

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: January 10, 2024

Attendees

Natalie Rutzell, Chair, County 2

Nakia Savage, City 3

Michael Faust, City 4

Sherry Washington, County 4

Mark Loflin, County 6

Sayle Brown, Cornelius

Preston Hagman, Huntersville

Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg

Dusty Gilvin, Pineville

Jacob Pollack, York

Diane Dasher, York

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)

Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)

Kevin Hennessey, CLT

Matt Reese, CLT

Chris Poore, CLT

Amber Leathers, CLT

Mike Pilarski, CLT

Sara Easter, CLT

Pearlis Johnson, FAA

Shane Jackson, FAA

Mark Libby, FAA

Tracy Montross, American Airlines

Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)

Cathy Schroeder, CSS, Inc.

Summary Minutes

Open the Meeting

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:06 PM
- ❖ Rutzell: Open the Meeting: Welcome.
 - **Airport Community Roundtable Mission Statement:** *To provide the City of Charlotte Aviation Department (Airport) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) with broad-based community input into airport-related noise impacts and to find, where possible, practical solutions and recommendations for the FAA to consider when determining aircraft operating procedures at Charlotte Douglas International Airport.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Updates on members. Four members have left the ACR, two from lack of attendance; Kim Hardee has moved, and earlier this week, Walter Ballard submitted his resignation. Thanks to everyone who is visiting tonight.
 - Introductions: *ACR members, CLT, FAA, AA, HMMH and CSS.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Thanks to all that are here. It is extremely helpful for you to share your voice or in some way be a part of what the ACR representatives are trying to do for the benefit of the community. There is public Wi-Fi. We are in a hybrid environment. If you are remote, feel free to put your information in the chat. We are recording to make sure we capture everything for the minutes. Speaking remotely, use the “raise the hand” function. CLT will be monitoring. Keep microphone on mute until called upon. We are scheduled to go until 8:00 pm.
 - Handout - Pages 2-3 are the Agenda for today. Page 4 has ACR members, Page 5 includes other ACR stakeholders.
- ❖ Rutzell: Approve Minutes: *Savage made motion to approve the minutes. Wright seconded. All in favor? Yes.* The Minutes are approved.
- ❖ Gagnon: Ground Rules: Seeking healthy, productive, and effective meetings. Healthy – dialogue about mission and goals. Don’t make it personal; don’t take it personal. Productive – be brief in making our points, stay with the Agenda. Effective in making noise improvement in our area.

Receive Public Input

- ❖ Gagnon: Guidelines for public speakers: No more than 5 public speakers per meeting. Given 3 minutes to speak. If more time is wanted or needed, it is up to Chair. ACR may or may not respond at time of meeting.
 - Person #1 - Janis Hayes
 - Pollack: I agree with the comments we just heard. Is it the ACR's responsibility to manage the publication of information? I have viewed this as the airport's responsibility.
 - Gagnon: In terms of some of the communications that have gone out from the ACR, the Community Engagement Project Team wanted to make sure that the ACR was doing its part to communicate about the Part 150.
 - Hair: There has been a communications plan associated with this study, and I do appreciate the feedback shared about the efficacy and potential for improvements to that plan. We have the right people that are hearing you, so I appreciate the feedback.
 - Person #2 - Lisa Schuller
- ❖ Loflin: Could we get her address, as I heard something about relocation, and I want a staff member to get with her?
- ❖ Hair: We have captured that as part of the sign-up process. We do have the contact information for the 2 speakers and can share that, and we can follow-up appropriately.
- ❖ Rutzell: It sounds like the public is asking for more outreach. I believe the responsibility relies on all of us. For the Part 150 Study, the airport is responsible for the communication, but we do have a role.
- ❖ Brown: In the Part 150, are they considering buying up more property within the noise abatement parameters?
- ❖ Hair: With noise abatement, real estate purchases could be an abatement procedure, but we have not gotten to that point in the process where there are any recommendations of action. In the previous Part 150 study that we did years ago, our abatement procedure was mainly about sound insulation.
- ❖ Hennessey: There were some buyouts in the previous study, but mostly sound insulation, and I suspect it will be the same this time. These are voluntary actions. We still purchase residential homes today on a voluntary basis. South of the airport and Steele Creek, a number of folks call up, and we continue buying on a voluntary basis.
- ❖ Wright: The 2 FAA meetings that were held, were they FAA sponsored?
- ❖ Gagnon: If you're talking about the November Public Meetings (*yes*), that is next on the Agenda. Thanks for the segue. The CLT staff will drop links in the chat – how to make a complaint about noise, and registering to speak at the meetings. That has been done.

Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update

- ❖ Gagnon: We will start with a brief discussion of the information shared at the TAC meeting in November as well as the 2 public meetings in November. We have 15 ACR members, and at least 7 of you attended those public meetings.
- ❖ Rutzell: We put together the ACR Response Document. We went through the recommendations that were included and excluded from the Part 150, and specifically focused on the ones that were part of our Slate recommendations. They were excluded because they did not have a meaningful impact on the 65 DNL.
- ❖ Gagnon: In Pages 7-10 in the handout, you were requested to provide input. This is reflective of the ACR's response to what was presented at the TAC meeting as well as what was presented at the 2 public meetings held in November. Question for CLT: Could you address Thelma's question about who scheduled, set up and launched those public meetings?
- ❖ Hair: Those meetings were Charlotte Douglas International Airport meetings. Amber, can you clarify some of this information?
- ❖ Leathers: As part of the Part 150 process, the airport has hired a consultant to do that study on behalf of the airport. In terms of the outreach and communication plan that was put together, it outlined - What are the basic requirements that FAA puts in place? Part 150 is a voluntary program that the airport chose to be a part of several decades ago. Any changes that are specific to noise as the FAA defines it, you have heard about the contours and what contours can the airport identify mitigation for - that is covered in part of the information that was involved with the Part 150. Part 150 does outline what they have for their communication plan, and on top of that the airport goes and exceeds what are FAA's basic requirements to be able to do that outreach.

- Landrum and Brown – the consultant completing the Part 150 on behalf of the airport – helped us with those meetings. They helped us with the outreach in terms of what was put in the newspaper, what was part of the airport newsletters, what was on social media, etc. We do have a communication plan and can share that as well as an outreach summary in terms of what engagement was and the reports after each of those public meetings. Back in March, we provided all media information about the Part 150 – what it is, what it means for the community, and how to get involved. After hearing tonight, it seems like we need more. I would like to share what we’ve provided in the past. The website is one thing, but we have ways to sign up for direct communication so you can stay up-to-date as the Part 150 progresses.
- ❖ Wright: My question is in response to the first speaker and the availability of meetings. I did attend the meetings, and there were plenty of resources there. There were posters, but I realize they were both night meetings. No daytime meetings. We need to do a better job at making the information available. I can commend the committee in terms of there being plenty of folks to talk to and lots of information.
- ❖ Leathers: Thank you for that feedback, and we will apply that for the next round. We provide options related to accessibility. If those meetings do not work or if there is a special outreach need for a specific group, that team is available and ready to do that. I think we can do a better job next time. All of that information and boards can be shared online and can be provided in a hard copy, if requested.
- ❖ Gagnon: Pages 7-10. This document includes the ACR’s response on individual recommendations. I won’t go into all these since that information was shared in November. This Response Document was provided to the Part 150 Team a few weeks later.

Receive Update on Progress Overall on the Part 150

- ❖ Hennessey: We’ve already talked about the public meetings we had in November. Since those meetings, L&B has received a number of comments and has been compiling them while also continuing to work on the scenarios and running those. I talked with L&B today, and they said they are probably 6–8 weeks out of finishing all the scenarios that they are working on. The next set of TAC meetings/public meetings and public hearings are penciled in for Spring. We do not have a date. As we get closer, we will update.
- ❖ Pollack: This document that was circulated back in November reflected a bunch of conclusions, and some alternatives were rejected, some in a very cursory way, just saying “not possible.” There have been comments submitted back asking for clarification. Are those proposals being reconsidered for further discussion on why these things are not possible? I don’t have clarity on who decided it was not possible and how that decision was made.
- ❖ Gagnon: Paraphrasing what Jacob said - in those presentations in November there were recommendations/proposals that were excluded for various reasons. Jacob wants to know the rationale for the exclusion. But also, with this response document from the ACR - is this being considered? How is it being considered in the process of evaluating the proposals?
- ❖ Leathers: As part of the Part 150 process, all of the recommendations and alternatives that were provided – over 25 (that’s great participation) – there is a screening process addressing: What is this recommendation? Is this going to have a true impact within the 65 DNL, and is that going to change the number of impacted residential units within that system? It will then be able to say - in a qualitative or quantitative way - if it is not going to have an impact on the 65 DNL, it will not proceed with the next level of the screening process. If something is recommended that does not meet the requirements of being able to improve noise within the 65 DNL, if it has any type of safety concerns or significant capacity concerns, it would not be able to proceed forward. That is a group and collection of us working with those agencies that have a direct influence on the way that those would be implemented with FAA. The FAA, along with the airport, is going to ensure that we are following this process that they have put out there. Collectively, in terms of the analysis that we have received, some of those would have fallen out of the screening process. The Part 150 is very specific to those 65 DNL contours. I know that a lot of complaints come from outside those contours. Unfortunately, we continue to follow what is the FAA guidance.
- ❖ Faust: I was noticing on Page 8, the very first thing stated there – the Part 150 analyses all assume a mix of 64% North Flow. Actual North Flow percentages have been below 64% since before 2019. Why was that mix used, and how would the results of the analysis change if the mix was closer to the 58%-59% it’s been since 2020-23? Is that being considered in any way?
- ❖ Leathers: I want to make sure that I understand fully what you are asking. If that could be written to the airport, I want to make sure that we get a full response to that.

