

# Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

## Unapproved Summary Minutes: July 10, 2024

### Attendees

Natalie Rutzell, Chair, County 2

Phillip Gussman, City 1

Michael Faust, City 4

Sherry Washington, County 4

Mark Loflin, County 6

Sayle Brown, Cornelius

Sam Stowe, Gaston

Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg

Diane Dasher, York

Jacob Pollack, York

Bob Mentzer, HMMH (Technical Consultant)

Jason Stoddard, HMMH

Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)

Kevin Hennessey, CLT

Matt Reese, CLT

Chris Poore, CLT

Pearlis Johnson, FAA

Rans Black, FAA

Peter Green, FAA

Andrew Applegate, FAA

Cathy Nelmes, FAA

Shane Jackson, FAA

Jasmine Evains, FAA

Lisa Favors, FAA

Peggy Kelley, FAA

David Wagner, ATC

Derek Thrap, ATC

Tracy Montross, American Airlines

Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)

Cathy Schroeder, CSS, Inc.

## Summary Minutes

### Open the Meeting

❖ Meeting started at 6:00 PM

- Open the Meeting: *Rutzell called the meeting to order.*
- Gagnon: Reminder of new technology today. Push the button while you are speaking. Green light will illuminate.
- Rutzell: Read the ACR 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: *Introductions took place. No elected officials today. ACR, FAA, CLT, AA, HMMH, CSS representatives introduced.*
- Rutzell: I wanted to share that I'm resigning and stepping down from the ACR. I think I am leaving at a good point in time. The divergent headings departure proposal should be included in the Part 150. We are implementing higher waypoints for arrivals. These are 2 key ACR proposals that we worked on, and some of the first ones that we all agreed upon. It has been almost 9 years since Metroplex changed our lives, and I think I filed the first complaint. I think we have made a lot of progress. We have become productive. Thank you, and please continue to voice your concerns, seek solutions, and work together to improve the quality of our lives. [Applause]
- Gagnon: The formal process of resigning will occur at the end of the meeting, so Natalie will still run this meeting. Thanks Natalie, for your leadership over the last few years.
- Hair: There is something special that Kevin is getting now, dessert in honor of Natalie.

- Gagnon: Meeting logistics. There is a lot planned for this meeting. We could go beyond 8p. Please stay focused on the topics at hand. Remotely, use the raise the hand function. We capture the chat comments. Please state your name when speaking. Handout – was sent by email. Agenda addresses what we will cover in the meeting.
  - Ground Rules: We want healthy meetings, productive, and effective but brief points. Be respectful of each other. Focus on making noise improvement in our area.
- Rutzell: *Wright motioned to approve the Minutes; Loflin seconded. Minutes approved.*

## **Review Public Input**

- ❖ Gagnon: Guidelines for public speakers: 3 minutes. If more time requested, it is up to chair. ACR may or may not respond to speaker at time of meeting.
- ❖ Speaker #1: Michael Khan
- ❖ Reese: Would it be okay if I elaborated a bit so the folks from the tower can understand? *Yes.* Recognize where Mr. Khan lives – just 7-8 miles to the Northeast. When the airport is in North Flow, runway 36R is what he is talking about. We have a fair amount of dispersion where he is, and he wants to know why are so many planes going over his house, and the second question is why is there not a 50/50 split?
- ❖ Wright: I am familiar with this area. I would agree that 28216 - they were beginning to have noise complaints from that area. Something has changed since November; even in 28214, something has changed.
- ❖ Gussman: Asking of the FAA – do we know why we are seeing an increase in planes there?
- ❖ Wagner: There are no procedural changes. Volume of traffic has increased on some days in excess of 19%. Not every day. Charlotte is doing well as an airport. Northeast is a prime destination. Next market would be – AA – Dallas, Atlanta. These are big markets.
- ❖ Montross: International flights, if they are on North Flow, they will fly Northeast until they connect over the Atlantic. Volume you mentioned - seasonal impact. Climate and temperature traps noise differently, so that is a potential factor.
- ❖ Brown: Bigger planes will climb slower in heat.

