

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: April 5, 2023

Attendees

Natalie Rutzell, Chair, County 2
Phillip Gussman, City 1
Darren Crosby, City 2
Nakia Savage, City 3
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Doug Pray, County 1
Sherry Washington, County 4
Mark Loflin, County 6
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Preston Hagman, Huntersville
Kim Hardee, Matthews
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Sam Stowe, Gaston
Jacob Pollack, York
Diane Dasher, York

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Pearlis Johnson, FAA
Shane Jackson, FAA
Anthony Lyman, FAA
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Dan Gardon, CLT
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Amber Leathers, CLT
Mike Pilarski, CLT
Chris Poore, CLT
Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Rob Adams, Landrum and Brown
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Summary Minutes

Open the Meeting

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- ❖ Rutzell: Welcome to the April meeting of the ACR. The ACR mission is: *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.*
 - Welcome to our new member, Diane Dasher. She is from York County.
- ❖ Dasher: I am happy to be here. I have lived in the area for 30 years and have watched the planes fly over my house a lot more. I served on Fort Mill School Board for 16 years and retired from that right before COVID.
- ❖ Gagnon: *Led introductions: ACR, CLT, American Airlines, FAA, CSS, Landrum and Brown, and HMMH.*
- ❖ Washington: I'd like to congratulate Tracy Montross who was recognized in the Charlotte Business Journal during women's history month.
- ❖ Rutzell: Congratulations, Tracy. It's well-deserved, and thank you for being so engaged and helpful in our ACR initiatives.
- ❖ Gagnon: *Reviewed the logistics of the meeting.* Please use the "Raise the hand" function for those remotely participating; please state your name when speaking and, if remote, please mute when not speaking. We will try to get through the meeting in 2 hours. There is public Wi-Fi for those in the room.
 - *Went over the handouts that were emailed yesterday.* Page numbers referenced at top of page. Ground rules: Healthy, productive, and effective meetings. Make brief points. Make the conversation about the topic - don't make things personal, don't take things personal. Stay on topic. Effective means making the noise situation in our area better.

- ❖ Rutzell: Do I have a motion to approve the Minutes from January? *Wright made motion, Loflin seconded. Any discussion? None. All in favor.* Minutes approved.
- ❖ Gagnon: Note that on Pages 3 and 4 of the handout are the lists of members of ACR and other stakeholders. *Mentioned the vacancies on the ACR.* Page 5 includes the guidelines for public speakers for which we have none tonight.

Engage/Improve: Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study - Part 150/TAC: Public Meetings Update

- ❖ Hair: We did have the first round of public meetings for the Part 150 Study these past couple weeks. Kevin and Amber are jointly managing that project for the Airport, and I only had a little bit of opportunity to participate in them. I will defer to them to provide the update.
- ❖ Leathers: We held two meetings, March 22 and March 23. On the first evening, we had 5 attendees, and on the second evening we had 18 attendees.
- ❖ Gagnon: Any questions on the public meetings? Comments?
- ❖ Rutzell: What is the initiative to draw more participation from the community for the next round?
- ❖ Leathers: In terms of public outreach, we had extensive public outreach. We did all of our news media that went out 30 days prior, we had all of our CLT newsletters that went out, we did a press briefing that was on several different media channels, we did social media outreach starting 15 days prior; so we think about what is the minimum requirement for FAA processes and how we went above and beyond that. The outreach and what we got is similar to our airport neighborhood committee, if you look at the last year of attendees that came out. The last meeting that we had was similar in attendance to these; they range from 19-22, and we had 23 in total. The same information was shared at both meetings. In terms of more outreach, that is as much as we have done, with the exception of mailers, which we have done for the EIS process. When we look at public meetings/hearings, we don't get a lot of engagement. This is average.
- ❖ Rutzell: Thank you. I guess there is some stuff that we as the ACR can do with our communities for the next round to make sure that people come to get more information.
- ❖ Brown: Is that the average?
- ❖ Leathers: Just looking at the Airport Neighborhood Committee – an informational meeting – that is the average. The most that we have had is 22 people.
- ❖ Brown: What about different areas of the country?
- ❖ Leathers: Good question. I think noise is different in every city and community related to a particular airport. I couldn't tell you what is average. If we look at the last EA here, it has been very little engagement.
- ❖ Gussman: I will ask Gene and Tracy if they have had any experiences.
- ❖ Montross: I think that is about right, but during the pandemic, there were several virtual options. I have attended a couple of virtual public informational sessions that were very well-attended. That manner may be considered for the future.
- ❖ Leathers: We did do the EA for the 4th parallel runway program - which was right in the middle of COVID - and we had even fewer attendees.
- ❖ Reindel: Our experience on Part 150s, it really depends across the country. Normal is probably 20-30. We have seen as many as hundreds. When we have had a bunch was when every local news station advertised it the night before. Other than those rare circumstances, about 15-50 is what to expect.
- ❖ Loflin: Did you get any written comments, and if you did, where would we be able to see those?
- ❖ Leathers: We did get some written comments, and we do have some that were mailed in. We wouldn't share those outright, but the consulting team will have them and work with the airport in the response for them. They will be shared at a later point, but we are not prepared to share them.
- ❖ Washington: Was this meeting held on this side of town?
- ❖ Leathers: We have to follow the federal rules related to public meetings. One was held at the Harris Center over at CPCC, and the other was at Aloft Hotel south of the airport.

