

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: April 10, 2024

Attendees

Natalie Rutzell, Chair, County 2

Sherry Washington, County 4

Mark Loflin, County 6

Bobbi Almond, City 5

Sayle Brown, Cornelius

Matt Hamilton, Davidson

Preston Hagman, Huntersville

Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg

Jacob Pollack, York

Kevin Hennessey, CLT

Chris Poore, CLT

Amber Leathers, CLT

Ted Kaplan, CLT

Shane Jackson, FAA

Mark Libby, FAA

Gaby Elizondo, L&B

Chris Sandfoss, L&B

Tracy Montross, American Airlines

Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)

Cathy Schroeder, CSS, Inc.

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)

Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)

Matt Reese, CLT

Summary Minutes

Open the Meeting

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:06 PM
- ❖ Rutzell: *Called the meeting to order.* The ACR was established approximately 7 years ago to facilitate community engagement with the airport. *Rutzell read the Airport Community Roundtable Mission Statement.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Matt, can you give us an overview of the new technology?
- ❖ Reese: Thanks to tech support and the airport, this room has now been wired with a new sound system. Video cameras not in service yet – will be shortly. *Went over the microphones and how they work.* By the next meeting, we should have everything working.
- ❖ Gagnon: No elected officials are in attendance tonight. *Facilitated introductions of ACR, CLT, HMMH, AA, FAA, CSS, L&B.* Thank you for using the video when you are remote. For those participating remotely, use the “raise the hand” function if you want to speak. Use the chat, we save it and incorporate that in the Minutes. CLT will keep you on mute until you speak.
 - Handout: Shared list of items included; on Agenda, next meeting is July 10, not June. Meeting invites are correct.
 - Ground Rules: Healthy meetings, productive, and effective, brief points. Healthy – Don’t make things personal or take things personal; keep the discussion focused on topic we are addressing. Productive – stay on task. Effective in making noise improvement in our area.
- ❖ Rutzell: Request a vote on the January Minutes. *Loflin made motion to accept the Minutes: Washington seconded. All in favor.* Minutes are approved.

Receive Public Input

- ❖ Rutzell: ACR members, we have a full agenda, so please limit follow-up comments or questions.
- ❖ Gagnon: *Went over guidelines for public speakers:* Each speaker gets 3 minutes. If more time, it is up to chair. ACR may or may not respond at time of meeting.
 - Person #1 – Resha Fortson
 - Pollack: I just want to quickly say to the speaker, to the extent that any of her requests are not being honored, it is not the ACR that is opposed to more sessions. It’s likely the airport making those decisions.

Tower/TRACON Tour Debrief

- ❖ Gagnon: We had good ACR participation when the tours occurred in February. This is an informal comment time.
- ❖ Brown: I have been in many towers. The new Charlotte tower is absolutely awesome. Very high tech, everyone is professional, works well together. Great visibility of the whole situation; very impressive. All questions were answered.
- ❖ Wright: Having gone on the first tour of the old one, this new one was very modern - no circular stairway; we took the elevator up. It was very impressive. The shades were going up and down as things are moving around. It is a 360 degree view of what is coming in and out of the airport. The new tower is great.
- ❖ Loflin: Most impressed with the 360 view. You can see everything involved with the airport. There is a lot of territory out there and how it affects the neighborhoods and all around it. The airport is a geographic area.
- ❖ Almond: I have gone to both tower tours. Really nice.
- ❖ Montross: I enjoyed TRACON; time was spent on weather patterns and technology they use to try and navigate routes around weather. I think it is important when talking about North vs. South Flow. It is neat to see that happening. On behalf of our partners at NATCA, I want to recognize the hard work it takes and the communication that is required at each one of these departure waypoints. I sensed the workload that goes into each departure - the queueing, the movements, etc. I can see why they're sensitive to additional workload, I see how busy they are queueing aircraft.
- ❖ Wright: We are regional. Each airport area, like Atlanta and Richmond, are working together to monitor what is going on in the air, and that was interesting.
- ❖ Gagnon: There are 20-23 major geographic areas within the US. It was interesting to learn how that is structured.
- ❖ Brown: Also interesting, we sit in a corner between Atlanta, New York, and Washington, DC. Flying up North, it is much more restricted because of New York and DC, and you have a little more leeway down South, right Mark?
- ❖ Libby: Yes.
- ❖ Brown: That helped explain the situation of why we are having problems with the arrivals coming from the North being more restrictive.
- ❖ Reese: On behalf of Noise, I thank the Tower/TRACON for letting us come; thanks to all of those who made it possible to bring three (3) groups up.

Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update

- ❖ Hair: I will defer to Amber, Kevin, and Gaby who have been working day-to-day on the Part 150 study.
- ❖ Elizondo: TRACON experience sounds awesome. I am a little jealous. Part 150 - We are excited about where we are in the Part 150 process. We are moving forward, and I know that everyone is looking forward to the next step.
 - Where are we? We are working diligently to get with the airport to finalize the Noise Compatibility Program recommendations as well as the overall documentation of the Part 150 document. Once that is completed, we will publish the draft Part 150 for public review. That is our next big milestone. After the document is published, after 30 days, we will have concurrent public meeting and hearing. At these meetings, we will have recommendations, and we will have an opportunity to receive verbal comments from the public in-person. We will collect public comments up until 15 days after the meeting. Total comment period, 45 days.
 - After we close the comment period, then we will address the comments. That will be shown in the final Part 150 document, which City Council will vote on. Then, submit to the FAA for review and approval.
 - The FAA will review the document, and the first thing they will do is look at our noise exposure maps. They will review them - probably 2 to 3 months - and accept the noise exposure maps.
 - At this point the clock starts for 180 days for them to review the NCP measures. That will likely take the entire 180 days. After that, they will publish a record of approval where they go item-by-item on our recommendations and either approve or not approve the measures. Again, our next big milestone will be publishing the draft and opening it up for public comment.
- ❖ Hagman: Do you have a proposed date for when that will happen?
- ❖ Elizondo: We don't have a date now, but I am thinking mid-to-late summer.
- ❖ Gagnon: Clarification. Mid-to-late summer for which of these steps? The publishing, the public meetings, or the Charlotte City Council meeting?
- ❖ Elizondo: For the publication of the draft document. We will work with the airport on that.
- ❖ Rutzell: Do we have the final proposals that are going into this draft? I thought there were a number of departure proposals, like some with the 2-mile restriction removed and some without. Are you doing both, and then the FAA decides? I didn't know what was being submitted in the draft.

- ❖ Elizondo: That is a great question. What you have seen to-date are the alternatives that we have reviewed. We have identified whether they will be considered to be included in the NCP as a measure or not. Currently we are working with the airport to finalize which measures actually end up in the NCP. They would make one combined scenario that would make it into the document. Even though several measures have made it forward to date, it doesn't necessarily mean they will be included.
- ❖ Rutzell: Does that mean that the ACR does not have any say in what goes into the final draft?
- ❖ Elizondo: Through the TAC, we have received a lot of input with the ACR and worked with other stakeholders and technical experts. We have taken all this into consideration. We are working with the airport, and it is ultimately the airport's NCP that will get published in the draft. We are taking the ACR input into account and consideration.
- ❖ Montross: I have been focused on the airfield and flight procedures, but what is the update on land use compatibility?
- ❖ Elizondo: I don't think that we have distributed any materials on land use, but we are working on that directly with the airport. Still TBD.
- ❖ Rutzell: Are you able to give us any indication if you are considering the departures with or without the 2-mile restriction? The ACR is recommending that if you keep one in, leave the 2-mile restriction in.
- ❖ Elizondo: We are all curious as to what is going into the NCP. I cannot currently share what is going to be in; we are working to finalize it. Once it is published, you will be able to see what is in it, and will be able to comment.
- ❖ Pollack: Following analysis, a number of proposals were rejected for various reasons. The ACR followed up with some commentary/questions about some of the bases of some proposals being rejected. I never saw a formal response to those inquiries. Are we ever going to see a formal response? Has the FAA seen the inquiries? Is this being shared with them? I would be interested in getting FAA reactions to these explanations. I have a lot of questions around these explanations. For example, when we are asking about balancing Northern flow, the explanation given is that this is determined by weather, and the tower rarely has the opportunity or ability to direct using discretion, which I don't think is accurate. There was another proposal where we suggested they have some takeoffs from the western runway, and it was explained that it was unsafe because of dual runway crossings, even though landing aircraft have to cross two runways. It does not seem to be clear why that creates more risk. I am interested to know if our questions have been seen by FAA, and what their reactions are. Is someone looking at this?
- ❖ Gagnon: FYI, we have an agenda item that is getting at some of what Jacob is asking. Gaby, can you respond to Jacob's question?
- ❖ Elizondo: I understand your question, Jacob. We have been coordinating with the FAA since the project started. FAA has been engaged through our Technical Advisory Committee. We do make them aware when these items pop up. When we got the request back in January, I believe, to respond to the ACR's recommendations, they did review those as well as our responses. They are completely aware of the things you mentioned – North and South flow, departures on the west runway - we are not in a bubble. We are being very transparent. We are taking their input, as well. We have been coordinating closely with the FAA, Tower, stakeholders. I understand the intent behind these recommendations, and unfortunately we can't share much more than was in our memo. Ultimately, the reasons that an alternative is not moving forward, those are very clear and have been gone through by a bunch of technical experts. If a measure was determined not to be feasible, it was considered and evaluated in good faith.
- ❖ Leathers: I want to echo Gaby. I understand that there were some unfavorable outcomes for the ACR that came forward. L&B did a very nice courtesy to go through all the items and talked about them at length. To say that we are doing anything outside of the process or without the FAA is untrue. The integrity of this study has remained a high profile, a lot of transparency, a lot of people involved. We did everything by the book. Nothing has ever been questioned as to the integrity of this study. I think it is time to proceed with other options if our responses have not met your needs.
- ❖ Wright: I have a question about the review process. When we had the review last year, there were 2 night sessions – one on the West side, one on the South side. In light of community members' comments in terms of access, what social media is being used to impart this information? Will there perhaps be daytime options for persons that work at night?
- ❖ Elizondo: Now is a great time to bring this up in advance of the meetings taking place. We are working on our approach. We will work with the airport internally and discuss based on all this input. We will take all this into consideration when planning these next meetings. Social media – Facebook and Instagram ads, where to find the documents, when and where the meeting will be held. Letting the public know that the document is out for public review. I think it is a fun way to get more input from the public. Other methods - Newspaper ads, a legal ad, email addresses, where we distribute direct emails to our very long subscriber list as well as our local community groups. We look forward to the next meetings and seeing what those look like.
- ❖ Montross: This question is for Natalie. Could you clarify the ACR's position on the 2-mile restriction?