- ❖ Faust: So, we don't know why the 64% was used, rather than what the mix was previously?
- ❖ Leathers: I will say the usage of the North vs. South Flow has been based off of historical use in terms of how the airfield has operated. The differences you may have seen over the course of several years is going to have to do with wind and the ability to switch between - going from North to South Flow. I understand that there was an intent to look at it in a way where it could be more equalized, but there are weather concerns that go beyond the Flow of the wind as well as the way the airport operates. In a South Flow, before 2022, we had a crosswind runway that was used for arrivals and departures. Since that process of the EA, that runway has been decommissioned. The airport uses that runway in a taxiing function rather than arrivals and departures. There is an intent to try to balance as we can, but other factors are beyond what the airport can control.
- ❖ Faust: I look at the map of traffic almost daily, based on wind and everything else, and it has been going North Flow 4, 5, 6 days in a row when it could be in South Flow. It does not seem that they ever change it unless the wind dictates it. When the wind and other factors are clear, they tend to just go to North Flow. That is based on me looking at it, and I look almost daily.
- ❖ Gagnon: For the sake of time, I do not want to get into the details of each of the comments. They were sent to L&B; CLT was copied on these documents, but there are 2 points to be made. Amber, just for your edification, 58%-59%, the Key Measures Report that CLT shares, that is always the range that it's in, so that is where the question comes from. Getting back to the broader question that Jacob had - for these types of responses, how is the consultant or CLT going to utilize these going forward? Will there be feedback to the ACR in some form, as well?
- ❖ Leathers: In terms of the alternatives and the way they were recommended and analyzed, all those responses to that are covered in the TAC information handed back to those representatives. As of the last meetings, it was the initial analysis that they have found thus far, but additional information will be shared in terms of how that information has progressed.
- ❖ Rutzell: Will we be getting written comments back from the consultant or the airport on our comments?
- ❖ Leathers: I will have to confirm what set of comments you are referring to, but all the comments that are received are always documented as part of this process, but I will confirm and get you a formal response on who will respond and at what level. It is not the last time to respond as part of this process.
- ❖ Pollack: I understand the principle of 65 DNL, and if it does not affect this, it does not move on to the next step. There are proposals that never were assessed, and there is just very cursory dismissal saying - I'm looking at one that says it has potential safety concerns. It raises more questions - When the consultant or airport says "there are safety issues running South," then why are we ever running South? We get different answers. Last meeting we were told by ATC that there are congestion concerns. The airport runs perfectly well South, we know that there are plenty of days when they can run either direction, and they continue to run North. It creates an impact to people when in North Flow. We need the airport and the tower to take it seriously. They should at least justify and explain the rationale.
- ❖ Gagnon: Before we get to the next topic, for reasons like safety concerns, Amber, is there additional detail, and that was just a summary, or was that the level of analysis done?
- ❖ Leathers: This information was discussed and analyzed with a group of people, and if it was identified as a safety issue, that is a true concern. I wish that I had more information to share with you today to be able to provide that, but I do think if there is a concern on what was provided, I would like to get more details. I do not have all that in front of me, but I would like to get you a good response.
- ❖ Gagnon: Maybe that follow-up along with how the response from the ACR will be handled - some description on what goes into determining whether something is excluded or not.
- ❖ Leathers: Yes, I would like to offer the consultant to come back to the ACR and explain things better than I could, or even a special session.