- ❖ Gagnon: Any other questions or comments on the public meetings? *None.*

Engage/Improve: Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study - Part 150/TAC: *Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting Update*

- ❖ Gardon: The 2nd TAC meeting took place March 22, two weeks ago. All the stakeholders are involved—airport representatives, ACR representatives, airlines, FAA - basically all users of the airport. We are still very early in the process, but at this time Landrum and Brown is accepting alternative recommendations for noise abatement procedures in Charlotte. That will be a hot topic tonight and uses up a lot of the Agenda time.
- ❖ Rutzell: The TAC meeting went well. It was well attended and was productive. L&B did present their noise proposals or alternatives. There were preliminary questions and some clarifications, but there were no notable objections. The ACR is pleased to have the opportunity to provide feedback and to be a formal member of the TAC.

Engage/Improve: Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study - Part 150/TAC: *Recommendation Submittal Timing and Process Discussion*

- ❖ Gagnon: There are a couple of different parts to this Agenda item. First, CLT and Part 150 folks to let us know, as the ACR submits recommendations to the Part 150 team, what is that process? How to do so and by when? Then, Dan and I are going to walk through the ACR virtual Part 150 briefings last week, and we will give an update on those and the findings from those sessions.
- ❖ Gardon: As part of the Part 150 process, Landrum and Brown (L&B) accepts recommendations from basically everyone on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). There is a deadline for recommendations - April 17, which is just under 2 weeks from today [NOTE: After the ACR Meeting, the due date was extended to April 24]. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to finalize any recommendations that the ACR would like to submit for review to the Part 150. L&B receives recommendations from all stakeholders. At this time, very early in the process, each recommendation will be analyzed to see if it is possible to do within the airspace, if it has measurable effect on noise, and what effect it will have on operations. Working with Natalie and Phil and Ed, and a few other members over the last few weeks, a short list of recommendations was developed. We will review that tonight and also make a few additions that have been recommended.
- ❖ Gagnon: Any questions about the timing? *None.*

Engage/Improve: Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study - ACR Recommendation Development for the TAC

- ❖ Gagnon: Can you talk about what the ACR needs to submit and to whom?
- ❖ Gardon: A written document going to Natalie and Phil would be preferred since they are the ACR representatives on the TAC. From there, they will be forwarded to L&B, and they will take that into the public record. Hopefully, we will have that finalized by tonight - off to Natalie and Phil.
- ❖ Rutzell: To be transparent, we did share a preliminary draft of those recommendations with L&B. They have already seen these, but we have not finalized them yet.
- ❖ Gardon: This is a collaborative effort. L&B may ask questions about the recommendations, looking for confirmation of what they are modeling or just to answer questions about it. This is not an “end all, be all” written request for now.
- ❖ Gagnon: Pages 6-8. There may be some editing of these. Essentially, the ACR last week held 4 different sessions/briefings, where there was review of the information that was presented in the March 22 TAC meeting. About 11-12 ACR members participated. Dan walked them through all the preliminary recommendations that were shared at the TAC meeting; to take a step to having the ACR submit questions/comments to the Part 150 consultants, we are going to look at this document. I will briefly walk through this first page, and Dan will walk through the next 2 pages. If you have questions or comments about this, feel free to share tonight, but there will be more time after this

meeting where Natalie and Phil will seek your input to refine and finalize your questions and comments about the preliminary recommendations that the consultants have put together.