## **Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Discussion: Receive Update on Progress**

- ❖ Gagnon: L&B emailed me today with a summary: CLT and L&B are working on finalizing the Draft Part 150 Study Update document and anticipate its publication in early August, with a TAC meeting and Public Meetings/Public Hearings following in mid-September. The Draft Part 150 Study Update will include the draft Existing (2023) and Future (2028) Noise Exposure Maps as well as the recommended draft 2024 Noise Compatibility Program for CLT.
- ❖ Hair: Part 150 has been in draft form for a while now, and there is really no new news. We look forward to a draft document coming out in the next couple of months. We have not seen it ourselves.
- ❖ Gussman: I know that they are looking at a 3 to 4 week window for public notice for public meetings.
- ❖ Hair: Public meetings and hearings will be done in-person. But there are multiple different ways for people to submit feedback. This feedback will be incorporated into the final document. I encourage people, especially stakeholders and folks that are concerned about this, to come to the meetings if your schedule allows; but if not, there will be a window to provide feedback. It is on the website how to submit feedback. All of that will be reviewed and documented.
- ❖ Washington: Do we have any services for the Spanish speaking community?
- ❖ Hair: Yes, all information is available in Spanish. And they are available to be translated into 170 other languages on request. As far as our noise complaint program, that is a gap that we have self-identified. We have multiple other languages that our staff can address, if necessary.
- ❖ Montross: Since this group does not meet until October, how do you anticipate your team working with the members outside of the TAC to broaden community participation and awareness of the public hearings?
- ❖ Hair: That will be a function of the Part 150 team and L&B. The ACR is a stakeholder, and they have a defined stakeholder engagement program. They will be specifically engaged as part of that process.

## **Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Discussion: ACR Approach for Reviewing, Evaluating, Commenting on Part 150**

- ❖ Gussman: Since we are likely to not get perfectly aligned with our meetings and Part 150 meetings, I want to put together a Temporary Working Team, a few people, who would commit to draft an ACR position paper, to give a rapid response when needed. I encourage everyone to make their comments individually also. Asking for people interested in participating to be available by email or via a phone call. We're probably looking at a 1-2 week window to get this done once the Part 150 is released.
  - Motion: *To form a Temporary Working Team, led by the Vice Chair, to Craft a Formal Response to the draft Part 150 on behalf of the ACR.*
- ❖ Rutzell: *Gussman made motion, and Dasher seconded. All in favor. Yes.*
- ❖ Brown: Do we know the timing of the proposal being submitted to us?
- ❖ Hair: It will be published in early August. That would be the earliest you all would get it.
- ❖ Gagnon: Page 6 of handout. We have L&B's response to questions asked by the ACR – what is the difference between public meeting and public hearing? You can read the response here.

## **Project Team Updates**

- ❖ Gagnon: I'll provide some verbal updates on behalf of the Project Teams. Government Engagement Project Team (GEPT): They are working on Council engagement. If anyone has interest in speaking at City Council meetings, let me or Thelma know. We are looking for additional speakers. Preston has spoken a couple times, but he's out for medical reasons for a while. The public forum is monthly. As Tracy mentioned at the prior ACR meeting, one of the Council members brought up the Part 150 initiative proactively.
  - A key topic at a recent GEPT meeting: In communicating with Council, emphasize that a lot of the analysis that has been done to-date through the Part 150 has been within the contour, but most of the complaints are from outside the contour.
- ❖ Gagnon: Community Engagement Project Team (CEPT): Sam and Phil are spearheading that group, discussing the desire to elevate the conversation about the Part 150 with the community - especially with the draft in August and public meetings in September. By elevating, they mean getting/sharing more details on the proposals that are coming out. Have discussed how the ACR members can engage potential partners. I understand that Sam has talked to several different community groups in Gaston County about the Part 150, about the ACR. We are starting to – in these ACR meetings – ask members who they spoke with and give other ACR member examples of how to get the word out.
  - Montross: Charlotte Mecklenburg Community Relations Committee. They are appointed members by Mecklenburg County and the City of Charlotte. They meet regularly, and I have attended a couple of their meetings. I would encourage you to keep this group apprised of next steps and content. I think they would be open to hearing from the group. They meet at the Belmont Regional Center. Also, the Tuesday Morning Breakfast Forum would be another group for you all to present to. This is a group of community leaders largely from the West side of Charlotte. I will continue to come up with a list of organizations and am happy to support that effort as needed.
  - Stowe: I've talked with others at social events. I have not discussed the Part 150 but do talk and try to clarify about the noise issue. We don't have much of a noise issue in southern/eastern Gaston County, but northern Gaston County there probably is a noise issue, but we haven't heard from anyone there.
  - Washington: I spoke to Cynthia Woods with the City of Charlotte. They send communications out to HOAs. And I had spoken to someone who brought up the Spanish speaking question.
  - Gagnon: Again, informally feel free to continue getting the communication about the ACR out there.
- ❖ Gagnon: Local Operations/Improvement Project Team (LOIPT): Much of what that group is working on is related to adherence. Adherence to the 2-mile restriction, starting to talk about monitoring the waypoint altitudes, where the FAA has recently raised those.

## CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations

- ❖ Hair: 46,000 - Anyone know what that number represents? That is our expected throughput tomorrow with local passengers. We are seeing incredible growth in demand, and in the midst of this, we are redoing the terminal. We understand that customer service might not be the best right now. We are getting busier, and we don't see this trend changing. We are 45% busier now than right after COVID. We are seeing about 15% annualized growth, year over year. Our growth is only going to increase. That is why we have a large capital program, because our existing infrastructure is inadequate to meet that demand. Our new normal is in the 40,000s local passenger day. Pre-COVID - 2019 was used as our benchmark – our high watermark. A normal day would have been in the low 30,000s for local passengers.
- ❖ Montross: Can you clarify Local vs. O and D?
- ❖ Hair: O and D is Originating and Destinating. Most people count as 2 because they originate and destinate.
- ❖ Montross: Yes, the 46,000 is the passengers in the terminal, not Charlotte passengers?
- ❖ Hair: It is the TSA forecasted throughput.
- ❖ Montross: 46,000 people are going through local checkpoints tomorrow. We usually count about 100,000 in the terminal on any given day, so over 40% will be local.
- ❖ Hair: We have baseload of connecting passengers, which provide us with about 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of our total, then local passengers, and that is forecast tomorrow to be high.
- ❖ Wright: I need guidance on the Flow reports and the colors.
- ❖ Reese: Flow reports - *went over page 10*. On the right-hand side of the circle, we have the cumulative totals showing 57% going South, and 43% going North. The green and red lines that you see are arrivals (red) and departures (green). The numbers represented on each runway are the numbers of arrivals and departures for that particular runway. Any other questions on the complaints reports, let me know.
- ❖ Wright: It looks like all runways are departures and arrivals. Has that changed?
- ❖ Reese: When we have construction going on, during the wee hours of the morning, there have been runway closures.
- ❖ Gagnon: Thelma, even though the green and red lines are the same length, if you look at the numbers in the circles, the actual operations are noted there; so the red/green lines make it seem like the runways are both arrivals/departures, but based on the numbers, some runways are only arrivals.
- ❖ Wagner: On 36L and 18R, are those “go arounds?”
- ❖ Reese: I don't know if this report takes that into account. I would have to reach out to the vendor to double check.
- ❖ Gagnon: What is a “go around”?
- ❖ Wagner: Go around - When they make the approach and have to go around. Wind shear on final, could be anything.
- ❖ Faust: That ratio of North and South - that is not typical, is it? Typically North Flow is higher. I've never seen South Flow higher.
- ❖ Reese: That's not necessarily true. If you look at the reports from January 2024 to now, you'll see there have actually been more months in South Flow. Typically speaking, the driving factor is weather, and wind and winds aloft. The general rule of thumb is Spring/Summer = South. Once the weather gets warmer, the winds will change. When it gets colder, we start more North.
- ❖ Faust: If weather is not a factor, how is it determined?
- ❖ Thrap: Weather is always a factor. Tail winds, winds aloft - that is usually how it is determined.
- ❖ Reese: Winds aloft is typically anything over 3,000, 7,000, 10,000. Keep in mind, once an aircraft takes off, that is only one phase of the departure. As they begin to climb, the winds above the surface have to be taken into account, and that is referred to as winds aloft.
- ❖ Pollack: Late night/early morning arrivals and usage of runways. Maybe because of construction, but I am seeing a lot more arrivals on 36L.
- ❖ Reese: Are you referring to the western most runway? *Yes*. 36L is a runway that we are left with. For example – A couple of days ago, I received complaints out of Berewick. If you look at the complaint report, you'll see that our top 2 complainers are from the 28278 zip code. What took place on that particular night was both the center runway was closed, and the east runway was closed. That is rare. We have seen nights when 2 runways are closed, and 36L is open. That is our only option.

- ❖ Wright: On the monthly complaint report on page 12, it shows 28278 and 28216 as having a number of distinct households. But then on Complainant Ranking, 28216 is low, and 28210 and 28278 came to the top. That was confusing.
- ❖ Reese: We are looking at 2 different metrics – Metric #1 is number of households – number of people or families complaining. Metric #2 is the number of complaints those households are generating. What we have seen over the last 9 months, we are covering about 2,000 complaints a month. This is actually pretty low. When we rank particular households, if you look at the bottom of page 13, one person in 28210 has complained 713 times. Numbers 2 and 4 on the list are 2 folks from Berewick, and the complaint from Indian Trail 28079 is complaining about air pollution.
- ❖ Pollack: I think the complaint system is an additional data point. I don't think the complaints do anything.