Address Obtaining HMMH Support in Analyzing Part 150 Proposals

- ❖ Gagnon: *Showing a document from Agenda Planning Call last week.* The Agenda Planning Call is with the ACR Chair/Vice Chair and CLT representatives to determine plans for the meetings. Part of what the Chair and Vice Chair were seeking was determining how to look at the Part 150 analysis through the lens of what the ACR is used to seeing - the type of analysis that HMMH with Gene, our technical consultant, has shown before in the initial analysis. These are 2 draft ideas that you are seeing on the screen - CLT had suggested having a conversation

about what might be a scope of work to have HMMH help the ACR understand the proposal using terminology and analysis that the ACR is familiar with.

- ❖ Rutzell: I think we would like to see the proposals that are going to go forward in the Part 150 that are evaluated in the terms that we have reviewed our Slate proposals. Apples-to-apples comparison, not just using the 65 DNL.
- ❖ Gagnon: Kevin had mentioned a timeline – 6-8 weeks. Can the ACR have HMMH do some analysis of the proposals, like using the N70 analysis, Comfort, Concern, No Go type of analysis? Timing?
- ❖ Hair: I think it would be appropriate to leverage HMMH and have them look at things they can look at. Not looking at things that L&B are looking at – not to have one consultant looking at another consultant’s work. When we talked – Gene – in the Fall, we did not identify any opportunities. Gene, do you see new opportunities for that analysis, and what do you think we might be looking at?
- ❖ Reindel: For scenarios or measures that they are going forward with in the Part 150, I think the ACR is not requesting that we redo what L&B did, but take what they’re moving forward with, we could do N70 and other analyses that the ACR is familiar with. It should be able to be done relatively easily with some minor conversations with L&B, making sure that we are understanding correctly. For example, they are proposing different divergent headings than we analyzed, so we could put in the same divergent headings. I don’t think we are there yet. I don’t think the FAA has determined what those headings would be. We could do ACR analysis when the recommendations are highly likely to be moving forward; we could then look at them how we looked at the Slate items.
- ❖ Wright: Do we have this document in our handout?
- ❖ Gagnon: No, I have been working offline with Natalie and Phil about this since CLT suggested if there was anything the ACR wanted analyzed to try to identify what that is.
- ❖ Rutzell: The other alternative is #2 - Doing basic analysis on how it impacts the ACR members.
- ❖ Gagnon: HMMH did some analysis about a year ago where they looked at the N70 and DNL for all ACR members. So #2 is updating that document based on the proposals; for individual ACR members, how the noise would change at your home.
- ❖ Reindel: We could certainly do that. In the Part 150 process, there is usually a recommended package such as: Here are the 5 things we are going to recommend. Then they evaluate putting all those together and how it affects the 65. It does not have to be individual measures; it could be the whole package to see how it affects ACR members and their neighborhoods.
- ❖ Gagnon: I am hearing that the outstanding questions are the timing of doing it and in terms of the proposals, what stage they should be in before they could be handed to HMMH to handle outside 65 DNL analysis. Am I hearing correctly? *Yes.*
- ❖ Wright: Do we need to vote, or is this something that we will see later?
- ❖ Hair: I don’t think we need a vote. We hear you.
- ❖ Gagnon: Any thoughts on timing?
- ❖ Hennessey: If we are not getting scenarios back from L&B for 6-8 weeks, then we have to do some massaging of that. It will probably be 3 or 4 months before we have a finalized package, and then Gene would step in, and I don’t know how long his process will take. It is going to be months from now before you get something back from HMMH.
- ❖ Gagnon: I will work with Natalie and Phil to work with you all to develop a timeline so that the ACR can look at the information in time for the ACR to give feedback before final decisions are made.
- ❖ Hennessey: Absolutely.

Discuss Overall Approach for ACR to Act on Excluded Part 150 Recommendations

- ❖ Gagnon: On Page 2 of the Agenda, under Agenda Item 3b, you see a table. As noted in the prior discussion, some proposals from ACR have been excluded from the Part 150 process. Part of the question is – if part of the excluded proposals came from the ACR, how – if interested – would the ACR move forward in some other way.
 - This table shows the recommendations that the ACR has made over the last few years. They are going through one of four different Concurrent Paths right now. Of the 6 recommendations that were submitted as part of a Slate to the FAA in mid-2020, one is still being looked at by the FAA. The FAA is actually in the process of designing with the intent to implement Slate recommendation #3a, which is raising 7 waypoints by 1000 feet.