- Page 6. This does not go through all of the different recommendations that L&B has provided. This gives overall sentiment, comments, and questions that came out of the 4 ACR member sessions last week. Some of what you see here references a specific slide that was a contour slide, asking for clarification - in particular, the 3rd sub-bullet where the ACR is requesting proposed usage and expected benefits of each recommendation. The ACR was interested in seeing more details.
- Next set of sub-bullets addresses 3 recommendations that Dan will walk through on the next page – NA-C-1, NA-C-2 and NA-C-3 – they include specific divergent departure headings, and also included are clarifying questions you had from last week’s meetings.
- Then questions about NA-H, NA-I and NA-J. They are listed here because they are not specific to just one recommendation but multiple recommendations. We will not wordsmith today, but we want to share what came out of last week’s meetings.
- Before we go through the next page, are there any comments or questions on this page?
- ❖ Rutzell: At the TAC, we were pleased to see that L&B had put forth a number of proposals and recommendations. That exceeded our expectations. We should be able to have meaningful discussions and put forth comments and discussion with what L&B has put forth.
- ❖ Gagnon: Structure of next 2 pages: Part 150 recommendations in the left column and any ACR comments in the right column.
- ❖ Gardon: At this early phase, there has been no analysis on any of these. The purpose of the meetings that we had with this group is to get ideas of the kinds of noise abatement procedures that are being proposed. You’ll notice that a lot of them increase the number of departure headings, increase level of dispersion, or increase altitude – similar to what the ACR has proposed in the past. However, there are no diagrams, there is not a lot of information to share at this point. Over the next couple of months as L&B works through some of these recommendations, some will drop off and some stay on; we may want to have this conversation at that point. I think we are too early to be eliciting any comments on these. I would say take a look at these in your free time because as Natalie noted, these could be beneficial to residents around the airport, but I don’t know if there is any specific work we can do on these tonight.
- ❖ Rutzell: I appreciate that, but I think there are things like the preferred runway usage about which we could give some preliminary feedback. I want to see if we are comfortable in saying to the consultants that we are not in favor of that preferential usage, or is this something that we feel that we want to hold back on and get more information.
- ❖ Gardon: That’s a very valid point. You are referring to NA-J on page 8, which evaluates new runway 1/19 as an arrival runway. In the EA for that runway, it was primarily analyzed as a departure runway. I have heard feedback that that may not be what the ACR is looking for. If there are any on this list that appear to be a non-starter from the ACR standpoint, then I think it is great to talk about that now. I suspect that might be the only one that ACR might really object to; the others you’ll notice are about increasing dispersion and increasing the number of departure headings. Then there are some other facility modifications that don’t necessarily affect the ACR. If there are any others on here with an immediate gut negative reaction to, it is worth recording.
- ❖ Wright: I have questions about NA-H and NA-I recommendations to use those 2 runways for south flow between 10p-7a. Pawtucket is under an arrival path. I don’t notice much noise between 10p-7a, but I think we sent something regarding the level of noise. We were going to ask the airport to do something about it, and it wasn’t that much. I do hear late night, but I know that based on weather and delays that a flight may come out during those hours. So, I have a curiosity about why those are being suggested.
- ❖ Gardon: NA-I. At the current moment runway 18R, the western most runway, is not used for arrivals between 10p-7a except for in cases of construction or very rare times. This specific measure is looking to use it for arrivals. This is for better use of the runway. It may decrease noise contours

around the airport simply by using other runways. NA-H is basically the same. 36L and 36R are north bound arrivals. 36L is the westernmost runway, and 36R is the easternmost runway. So, it is opening up the westernmost runways for arrivals at night, and this is not currently performed.