### **FAA Update on Implementation of Alternative Recommendation #3a**

- ❖ Gagnon: FAA Progress Discussion – implementation of Alternative Recommendation #3a. In conjunction with this we will have a presentation by HMMH and then we will see if CLT wants to add in any information/update.
- ❖ Johnson: (Jackson sharing an FAA slide) We made the change to the STARs, raising the altitude by 1000 feet, and those in the yellow were below 10,000, and the ones in purple are above 10,000. That shows that we did make the change. The airport has some slides, as well.
- ❖ Hennessey: Our slides are very similar.
- ❖ Gagnon: The key in the bottom left of the screen – anything that was orange was before May 16, and that is when the changes were made. HMMH is going to describe the procedural changes in a minute. After May 16, this illustrates the altitude changes.
- ❖ Gussman: Are those the flight lines of the aircraft taking off? The purple lines are higher than the orange lines, showing before and after the change.
- ❖ Wagner: Those are arrivals, not departures. The orange is before May 16; purple is after May 16. You can see the purple being higher than the orange. The new procedure has them coming in 1000 feet higher than before.
- ❖ Brown: Does that delay the downwind when you turn base when you raise those?
- ❖ Wagner: It can. It depends on the volume of traffic. If it was one plane, then no. We have to turn appropriate space. Depending on the type of aircraft, sometimes we need more space.
- ❖ Gagnon: Can you clarify the scale on the right? What are the numbers on the right – for example, “120”, does that mean 12,000’?
- ❖ Thrap: Going up the right side it starts at 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, 5,000 all the way up. Where you see the purple and pink come together and the orange below it - and they come together - that is where the change was made. As they come down the downwind, it is the downward slope, so they are higher the entire time on the downwind. 5,000 feet from the west runway, you have one at 5,000 and one at 4,000, instead of two at 5,000. Traffic volume usually extends the downwind.
- ❖ Dasher: How far out, away from the airport, are these happening?
- ❖ Wagner: Base to final is what we call it. They can be out as far as 10 miles. If there is an unknown circumstance, an emergency, we will bring them in closer to the airport. But that is not common. Base to final 10 miles. Can be 35/40 miles. That final will be packed, meaning there will be an aircraft every so many miles. No empty slots.
- ❖ Rutzell: I recall this was really impactful to the SouthPark area.
- ❖ Wagner: The waypoints that were changed from 9,000 to 10,000 are directly northeast, directly southeast, directly northwest, directly southwest of the airport. Probably 7-8 miles in each direction, it was 9,000 they were crossing, now it is 10,000. If you draw an X over the airport, pretty much 8 miles in each spot.
- ❖ Reese: If you look on the top, you'll see those 5 letters with the triangle. Those are marking the waypoints on the STAR procedure. When you are asking how far out it is, it is difficult to answer that without having the procedure in front of you. This is only half of the puzzle. You need the actual STAR itself.
- ❖ Pollack: I do think the planes are a little bit further out. The real noise that people are complaining about is closer in arrivals. One thing, I have an intuition that they are turning, and they probably have the throttle up. To the extent that you can push them out to higher elevation at base leg, that helps.