- Pathway 2: 3 of those 6 recommendations were sent into the Part 150 process. Some of these are still being analyzed through the 150 process. They are: Removing the 2 mile restriction, Utilizing divergent departure headings, and some others that you all made during the Part 150 process early on that you wanted to be considered. So, there are still some recommendations that you made that are working their way through the process.
- Pathway 3 – One of the original Slate recommendations was initially rejected by the FAA, and that is Continuous Descent Approach/Optimized Profile Descent recommendation. At this point, the ACR has formed a Technical Working Group which is made up of Phil, Preston, and Sayle; they are in the process of trying to schedule a meeting with local Air Traffic Control representatives to begin conversations about this. The ACR assigned that recommendation to the Technical Working Group.
- Pathway 4 – This Pathway is what we're discussing now; this addresses all the recommendations that have been excluded from the Part 150 at this point. Going back to the working document (not in the handout). As you can see in Path 4, there are several recommendations that have been excluded for various reasons. This was noted in Pages 7-10 that we looked at in the handout ACR Response Document. The only one that was a Slate recommendation that was excluded – Change headings of first turns off Runways 18L and 18C. But you submitted others through the Part 150 process that were excluded, and some of them are here on Page 2 in the table. Some are:
 - Balanced mix of North vs. South Flow; for South Flow arrivals, along the CHSLY procedure, maintain published altitude of 6000 feet at the HEELZ waypoint; for South Flow arrivals, extend eastern downwind to intercept final approach over main channel of Mountain Island Lake keeping an altitude of 6000 feet.
- The goal here is to have an open conversation with ACR members and others; what kind of guidance do you all have for the ACR and these recommendations that are not moving forward?
- ❖ Rutzell: We spent a lot of time putting together these ideas, so we do not want them dropped. We would like to find a solution to have these addressed.
- ❖ Reindel: The last 2 items dealing with 6000 feet.
 - Would what the FAA is doing in #1 – raising waypoints by 1000 feet – does that affect the ability to do that, and does it improve the ability to do that? My thought is do we wait until that is complete because it is underway to try to figure out how to mix the arrivals and try to keep them higher as well?
 - The other one - Balanced mix of North and South Flow. There has already been a lot of talk on this tonight. I'm wondering even though it was kicked out for a couple of reasons in the Part 150, with L&B doing all that analysis, could they analyze a 50/50 split just to show if there is any benefit? If there is or is not, that might sway the ACR efforts and ability to try to get it more balanced. There are other things to do to try to improve the balance, if it was able to be determined that it provides benefit even under Part 150, it helps provide more benefit for the ACR to continue with that measure.
- ❖ Gagnon: Sounds like there are 2 pieces. One is to see how these bottom 2 recommendations relate overall to Recommendation #3a, which is raising waypoints. Making sure there are no conflicts or whether they're complementary. And secondly, seeing if a 50/50 mix has a net positive effect on the broader community – not just make that assumption. It would be a request of L&B?
- ❖ Reindel: Yes, that is what I am suggesting. Would CLT ask L&B to do that because it would provide some valuable information to the ACR? It is not what they typically do, but they have all the data.
- ❖ Faust: Are we looking at Part 150 or outside of the Part 150?
- ❖ Reindel: I am suggesting asking the consultant what the benefits or disbenefits would be in having a 50/50 mix, and then we can use those results to help determine how the ACR may proceed to do other things that may promote a more 50/50 split.
- ❖ Leathers: Yes, we'll definitely talk with L&B and see if there are opportunities for that and see their response.
- ❖ Pollack: A different proposal that was in our comments. There was a proposal about running some departures off of the western runway. There was a comment that it was unsafe because it would be 2 runway crossings of planes going out. The ACR commented that for planes getting to that runway they have to cross 2; so why is it safe one way and not the other (crossing 2 runways for arrivals v. departures)? And will we get an answer to that?
- ❖ Leathers: Yes, we are happy to get a response to that.