- ❖ Wright: This will increase the noise in the 3-mile radius?
- ❖ Gardon: It is unclear what effect it will have on the DNL. DNL contour is the average of noise around the airport. So, by opening up this specific surface for runways, it may affect DNL, it may shrink it in other areas. Everything is extremely preliminary at this point.
- ❖ Gagnon: Just to clarify a couple points - the purpose of this document is to aggregate comments and questions to be shared, and not necessarily to get answers today. If you have specific comments or questions, we want to get those captured.
- ❖ Loflin: This has not gone past the very first stage, so is it safe to say that safety and things like that have not been considered at this point?
- ❖ Gardon: Yes, that is correct. At this point, L&B has compiled recommendations. No work has been done. A few contours/maps have been drawn, but that is it.
- ❖ Leathers: We have Rob Adams on the phone, and he did get the preliminary draft alternatives. He did have some clarifying questions to understand the intent if there is time for that.
- ❖ Gagnon: Yes, that's actually the next page in the handout, so that's perfect.
- ❖ Montross: Before we move on, I did want to address NA-J and why that has been recommended by the airline and also supported by NATCA, National Air Traffic Controllers Association. As we look at the development of the runways and runway usage, we like to understand the operational benefits from using the runway for arrivals only, which would then put the departure runways closer to the terminal. In doing so, we could push aircraft to departures easier than when you have to cross an active departure runway. It is to study if there is a noise benefit in moving the runway usage or creating flexibility in the use of the new runway for arrivals or departures. That is why it is included in the recommendations, as something we would like to see evaluated. I am interested to hear the resistance to evaluating that. Could someone share why that might change the noise profile?
- ❖ Pollack: I have a lot of concerns about NA-H, I, and J. During the debriefing sessions, we did not get into D, E, F and G which look like they relate to H and I. Maybe someone can clarify their purpose. Starting with J, it is an unconscionable proposal in so far as the impact of it would be to put 80% of arrivals over the heads of residents going back 10 miles. It will create a huge nuisance for people who are living between those rails. I don't see how it can be implemented if you care about people. Similarly, with I and J, it sounds like AA is a proponent of J. I am curious where H and I are coming from. As a resident living under 36L, the benefit of the new runway is going entirely to residents living under the rails of the eastern and center runways. There will be no benefit at all to people living under the western runway, at least that I can tell. H and I actually take more burden from folks that are getting benefit from the eastern and center runway and pushing more arrivals over people living under the western runway. I think those 3 proposals are very objectionable. I don't really understand the process here. I have nervousness with them even being analyzed. Maybe someone could tell me, once they are analyzed by the consultant and it says what it says, who says whether or not to implement them? I am curious as to what those mean.
- ❖ Gagnon: The way I would like to handle this is to have Dan comment on NA-D through NA-G, similar to what you did in last week's sessions. Then, if there is clarification on the process, particularly for NA-H through NA-J that Jacob was questioning, it would be great for someone to address.
- ❖ Gardon: Handing this off to Rob Adams.
- ❖ Adams: I really appreciate the effort and thoughtfulness in providing comments. It is really helpful to have good conversation. Specifically on D, E, F, and G, these are looking at implementing what we call a displaced arrival threshold, which means typically aircraft land toward the end of a runway, so it is not exactly at the end of the runway. There is a spot that they are shooting for, and that point on the runway can be shifted further down the runway; that is called a displaced threshold when you do that. If you are shifting it only for arrivals, it is a displaced arrival threshold.