- ❖ Stoddard: I am an airspace analyst at HMMH. Prior to HMMH, I was an Air Traffic controller for about 12 years. FAA just gave an update with the raw data. I will go through and show you the procedures and how they were changed.
  - Agenda Slide: Slate Recommendation, FAA Proposed Alternative as of 2022, FAA Implementation, which is the May 16 update, and a few in-depth slides at the end if you want to look at them.
  - Slide 3: This is the ACR Slate Recommendation #3. Bring altitudes on CHSLY closer to pre-Metroplex altitudes. The analysis showed this should benefit 80,000 residents. Preliminary analysis evaluated raising CAATT from 9,000 to 10,000 and EPAYE from 6,000 to 7,000.
  - FAA Proposed Alternative: To modify altitude at CAATT and EPAYE, this requires that corresponding fixes for other STARs must be raised for operational continuity.
  - FAA Implementation: On May 16, 2024, FAA published updates to seven Standard Terminal Arrival Routes (STARs) into CLT. The updates included altitude changes to address ACR recommendation #3. As a result of the FAA's implementation of the changes to the 7 STARs, the CHSLY procedure increased the altitude at: CAATT from 9,000 to 10,000 and EPAYE from 6,000 to 10,000 - unless otherwise directed by ATC. They removed the altitude restriction on EPAYE.
  - That is the main information that Gene put together. If you want to go over the remaining slides, which go through all the details – altitudes, altitude restrictions, etc. – we can, or it can be distributed to you.
- ❖ Rutzell: I am fine with moving on.
- ❖ Pollack: EPAYE restriction. I don't follow that. Are you saying the minimum altitude is 10,000 or anything between 6-10?
- ❖ Stoddard: So in the absence of any instruction from ATC, they will maintain the last required altitude which is the previous waypoint, and that is 10,000 at CAATT. When ATC does not give any instruction or clear them onto any approach, they will still be at 10,000. That is not likely. ATC is probably talking to them and clearing them for approach, and descending and maintaining to a certain altitude. The only way to really tell is by looking through actual flight data over a number of months after this implementation.
- ❖ Brown: In NORDO (No radio) situation where they lose communication, the aircraft will maintain 10,000.
- ❖ Stoddard: Yes, that would happen in a NORDO; but depending on the traffic, they need intervention from ATC after passing CAATT to descend below 10,000.
- ❖ Wright: If there were additional slides, I would like to see them.
- ❖ Stoddard: BANKR FIVE ARRIVAL – Waypoint changes at CONTR where they changed the altitude restriction. It used to be above 11,000, and now it is between 11,000 and 12,000. Not much of a change for people on the ground. On OPALS, they deleted altitude restriction between 11,000 and 12,000 feet. You can see it on slide 9. BLNCE will stay the same. Slide 10: CHSLY SIX ARRIVAL – The changes are written there. Slide 11 – starting at the top – KRISS Waypoint - previous version it was at or above 11,000 feet. MSL, now it is between 11,000 and 12,000 feet. On the 36 transition, the SLPOH Waypoint, they were between 10,000 and 21,000 feet. Now between 11,000 and 21,000 feet. Continuing on the 36 transition, WHIZE Waypoint. Used to be between 9,000 and 12,000 feet MSL; now between 10,000 and 12,000 feet MSL. Again, they've raised the floor. And CAATT Waypoint, it was at 9,000, now it is at 10,000. EPAYE used to be at 6,000 feet restriction; that is no longer there. There is no altitude associated with EPAYE anymore, so I have 10,000. It is up to ATC.
- ❖ Pollack: How often are we at 10,000 on EPAYE? Are they typically descending down to 6,000?
- ❖ Stoddard: We have not looked at that flight data yet. Maybe the tower or FAA representatives can speak on that.
- ❖ Thrap: Looking at some data, and I believe this is from the month of June, the EPAYE crossings are anywhere from 6,500-7,000. They can be slightly above that, but that is the norm.
- ❖ Gagnon: One thing I know CLT is going to talk about is how the monitoring process and analysis process will work going forward. The Local Ops group has talked about, along with identifying the kind of information David just shared, looking at the baseline - what were the altitudes prior to May 16 - to be able to draw a comparison.
- ❖ Pollack: The takeaway is arrivals are coming down to 7,500 or 6,500?
- ❖ Stoddard: That is correct. They are most likely, most of the time, being otherwise directed.
- ❖ Wright: In Project Team meeting, we were discussing our monitoring. We said we needed to have the baseline so that we can determine that, now that we have the procedure change, is that what they are actually doing?

- ❖ Gagnon: Local Ops Project Team – for the last several meetings, Sam and Thelma in particular were talking about how it could take several months to see the true impact through all the operations that will occur. The team had talked about looking at the actual altitudes prior to May 16 compared to the actual altitudes after May 16 because the ACR and FAA had done studies years ago about altitudes at CAATT and EPAYE, and I think even though EPAYE procedure was at 6,000, the average altitude was around 5,000 at the time. The analysis that the Local Ops team wants is to determine whether they are now operating 1,000 feet above what they were prior to May 16.
- ❖ Wagner: The pink and orange graphic that you had up there, that showed what you are talking about.
- ❖ Wright: We have a baseline now based on what the FAA shared.
- ❖ Gagnon: Does CLT want to add anything?
- ❖ Hennessey: We are in the middle of changing our flight track provider, so we will have all the information, but we just can't process it yet. This happens all the time with contractors. Just can't get to you before next ACR meeting.
- ❖ Gussman: We will still have access to historical data, so we'll have that baseline information by next meeting?
- ❖ Hennessey: We should have two providers for the month of August to run overlaps so we don't have gaps.
- ❖ Montross: For the record. I sit on a couple other roundtables. Progress is really hard to come by. Can we celebrate a little bit of progress, and thank the FAA for two years of effort? You, the ACR, came up with the strategy, you evaluated the strategy. You did the pros and cons. You submitted to the FAA, yes it took a long time, but no one else is doing this as effectively as you all are. So be very proud of yourselves. People may not be complaining, but the people that are getting it done are in this room. No one else is doing this as effectively as you are. So, Bravo, Natalie, a big testament to your leadership, as well.
- ❖ Rutzell: Thank you. [Applause]

