to look at who is receiving our communications. There are other types of engagement. The airport has let others tell our story and have responded to inquiries from traditional media.
- Schofield: Have we had a consideration of press releases periodically?
- Hair: We did one on the ACR when we first convened in June 2017, and that's the only one we've done on this group.
- Garrett: It might be time for a press release in addition to going to the City Manager. The ACR needs to issue a press release.
- Cameron: I agree. This is a milestone in our process to come up with a Slate. Whoever press releases go through (Observer and radio stations), that can serve as a reminder.
- Schofield: The first way is to get something in front of them first, then we can do the visits. We can raise the bar on our conversation.
- Miley: Why don't we do a Twitter handle with updates?
- Gardon: We currently have a media team that handles the CLT Twitter, but that's a good idea.
- Gagnon: Kurt, based on the direction the conversation is going, it seems like there are two different ways to look at this. One is very tactical in trying to be proactive and informing people (governmental and community) of this milestone. The other thing I'm hearing is that it sounds like the group needs more coordination of a cohesive strategy (relating to the community engagement plan Stuart referenced). One is finding out the pain point; second is getting in front of local representatives, state, federal representatives, and the FAA. At some point in the near future, develop a coordinated strategy which has ongoing touches with the community, local, state, federal personnel.
- Wiesenberger: Yes, I think you captured a lot of what the discussion included. I'm unclear on what Dan, Stuart, airport folk, are doing in terms of updates. We want to be coordinated with you in the most effective way.
- Hair: We will do a debrief with Ed/Gene tomorrow. We will look at how to do something.

- Wiesenberger: The fact that you have a media team is good leverage since we're mostly not professional marketing/communications people.
- **CLT Update on Planned Major 5/23 Runway Renovations – CLT Staff**
 - Gardon: There's been a slight setback on this. This has been pushed back to September. We can ignore this because it's not in effect for about 6 months. We can revisit when it gets closer. Generally, it will cause unusual patterns at night for people living on the west side. It's scheduled for 175 days.
 - Blair: Will there be a change in air traffic control procedures when the new runway opens?
 - Gardon: This is one of our existing runways that will close down.
 - Blair: Will there be new procedures with the new runway?
 - Gardon: We don't know. We know where it's going to go. When routes are designed, our Slate is taken into consideration.
 - Blair: If we spend two years to get something implemented, we are bumping into 2023.
 - Cox: Sam, that's another example of why we need to meet with city leadership. That's a good concern to ask. We're doing a big body of work, what assurance do we have that this is not getting put off if we get a new runway?
 - Sauber: You can only control so much. If ours doesn't get implemented for two more years, that's a great reason to delay implementation. We should push very hard once it's in, and don't let two years go by.
 - Gardon: That is likely a valid concern. In the planning phases of the new runway, the ACR would likely have some sort of input on how it is used in terms of departure procedures.

➤ **Motion Updates**

- **Return the CAATT Waypoint** - FAA: No additional updates.

- **Voluntary Curfew Request**

- Hair: Dan is passionate about his work, and that passion has been a great asset to our organization. Dan brought forward and fought internally. Sara and Kurt will receive a hardcopy requesting avoiding doing operations overnight. Dan will email for your review tomorrow for editorial changes. We have a process identified on how Dan will send that out to all the existing base operators as soon as possible and on a regular basis to operators newly based here.
- Sauber: Is this going to commercial and all parties?
- Hair: Great point. We get a lot of corporate jets; sometimes the impact of the corporate jets is greater; that's why we won't just send one time. We want to have an ongoing regular letter sent under signature.
- Wiesenberger: What about freight and military, are they excluded?
- Hair: No, they are not excluded.

➤ **Requests for Support – Updates**

- Support for Phase Out of Stage 3 Aircraft (Letter of Support for the FAA Reauthorization bill)

- Gardon: Brian, you said it really well: "things often get tied up." This is at or near Brent's desk. Hopefully we'll have an update in the next couple of weeks.

❖ **New Business**

- Montross: Just a quick update on vortex generators; we have retrofitted 59 of 283 in our network. We will continue to provide updates. Everything is on schedule and on budget. I appreciate everyone's support on this.
- Nomellini: When do you estimate them all to be done?
- Montross: 2021.

- Miley: The Airmax 8 and 9's that are not in use right now, are they operating much in Charlotte and if they are, are they that noisy?
- Montross: Ben is talking about the Boeing 737 Max 8 and 9 aircraft that were grounded at the direction of the FAA last week. Those aircraft do not serve Charlotte. They are primarily based out of Miami and Chicago. We have 24 aircraft in our network, and they're all grounded. We await more information from the FAA. Hopefully we can get more information on what caused that failure. In terms of noise, I don't have that update.
- Gagnon: Any need for breakout, Sara?
- Nomellini: No.
- Garrett: Thank you to Brian for putting in an incredible amount of time on this committee for the last couple of years. He is one of the original members of the ACR. Thank you for your time and commitment.

❖ **Adjourn**

- Brown motioned to adjourn. Miley seconded; all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:27 pm.