- What that does, if you shift the landing point farther down the runway, the aircraft is going to be a little bit higher as it is coming over a community because the landing point is a little bit farther down the runway. That is the background on the concept of arrival threshold displacement.
- We looked at 4 runway ends where a threshold displacement could potentially reduce noise within the 65 DNL. We have not run any models yet - just looking at the layout of where people live in relationship to those arrival paths. Each one has a slightly different distance of displacement, and that is due to the location of where that original arrival threshold is and where the taxiway exits are located. There is a little bit of analysis that goes into figuring out what the maximum displacement could be on a runway.
- ❖ Wright: Is the 1,235 and 1,376 foot displacement further from where it is now? Which way is it moving?
- ❖ Adams: It would move closer to the center of the runway. The arrival threshold is very near the end of each runway. There are some operational impacts to these, and we will get to that when we start analyzing.
- ❖ Dasher: What does 1,376 feet do to altitude?
- ❖ Adams: We don't have that yet, so I don't want to speculate. There are factors along with aircraft and terrain. It is dependent on each runway.
- ❖ Brown: Asking of Tony, what is the – VASI – target touchdown point? VASI is the Visual Approach Slope Indicator. 1000' down the runway? Is the ILS also targeted at 1000'?
- ❖ Lyman: Yes.
- ❖ Brown: That isn't that critical for landing, but it is going to shorten the runways.
- ❖ Pray: If they are coming in at 3 degrees, the difference in altitude will be very minimal. It will be a small amount vertically.
- ❖ Pollack: A follow-up question on H and I, H particularly, who is interested in this - whose interest is served by this? Why are late night arrivals coming in so far from the terminal when all the runways are empty? How is having late night arrivals coming in on 36L or 18R, how is that logistically better?
- ❖ Gagnon: Rob, I know you haven't done the analysis yet, but part of his question is about the logistics of it. He also had a question about whether any group in particular is interested in these last 3 recommendations.
- ❖ Adams: In general, the airport has had a runway that has been used for nighttime - runway 5/23. That runway is no longer in service, so the impetus to identify a nighttime preferential runway use is to identify if there is a better, more compatible set of runways in each flow. I understand the question of specifically 36L and 36R, and we can look at other runways. Although there may be some benefits to using those runways, I am happy to take the comment back about that and to look at other runway ends. NA-J, as Tracy Montross mentioned, was recommended by American Airlines and NATCA, so we are going to evaluate that. I hope that answers the question as to the origin of those.
- ❖ Gagnon: Just to reiterate, if you as an ACR make comment on these and/or want to recommend any other concepts, that is definitely within your ability. Are there other comments or questions on these preliminary recommendations? *None.*
 - Page 9. This is the set of recommendations that has been put together to-date by you for the TAC – ACR Member Recommendations. Starting with the January meeting, we spent part of the meeting brainstorming and having some discussion on what kinds of recommendations you wanted to have the TAC consider through the Part 150 process. There were several suggested at that meeting, and some suggested after the meeting. We compiled a list of recommendations, sent it to the ACR, the ACR completed a survey prioritizing the recommendations, and several other recommendations were added. From that process, there was a document that was created, very similar to this (Page 9) that was presented at the TAC on March 22. Since that TAC meeting, there have been some changes to that document resulting in what you are looking at now on Page 9, as of Friday, March 31. This document is a set of preliminary recommendations that you are considering presenting to the TAC for

their consideration as part of the Part 150 process. We are looking for feedback from you all after the meeting, likely by April 10. At that point, we can rely on the Chair and Vice Chair of the ACR to refine this document before presenting it to the consultants. Natalie, Phil, and I will walk through these.