### **Discussing FAA Response to FOIA Request**

- ❖ Rutzell: One of our key initiatives is that we want to better understand the North/South Flow balance and whether there is a path forward for us. At the last meeting, we submitted a FOIA request to get the Tower procedures. We received these, and they were distributed to ACR members. I encourage you to review and send comments to Ed, and we can collate them. Our thought is to have the Local Ops Team review the response and put together a summary of what was in the procedures and an overview of any recommendations. I know that Jacob did start his review and may want to provide some commentary.
- ❖ Pollack: I think there is some interesting information in there. Within the information, I have no idea whether there are opportunities presented to do anything. There are references to calm wind runways, there are references to other things, and I don't know if we want to go over them now.
  - I do have a question that relates to a comment that was made earlier - the comment that there are always winds, and there are winds higher than 5 knots. What level is altitude at 5 knots?
- ❖ Thrap: Surface wind initially.
- ❖ Pollack: So is it surface wind, or winds at another altitude? Is there any detail about that?
- ❖ Wagner: This would be the plan of the day. We would consider the winds starting first thing in the morning, and we would run our operation based on that. If it is 5 knots or less, we would possibly look at departure fixes, or if there is any construction - there are a multitude of items that play into the selection of runway use. So, if we start as a South operation, then we'll notice, before we pick that operation we would refer to the winds aloft. So at the airport the winds are less than 5 knots, but at 2,000 feet it is out of the North at 10-15 knots, we will go to North operation. If you land with a tailwind of 10-15 knots, you can't keep up with final. It will reduce your arrival rate. We will depart into the wind even though it is not at the surface. Could be weather to the North or South that we have to think about. It is not one thing. In a perfect day, with 5 knots and no winds aloft, we would probably do South operations. We have navigational equipment also that will determine operation. Sometimes changes can happen in minutes.
- ❖ Faust: Are those decisions documented?
- ❖ Wagner: In your description, no, but everything that is done in our world is documented and can be retrieved. Weather is always documented and recorded. It is done so by the National Weather Service and local contracts that we have. Winds aloft is documented, and that is retrievable data. We document equipment outages. It is documented, but not exactly in the way you described.

- ❖ Pollack: I think we are asking the same questions. We want documentation. I am looking at runway selection (*from the FOIA response*). It says – the runways will be assigned based on the alignment of the wind 5 knots or more or the calm wind runway – and I don't know what that is or if Charlotte has a calm wind runway. And it says - unless using another runway is operationally advantageous or a runway use program is in effect. And that is the only things it says.
- ❖ Gagnon: Before you respond, to let you (*the ATC representatives in the meeting*) know what Natalie was suggesting and to give a little background for folks that are newer - in the April meeting, the ACR had an interest in getting documentation on procedures that specify decision-making criteria for North vs. South Flow. At Mark Libby's suggestion, the ACR put in a FOIA request. Jacob is referencing the FAA's response to the FOIA request. What Natalie has suggested is we have a Local Operations Project Team that is one group that discusses and focuses on items such as this; what Natalie suggested is, prior to the October meeting, to get any other input from ACR members on questions like Jacob has, analyze the FOIA request response, and come back in October to the ACR and say "this is what we recommend the ACR ask, if anything" for additional, clarifying information on how decisions are made on North vs. South Flow. Jacob was referencing some of what was sent in the FOIA request.
- ❖ Montross: This is a super oversimplification, but if everything was equal, our preference would be to do South Flow departure because the runways are closer to the terminal. You get the aircraft off the runway as soon as possible to get out of the airfield and can clear the ramp quicker to make way for arrival traffic. For operational benefits, that would be preferred. When we think about pushing aircraft for departure, the closer the departure queue is to the terminal, the more quickly we get off the airfield - which frees up concrete for other aircraft coming in.