- ❖ Wright: I am getting confused between what we recommended to FAA and they are currently working on, and we have things that rolled into the Part 150. Then things on Pages 7-10 that they are working on. I guess I am trying to see what we have on Page 2, Path 4, and what is already being worked on with FAA.
- ❖ Gagnon: To summarize, in the handout on Page 2 where the table is, the FAA directly is working on 1 item – raising 7 waypoints by 1000 feet. Out of the 6 Slate items currently, FAA is only working on that one item. The Part 150 process is still working on several recommendations, 2 of the Slate departure recommendations, several others that you have submitted. But the FAA is only working on that one recommendation. The items that pass through the Part 150 will eventually pass City Council, then will go to FAA. Any other thoughts about these additional recommendations being excluded? It looks like L&B can do additional analysis. Just trying to figure out the Path for the ACR for these excluded recommendations.
- ❖ Rutzell: Phil and I have discussed that one potential Paths is to create another Slate - present to the FAA through ACR.
- ❖ Brown: Would that give the FAA another opportunity to reject them?
- ❖ Rutzell: Some of them have not been looked at by the FAA. We would do our analysis and determine which ones would go to a Slate like we did before.
- ❖ Gagnon: Maybe this is a question for Pearlis or for CLT, but is there anything that would preclude the ACR from attempting to put together a new Slate?
- ❖ Pollack: Are we discussing proposing a new Slate or revised Slate for the Part 150 or for the FAA?
- ❖ Rutzell: Right to the FAA. We put together our Slate, and they said these recommendations need to go through the Part 150. And then we came up with some additional recommendations, and some of them got kicked out. Is this now a time to propose another Slate and include some of these that were kicked out? The impact might be beyond the 65 DNL.
- ❖ Pollack: It might be interesting to submit one or two revised proposals to the Part 150. In reading the responses, I got the feeling in some cases it was hyper technical reading of the proposal and wasn't the substance of what was being proposed.
- ❖ Gagnon: Two different questions here, and I'll go to CLT and the FAA. We are trying to have a conversation about what action the ACR can take moving forward. Is having a new Slate developed an option? Is there a timing question?
- ❖ Hair: I think I want you to be realistic with expectations with any sort of work related to the current Slate of recommendations that have been submitted and what may or may not come out as recommendations from the Part 150. Where limited resources of our Federal regulator are going to go toward anything else that might come forward, I just want to set realistic expectations. It has taken us how long to get to Slate 3a being implemented, and there are Slate items still being considered by the FAA. We don't have a timeframe where we are going to get feedback on those items. I caution us that if this is a Path that the ACR wants to go down, with new recommendations, that the potential action of evaluating them is not immediate.
- ❖ Rutzell: We appreciate that response. Part of this is to address, when we started the TAC and we put together some of our recommendations, it was implied to us that we were not going to be held strictly to the 65 DNL. On more than one occasion we said we know that the 65 DNL might not be impacted, but it is important to the ACR and the community. We proceeded under the expectation that they would be considered. The Part 150 as a whole is supposed to be a noise abatement program, and so we are really looking at ways to move forward some of these recommendations that we think are beneficial.
- ❖ Reindel: Just to reiterate, the Part 150 regulation is limited to 65 DNL. The FAA suggested 3 of the 6 Slate items to be put into the Part 150 process as a first round of evaluation, and if it is beneficial to the 65 DNL, let them proceed with it through that process. As things are kicked out of the Part 150 process, as an ACR you want to keep tabs on them. I think there are next steps – whether it's a Slate or a set of recommendations. Whatever that step is, I don't want this committee to think that if there is no benefit to the 65 DNL, it will go on in the Part 150.
- ❖ Gagnon: Any other thoughts as to what to do with recommendations that may be excluded from the Part 150?
- ❖ Hagman: We do represent the community and if it benefits the community, we need to fight for it. That is our job.
- ❖ Montross: A point around runway utilization. I read you loud and clear around dual stream and arrival runway, but I also heard an interest in departures off the West runway; I've heard a mix of operations on the runways. Some of these things conflict. If you want to look at how runways are used today to more distribute noise, that would be considered outside of the Part 150 but something this group could continue to evaluate. As you look at how things

are today - EA and NEPA govern how runways are used - but if there is a desire to change the way runways are used today to benefit noise, to get a better mix of 50/50 operations or more dispersion on the western side or less dual stream, you can't do any of those things unless you look at the way we are currently utilizing runways. That exists beyond the Part 150. Runway utilization is a conversation that needs to keep fresh in this group. Don't oppose things too quickly without understanding the potential benefits for what you want to get done.

- ❖ Gagnon: That ties into what Gene was saying earlier. Maybe an analysis of 50/50 to see if it does have a positive noise effect - keeping the ultimate goal in mind.