- ❖ Gagnon: First recommendation: Balanced Mix of North v South Flow. This is saying over the course of a quarter or a year, the goal is to try to achieve a 50/50 balanced mix of flow; on days where there is discretion, if – for example – the mix is trending heavily North Flow, then the decision would be made to utilize South Flow. I know this has been discussed for a while.
 - Next item - Noise Abatement Corridor – there are 4 different examples or ways that this can be viewed. The general principle is to find those flight paths that avoid the highly populated corridors, etc.
 - A- Explore opportunities to create these flight paths or maximize the use of existing such paths.
 - B- In South Flow, arrivals along CHSLY procedure, maintain 6,000’ and use the lake as a Noise Abatement Corridor.
 - C- Similar to B - in South Flow arrivals on the eastern downwind, extend it so the lake is used as Noise Abatement Corridor.
- ❖ Brown: This is what Tony and I have been talking about - maintain a higher altitude. I understand that the controllers want to get the planes down to feed them in, but what that is doing is that brings them over Cornelius and even a little bit south of Cornelius. Between Davidson and Mooresville, there is a causeway, and if we could keep them higher and turn them over that causeway away from populated areas, that’s the concept. I am trying to address controller technique.
- ❖ Gardon: We are definitely not trying to put our partners at the FAA on the spot. We do not expect any response to this; it is just preliminary for L&B.
- ❖ Brown: If we could get some TAC team members to come into the tower, it would help us understand your predicament even more. I know that you want to be community-friendly as much as you can, but you are also looking for safety and efficiency.
- ❖ Pray: I have asked before about the idea of continuous descent and been told that it would not be considered because it is outside the 65 DNL – it wouldn’t affect much within the 65 DNL; I’m paraphrasing. I was reading and this is from the FAA, it spoke to the fact that Optimized Profile Descents are being used, and Charlotte was named in here. It looks like Continuous Descent Approach. My question is if it is something that they are saying is more efficient, reduces fuel burn and emissions, and it would also reduce noise, how is that something that is a non-starter?
- ❖ Montross: We have talked about it a couple of times. The procedure that we worked with the FAA to design for Optimized Profile Descent gets the glide path to about 9,000 feet. But then, we have to stop that because we need the flexibility to cut in line on the approach. It exists from 30,000 feet – we start OPD in Roanoke all the way down – but by the time you get to 9,000 feet, we have to have the flexibility to merge traffic into the approach path, and that is where OPD does not work because it removes the flexibility to enter into the flow path when there is an opportunity.
- ❖ Pray: Is it used differently in different cities?
- ❖ Montross: That press release that came out is our work with FAA in a number of hubs and other carriers and their hubs to address that traffic to a point at which the approach path begins. It is a great efficiency measure, it is something we are interested in regarding fuel burn and emissions. It has been implemented, but it does not get to what you are asking about, which is Continuous Descent Approach, which exists at London Heathrow and a couple of other stations in Europe where we use it. It primarily impacts throughput into those stations, because you have to circle around an airport to manage approach. Charlotte is not one of those airports.
- ❖ Pray: It is essentially balancing the need for volume over the people under these flight paths. Because CDA would reduce noise. It is something to consider even as it might reduce efficiency of the airport.

- ❖ Rutzell: I think we have done analysis on this. Gene, I think we have done some work on this; maybe it is something we can follow up with you on and share – us, Gene, and the airport.
 - The Noise Abatement Corridor – a lot of these may not have any impact on 65 DNL, but I think it is worth exploring. We might want to add one more example which is extending the South Flow departure beyond the 2 miles and making it 3 miles, and then making the turn.
- ❖ Gagnon: I'll list that as a tentative Recommendation 2e to follow-up with Natalie and Dan. For Recommendation 2d - In North flow for arrivals, utilize 1-77 as a Noise Abatement Corridor – this is similar to Sayle's recommendations, but it's focused on the South.
- ❖ Dasher: I know things have changed since 9/11, but I remember watching the planes come in all different ways at that time. It was a nice break to not have the same paths every day and to have changes. I don't know if that is an option, to not have the exact same route every day. It would be helpful for the people underneath them.
- ❖ Gagnon: Runway Operations. There are 5 different Recommendations:
 - a) Try to spread the operations. Notice the example listed.
 - b) Limit one direction flow to a maximum # of days. The concept is that we are not in North Flow for several days in a row.
 - c) Capping arrival mix by runway – the example given is to avoid having more than 50% of arrivals over any single day period.
 - d) Avoiding dual stream arrivals during non-peak daytime hours. Daytime operations are defined here as being 7a-10p, and during a non-peak time of day from 7a-10p, avoid dual stream arrivals where you have 2 runways right next to each other getting all the arrivals.
 - e) Alternate primary operations for adjacent runways, so that you don't have side-by-side runways getting heavy departures or heavy arrivals. A lot of these runway-related recommendations are trying to spread operations over different runways, so the frequency is not overly consistent.
- ❖ Adams: For C, D, and E, we had some questions or clarifications. C – Our NA-J was looking at changing potential runway use of the 4th parallel runway. That would then change the runway use of the center runway. Instead of the 4th parallel runway being primarily a departure runway, under J it would become a primarily arrival runway. The question that we had for “C” is if we were looking at combining different measures together, would you change the language to say “center runway” such as *the aggregation would be 18R/36L plus center runway*, or would you not change it?
- ❖ Gagnon: You are not seeking an answer on the spot?
- ❖ Adams: Correct.
- ❖ Pollack: I proposed C; C and alternative J are opposed. The whole point of C is to prevent the movement of a very heavy weighting of arrivals to one side of the airport because that would put a lot of burden on particular folks. By the same token, every one of these bullets would have mirroring effects, so it prevents all departures on the other side of the airport. If the questions were put to me would we change it, I would say no, because the whole point is to prevent more than 50% of arrivals to be stuck onto adjacent runways.
- ❖ Adams: That's fair. Just wanted to clarify if we were grouping things together later on. My other comment is on D and E. It is the same comment; what is listed here is basically what is anticipated to occur. At least what was listed in the EA in terms of the assumptions of how these runways would be used. 4th parallel runway, in the EA, is identified as a departure runway. It would not be used to have dual stream mode most of the time. It could be sometimes, but not in general. And the same for “E” - alternate primary operation for adjacent runways. If you look at the runway use that was in the EA for the 4 runway condition, it does alternate the primary - it is arrival/departure/arrival/departure. I am not suggesting you change anything; D and E in particular are already built into our starting point.
- ❖ Montross: So Rob, as you study the preferential runway use in NA-J, are you going to evaluate the usage with divergent headings on departures? Will you model that?
- ❖ Adams: All of the alternatives will be looked at individually first, and the ones that make it through the screening evaluation will then be grouped together into what we call scenarios. Then things like divergent headings, runway use change can be modeled, and there can be options for that. It could be certain runway