### **Technical Working Group Update – Identifying Recommendation #1a Alternatives**

- ❖ Gagnon: We have been talking about different proposals or aspects of potential solutions the ACR has recommended, one of the Slate items we talked about today, which was #3a and has been implemented. Another recommendation was #1a, which was Continuous Descent Approach - CDAs - and Optimized Profile Descent. That was something the FAA had looked at, considered, and did not have a great solution. About a year ago, the ACR formed a Technical Working Group to learn more about some of the decision-making process relating to those types of arrivals. Phil and Sayle are members of that group. Can you share a bit about your initial conversations with Tower representatives?
- ❖ Brown: Mark Libby took us to TRACON, and we spent about an hour and a half with him. He showed us the high volume of arrivals and departures. I've been in towers and TRACONs, but Charlotte is unique. When there is little traffic, the radar screen is dormant; but when you get into high volume of arrivals, they start tracking an airplane to a particular runway probably 50-60 miles out of arrival. They start tracking airplanes way out. It is like a ballet, everything coming in at the same time and everything spaced. Especially on arrivals from the North, they have 23 miles to fit all these guys into the Southern runway arrivals, and what they do is they try to get an 8-mile break in there. Most of the problems on arrival from the North, where people are complaining about, is what we call cutting the corner. That is a space in there for 8 miles where they can slice someone in coming from the opposite direction. They want basically a 4-mile space between arrivals and departures so they can get an arrival in and a departure. Is that correct? On a good day? (*Yes*) Most of the problems are because of slicing planes in. They are coming in over Cornelius at 3,800 feet; this is where the noise is coming in because they're cutting the corner, turning up the power. It is because of efficiency. These guys are doing a fantastic job staging everything coming in. I was pessimistic, but Mark explained it, showed us, took so much time with us.
- ❖ Montross: A bank is like a peak and valley. We pull all the aircraft in at a peak, get the customers off, move them around. Then push the aircraft at a bank. You can see in the terminal when we are in a bank. Other airlines schedule their departures during our valleys. Nine banks a day, and on holidays we add a bank to accommodate additional traffic. Banks are good for connection time, good for staffing, gives the day a flow. Banks exist at every hub.
- ❖ Brown: My question to Mark was - how can we change this to be community friendly? He says there is not really a way to change that; the main way to change that is in the valley, the lighter times. They may be able to extend it up a little further.



- ❖ Gussman: It was very informative. The airport was in South Flow when we were there. One thing I specifically ask is - we had literally been going on it for 11 days – do these aircraft look to be higher than 3 weeks ago (when the FAA raised the waypoints). His reaction was that it did look a little higher. I mostly took a positive take away from it in regard that it looked like the things we had done were happening. The reality on the ground could be different than what is happening in the air, and that is where we come in. If anybody missed the Tower tour, and you didn't get to see TRACON when it looked like it was covered with aircraft, it gets you a sense of what was going on. Sayle and I would be happy to help you get some of that exposure.
- ❖ Brown: Asking about complaints from the Peninsula - I am friends of the new president of the Peninsula, and I gave him all the information that I had gotten. He was to put it in his newsletter. Have we gotten any complaints from the Peninsula?
- ❖ Reese: Complaints are declining over the last 9 months, and we are focusing on households now. At the 6-month mark, as of the end of June 2023, we had 147 households and as of now, we have 137 households. Not only a decline in complaints but a decline in the number of households.
- ❖ Brown: Has anything changed in the tower since Phil and I toured, to take them further up to go over the main channel?
- ❖ Wagner: Our procedures are pretty much set. The only thing that would take them out further is because the altitude was set at 10,000 feet at the 4 corners.
- ❖ Pollack: Altitude is hard for me to access because I am 29 miles directly South of 36L – I am getting all those routes. I feel like they are generally base legging a little further South. Generally, not always. I am seeing an impact. I think it is changing how planes operate. Jury is out on the noise. I would expect over the years that complaints would go down from the North because of the shift in the flow of the airport. 15 years ago, it was a South flow airport. Now it is a North flow airport. Arrival noise is now South of the airport. It is really helpful for the tower folks to be here. We get different information. We just want to understand. We do care about safety. I would like to see more communication. I get the feeling that the focus is on efficiency and operations. When the 4<sup>th</sup> runway comes in, folks will have incessant noise. How is that balanced?
- ❖ Brown: They do care about us and the communities. “Safety creates efficiency.” Mark Libby said that.
- ❖ Gagnon: Thanks for the update. I will follow up offline with the Technical Working Group about next steps.