Updates from Project Teams

- ❖ Gagnon: Government Engagement Project Team. Preston made a presentation to City Council in December on behalf of the ACR and the community.
- ❖ Hagman: We had 2 minutes to speak - they had a full Agenda. We reiterated that the Part 150 vote is coming up in the summer, and wanted to make them aware of what the ACR is doing through community outreach, what we consist of, what our mission statement, etc. We gave them handouts, which they accepted. Basically, just giving them information on what the ACR is trying to do. Follow-up in February at their next meeting.
- ❖ Rutzell: Thank you Preston. It was well-received.
- ❖ Gagnon: Next Council meeting is February 12. The Government Engagement Project Team needs a speaker. Feel free to volunteer to speak. They will help with what to share. Let Natalie, Phil, or myself know if you want to speak or know someone in the community who would like to speak. The focus of the talk will be more information about the Part 150, in particular how some things have already been excluded. Letting the Council know that several months down the road, they will be voting on this. We want to make sure they are well-educated on this.
 - Something that Thelma and Stuart think is important: Following up with written updates to the Council members. I will follow up with how - between meetings - to stay in touch with Council members.
- ❖ Montross: Just a reminder – there is not a meeting that I have with Council that I don't mention the ACR, and when you go to Council to seek endorsement of the Part 150, AA will stand with you.
- ❖ Gagnon
 - Community Engagement Project Team – I will send something out next week. The update is that they are interested in hearing from ACR members if there are other groups or community organizations, environmental groups that have a common quality of life focus that you think would be good for partnering with the ACR. Are there other groups in the community to leverage to get the word out and to heighten awareness of what you all are doing? These are things I will ask you when I reach out next week.
 - Local Operations Project Team - no update. They have not met since October.
 - Pages 11-13. These are the cover pages for the quarterly ACR Member Newsletter. This is the email shared between meetings. This is provided to keep all in-the-loop between meetings. There were several Part 150 updates that were shared, some Project Team updates, and the dates for the Project Team meetings. I will send out calendar invites next week for Project Teams. Also included are CLT Operational Measures, FAA News Releases, updates on Requests/Motions, initial plans for upcoming ACR meetings, and the updated ACR calendar.

City of Charlotte Community Area Planning (CAP) Overview

- ❖ Next Agenda item was supposed to be Phil Gussman presenting on the CAP – Community Area Planning – but he is not feeling well.
- ❖ Hair: CAP - I get the CAP newsletter and can share from that. In 2024, the City Planning Department will be revising the policy map that they adopted a couple of years ago. The draft revisions will come out in February 2024. It is a result of engagement efforts from 2023. This year, they are going to focus on identifying projects and programs needed to support the community's vision of Growth and Development – they will be doing a series of engagement events in the Spring and in the Fall – more virtual and online engagement – a series on how does our community grow and develop. They have an informative website. You can see the phase that was completed this last year. It was Creating Great Places highlights. They also have a newsletter, so if this is something that you are interested in, they do have various information sources. Nominally, the revision and refinement of Comp Plan

2040 will continue for another 2 years, and sometime in 2026 will plan to do an update of the Comp Plan that was adopted.

- ❖ Gagnon: Phil was on the Planning Commission and is very knowledgeable about changes. He wants you all to look at plans for development vs. noise situation. One of his ideas is to take one of the HMMH grid point analyses and overlay that with the development plans to see how they sync together.

CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations

- ❖ Hair: We are busy and exceeding forecasts. Any metric you want to look at - Number of passengers, luggage, everything. That means there are more flights, and there are more noise impacts on our community. We have heard you on feedback around how we report some of the numbers. We are in the continuous improvement process of this reporting document. If you have feedback, we take it and try to improve how we are reporting.
- ❖ Montross: AA will launch its largest schedule ever this April: 400 mainline departures, about 300 regional flights. We are excited about what is to come. We will be hiring to support the flights and growth. Kicks off in April. The day is not getting longer; we operate in a peak and valley bank schedule – with high points of connecting; this will fill some of the valleys. Filling the day where there would have been gaps in the schedule with more flights. In February 2020, we had 700 flights – more regional than mainline – then COVID hit, and it all went away. We are coming back with that now. It is more mainline because we have a regional jet pilot shortage. I will be happy to share more in the spring.
- ❖ Gagnon: Thanks, Tracy. Every six months CLT provides detailed complaint statistics - see Pages 15-18.
- ❖ Reese: One of the questions that ACR raised was that between 2022 and 2023 we had seen an increase in complaining households but a marked decrease in complaints. When we did research, we found that was due to the airnoise app. We had a significant number of complaints fall off because of airnoise. Even though the complaints went down dramatically, the complainants went up. Want to point out, when we look at the numbers of the top 25 complainers – Page 15 – 25 callers are responsible for over 99% of all complaints. We keep an eye on this, and when I do see a new name come up, I always reach out. I'm always available.
- ❖ Rutzell: I always have questions on this. I live in the 28278, and I was wondering - did you notice that the top complainers were coming from the same neighborhood?
- ❖ Reese: We use a Heat map (Page 19). It is easy to see who is calling. Yes, there are areas where we see concentrations. It is fairly easy to tell where the areas of greatest concern are and how they correlate to different flight procedures. Cause and effect, basically.
- ❖ Pollack: I question the value on a lot of the noise complaints. The noise in my community is tremendous, and I haven't complained in years. When you run your analysis and see where the planes are flying, that is where people are suffering. Even if they are not complaining they are suffering. I would like to see more effort from the airport, tower, airlines, FAA.
- ❖ Wright: I'm in 28214 zip code, and there are new homes being built near 485. I suspect there will be some new complaints. I am also familiar with 28216 zip code that is more I-85 around Beatties Ford Road. The increase in that area is interesting to me because I thought they were a little bit away from the area.
- ❖ Gagnon: I think that is interesting when we see areas that might not be intuitive for complaints. When the Slate was developed and HMMH did their analysis overall, they also did subgroup analysis for Steele Creek, South Park and Mountain Island Lake, because after Metroplex that is where complaints increased, reflecting where the noise experience changed.

FAA Update on Implementation Process for Alternative Recommendation #3a

- ❖ Johnson: We are on track with what we are doing. Funding is questionable moving forward, but we are expecting to get this project to you on time, end of May, I hope we will have it done. If funding lapses, we will have to evaluate where we are.
- ❖ Gagnon: Clarify what you mean that it will be done by end of May, please?
- ❖ Johnson: Hopefully published, and controllers using those procedures by May 2024.
- ❖ Montross: Did he say published by May 2024?
- ❖ Johnson: Yes, May of this year, 2024.
- ❖ *Note: The following discussion occurred later in the meeting but applied to this topic.*
 - Jackson: Feeding off of Pearlis, in addition to CHSLY, the FAA was able to raise downwind altitudes by 1000 feet on the 4 corners of the airport. STOCR, BANKR, JONZE, FLIPZ, MLLT, PARQR. The next steps for that are Environmental Analysis and then we will move to publication - estimated chart date would be late 2024.
 - Gagnon: To clarify, you are talking about the 2 recommended waypoints that the ACR put forward, and you just named 5 additional waypoints for a total of 7 waypoints, is that correct? *Yes.* You said the end of 2024, and Pearlis said May 2024. Help us understand the difference?
 - Jackson: I believe these are for the additional waypoints. The original waypoints would be implemented May 2024, and these would be later this year.
 - Gagnon: CAATT and EPAYE – the 2 East of the runways, the original proposal – would be May 2024, and the additional by the end of the calendar year.

Update on FAA Leadership Changes/Direction

- ❖ Gagnon: Next, asking about new FAA administrator. Do you anticipate any change in direction or focus? Will anything in the Charlotte region be affected?
- ❖ Johnson: No, I have not heard of anything that he has talked about except safety is his primary mission. That is our primary mission.
- ❖ Montross: AA does not have a Boeing 737 Max 9 in our fleet.

Technical Working Group Update – Identifying Recommendation #1a Alternatives

- ❖ Gagnon: The other item under FAA progress is the Technical Working Group. We already talked about that a little bit. The last conversation I had with Phil said he was working with Anthony Schifano to try to schedule a meeting with Sayle, Preston, and Phil to start talking about some of the potential initiatives and opportunities especially related to Recommendation #1a.

Unfinished Business

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 20 in handout. Requests/Motions documents. 1 - CSS would compile your summary of brainstorming ideas on how to share communication pieces with constituents. We shared it back with you. 2 - You all were asked to provide edits/additions to Government Engagement Project Team's Council Presentation Points that Preston and the GEPT would use in front of Council; you did that. That final talking point document was refined. 3 - You voted to approve the approach that the GEPT put together to use over the next months that the ACR is going to engage with City Council before their vote on your recommendations as it relates to the Part 150. The ACR unanimously passed the Motion.

New Business

- ❖ Rutzell: Is there any new business? *None.*

Adjourn

- ❖ Wright motioned to adjourn. Brown seconded, all in favor.
- ❖ Meeting adjourned at 7:56 pm