use program or certain divergent heading program. There might be a different runway use and a different divergent program. Short answer is not initially; they won't be combined.

- ❖ Gagnon: That is similar to what HMMH did with the ACR, where they took multiple recommendations and analyzed them in the aggregate.
- ❖ Wright: On 3d, I thought the dual arrivals was not an option because it doesn't allow the planes to be separated by 15 degrees from one another.
- ❖ Adams: That is a departure separation. This is an arrival recommendation, so 15 degrees separation isn't an issue.
- ❖ Pollack: Rob, had a comment on D. Do you have a concern? In looking at the EA, there might have been a thought around using the new runway again with the western runway during non-peak periods. As someone who is affected by those, I can imagine the impact of that would be, during peak periods, you're going to get the heavy arrivals you already get on the western runway, and then on non-peak periods, you might see continued heavy, but now it is spread between 2 runways. It is just going to shift back and forth. Are you saying that is a problem?
- ❖ Adams: That is not a problem. I am understanding now what you are trying to prevent, so that is helpful.
- ❖ Gagnon: Last recommendation deals with Adherence Monitoring - requiring the airport to monitor complaints and have quick investigations into what may have caused a spike in complaints. To see if noise abatement initiatives can be put into place after the investigation to check on that.
- ❖ Gagnon: The current plan is to look at the document on Pages 6-8 and this document on Page 9 to get those recommendations/additional edits to Natalie and Phil, preferably copying me, by April 10 so it can be submitted to the TAC. Natalie, would you like to hold a vote on that tonight?
- ❖ Rutzell: Yes. That was our initial plan, to move forward knowing that we can get comments until April 10.
- ❖ Wright: Motion: *To authorize the Chair/Vice Chair to:*
 - *Refine the list of Part 150 Comments and Recommendations on Pages 6-9 of the handout, with modifications described/documented during today's ACR meeting.*
 - *Submit these and any additional responses/recommendations on behalf of the ACR to the Part 150 team.*
- ❖ Savage: Second.
- ❖ Rutzell: Any discussion?
- ❖ Pollack: I have a question about the notes that Ed put on the screen – regarding Rob's questions; is that an edit to the document?
- ❖ Gussman: That was just Ed taking notes.
- ❖ Rutzell: All in favor? *All*. Any opposed? *None*. The motion passes.