### **Gain Understanding of Community Area Planning and Noise Disclosure Overlay**

- ❖ Gussman: I did want to check to see if Kevin had the opportunity to pull together the disclosure map.
- ❖ Hennessey: Not ready to pass out. I will write up some stuff and have Ed send it out.
- ❖ Gussman: I'll touch on a few things. This portion is about the recurring conversation that we have had in this room many times when we talk about airport noise. There are things we are doing with CLT, FAA, AA – all of this stuff we've had some impact on in places. The other thing that has been pointed out frequently is how we decide on land use around the airport and where we all live. I served on the Planning Committee for Charlotte Mecklenburg. There is a way to participate in those systems or processes and how we plan a City. It is an opportune time to participate. They are going through something called the Community Area Planning (CAP) process, and that is looking at individual areas around the City and County and talk about how those things develop. It is important for those of us with the knowledge - we know where the noise is – to participate in this process. It may be a residential area is not the best place at the end of a runway, etc. If we participate in this process, it is another way to have some impact on those noise problems down the road. In this document (*referencing the back portion of the handout relating to Community Area Planning*) it goes into ways you can participate, sign up to receive email notifications. I just wanted to make sure everyone knew that this existed. The other element that we will be getting later, we have had some conversations about – the City and the airport do have a vehicle for not allowing people to move into these places where there is excessive airport noise, without knowing about it. It is part of the Noise Disclosure Overlay. It is important to know that this exists. It would be good for everyone who moves into a high noise area to know they are moving into a high noise area.
- ❖ Montross: On behalf of American, we will stand with you in support of land use all day long. The airport is equally interested in this. The City needs more voices protecting how land is used. AA will support you.

- ❖ Hair: We have been engaged with planning staff on the UDO and have been working on a couple of things - one of which is specific residential land use immediately adjacent to the airport. The other is the Airport Noise Disclosure Overlay. Had a very good conversation with senior planning staff on Monday. They are glad to work with us. They have a plan for outreach for this next phase – what this handout is about. The UDO is a living document. They want it to have constant revisions. The Compact residential development district is something new that came out in the last couple months. So, if there are things you think we should add, Planning is open to have those conversations.
- ❖ Wright: When I moved into my neighborhood, my neighbor told me airplanes are close. I made the assumption that Pawtucket, this neighborhood of over 1,000 homes, must not be noisy - not knowing that most of the people in my neighborhood worked at the airport, so they were used to it. The community is also contoured out of the noise phase. There were changes made to the older brick homes for noise. And Mr. Khan 28216 – has not been hearing any noise and for the last 6 months, he is experiencing something he has not before. SouthPark and Steele Creek, they are close to the airport, so they know there is going to be noise. I am not sure that despite the good intentions of the planning committee, it's difficult because you don't know where the noise is going to come from at any given time.

### **Unfinished Business**

- ❖ Gagnon: In the handout on page 16, these are the Requests and Motions from last meeting. You all authorized the Chair and Vice Chair to develop a letter to send to the FAA and to develop a FOIA request. That was done. We received the formal response to the FOIA. We have not received a response to the letter that was sent out a few weeks after the FOIA request was sent out.

### **New Business – ACR Chair Transition**

- ❖ Gussman: Thank you, Natalie, for taking this role on and helping move us forward. I make the Motion - *To accept Natalie Rutzell's resignation. Washington seconded. Motion passed.*
  - *CLT provided an appreciation gift to Natalie. [Applause]*
- ❖ Gussman: We will need nominations for a new Chair. We will seek these over the next few months, so we can make that happen at the next meeting. I will also need a replacement partner for the TAC.

### **Other New Business**

- ❖ Wright: How are we doing with our vacancies?
- ❖ Hennessey: We have put out some applications on that and have received a number, and we are going through those.
- ❖ Brown: Do you have to have made a complaint to be considered?
- ❖ Hennessey: Our #1 criteria is that you have been a former noise complainer. We have areas that we don't get complaints from so we move onto general interest and those who want to serve. The answer is no, but that is where we start.
- ❖ Brown: Do we have enough people in the stream?
- ❖ Hennessey: We have enough to fill some of the spots but not all of them.
- ❖ Gussman: If we suggest someone, does that carry some weight?
- ❖ Hennessey: Yes, please let us know.
- ❖ Gussman: We will put out some feelers in specific areas that need representing.
- ❖ Gagnon: The vacancies are listed on page 3 in your handout.
- ❖ Washington: Has anyone reached out to the woman who complained 700 times?
- ❖ Reese: I call every single complainant. Even repeat complainers. I always follow-up, and follow-up with quality details that seem to be appreciated, at least by the gentleman that I spoke with today.

### **Adjourn**

- ❖ Loflin motioned to adjourn. Stowe seconded, all in favor.
- ❖ Meeting adjourned at 8:24 pm