Monitor: CLT Updates

- ❖ Hair: Couple of things to make you aware of - be careful when walking in from parking to the ACR meeting. We have decreased parking in front on the CLT Center. There is a lot more traffic here than before. We are busier here than ever at Charlotte Douglas International Airport. It is not just perception, it is reality. From our business intelligence team, we were up for March in every single factor except for one small dynamic over 2022 and 2019. We expect to set records this summer – expected to be up about 6%. If you are traveling anytime, plan in advance. It will be busy. It has community impacts. In addition to increased air travel, we are reaching some critical milestones on our capital program. We have changed checkpoints, terminal lobby entrances. We will be closing some runways and using the westernmost runway for overnight arrivals for the next couple of weeks. You may notice different patterns over your homes over the next couple weeks due to construction. A lot of excitement here at CLT.
- ❖ Gardon: One key metric that is not quite at pre-COVID levels is the number of aircraft operating at the airport. We are at about 1,330 average flights a day. This is down from 1,600 on some days pre-COVID. We have a lot more passengers. Just sharing additional information.
- ❖ Montross: Additional context on why the operations have changed - there is a regional pilot shortage. We don't have enough crew to fly the regional aircraft. More passengers are traveling mainline aircraft.

Engage/Improve: Updates from Project Teams

- ❖ Wright: I have been participating on the Government Engagement and Local Operations Project Teams (LOIPT). There is some overlap between these. If you have not sent the letter that Ed provided to us for your local representative, please do that. He also provided who our local representatives are. The LOIPT met in March. We have already talked about the North and South flow operations being equalized. We are continuing to monitor and measure noise levels, we did look at the violation of the 2-mile restriction and what it means - we are looking at how we may respond to that. We are looking at opportunities to partner with environmental groups. There was a quiet noise e-mail sent to us to view. Our focus is to see what we can do locally to get engaged with the community and also what we can do locally in terms of noise.
- ❖ Gagnon: Thelma also mentioned the Government Engagement Project Team update. The only thing I will add is that after the last meeting, Kurt, Sayle, and Darren met with Commissioner Powell. Kurt sent the letter to Commissioner Powell, and she convened the meeting. She voiced a lot of support of the ACR, especially when the Part 150 program will be presented to City Council.
 - Community Engagement Project Team update: Since the January meeting, they have met twice. They have created a media update document. They created a brief collateral piece that talked about how the ACR is the real change agent for noise. A lot of residents view a complaint as how they affect change in airplane noise, but really the ACR is the conduit for that, and the complaints help. Sam is talking to different people particularly in Gaston County about how best to get the word out about the ACR and the Part 150 initiatives coming up. This Project Team will begin distributing the media update document as the best way to promote the 704-359-HEAR hotline.
- ❖ Gussman: We will be utilizing the newsletter. We will make the documents available to you guys so that you can be the voice in your communities - maybe in a neighborhood newsletter, etc. Help us to have a louder voice. We would love your support as we get these materials out.
- ❖ Gagnon: The Project Teams meet on the months that the ACR does not meet. I will send out the calendar invites for those.

Monitor: FAA Progress - Update on FAA progress on Recommendation 3a

- ❖ Johnson: On Option 3a, we're still on track to publish the procedures the end of 2024 or first quarter 2025.
- ❖ Gussman: I want to make a point, especially to our newer members. Do not be dismayed by the relative dates. This is the process of that change. We are still on track. It is reality.
- ❖ Johnson: Safety first, and then efficiency. We have over 8,000 recommendations on our plate right now.

Request/Address Additional Business - Unfinished Business

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 11. These are the Requests/Motions that came out of the January meeting, and they have all been addressed. Note that Diane is the new York County representative referenced in that document.
 - Page 12 - Written updates. No recent updates here.

Request/Address Additional Business - New Business

- ❖ Rutzell: Any new business? *None.*
- ❖ Gagnon: As a reminder for the Part 150 process, we will be communicating about the need for receiving any additional comments/edits/recommendations by April 10.

Adjourn

- ❖ *Dasher motioned to adjourn. Wright seconded, all in favor.*
- ❖ Meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.