- ❖ Rutzell: I might have misstated. I thought there was a recommendation that we could keep the 2-mile restriction with dispersed headings.
- ❖ Montross: So, the ACR's position is dependent on either of those outcomes? The consideration of keeping 2-mile restriction with dispersion or removing the 2-mile restriction with dispersion will be in the airport's final decision and publication report. The TAC process has considered all of the ACR feedback that was relevant to 2-mile restriction, is that correct?
- ❖ Rutzell: I believe that they have it from the TAC. I don't remember going into much detail at the TAC sessions on where we stood on each one, other than here is our Slate.

Concurrent Path Review/Update

- ❖ Gagnon: This is something that was part of the Agenda at the last meeting, and these are 4 different Concurrent Paths that were discussed at the January meeting. We are sharing as a reminder because there have been so many proposals, the Slate items over the years, that sometimes we wonder where these items are at this point.
 - I will review the Concurrent Paths, and then we can see if Shane or the FAA has anything to weigh-in on about this. As a reminder of how this document is structured - Left side, 4 Concurrent Paths listed; right side we have what ACR recommendations or proposals are in this path. When we say Concurrent Paths, these are 4 different ways that your ACR recommendations or proposals are being addressed or could be addressed.
 - 1- Slate items that are currently being addressed by the FAA – Slate #3a – we will ask for update on that later in the meeting.
 - 2- Items that are still being evaluated/considered in the Part 150 process. That second row of data are those items as of the last report from the Part 150 team (as of mid-November) that are still in consideration. Two of the Slate items are listed there: (A) Removal of the 2-mile restriction on departure and (B) Utilizing divergent departure headings.
 - a. There are several things in this row that were not a part of the Slate but suggested or proposed by the ACR during the Part 150 process, and as of mid-November, they were still being evaluated.
 - 3- These are items needing to be addressed. This is an item that the FAA did not have an alternative for, but they encouraged the ACR to look for other alternatives for Slate #1a – Increased use of Continuous Descent Approach/Optimized Profile Descent. Several meetings ago, the Technical Working Group - Preston, Sayle and Phil Gussman - was given a task of trying to work with either TRACON or the Tower to see if there are any options here. Hence, Sayle's earlier question of Mark.
 - 4- Proposals or recommendations that ACR has made, and they have been excluded from the Part 150 process. These items are not in the works now, and the ACR will need to decide whether and how to proceed on these. Not everything you all have proposed has a clear path.
- ❖ Reindel: I want to comment on those still being evaluated in the Part 150. You will get to review once that document is published. At that point, you will be able to determine what is ultimately in the Part 150 and - as Amber stated - at that point, you could then determine which ones are not in, and move in other directions for those. I think you were alluding to when you would have another opportunity to comment, and that will be during that public comment period.
- ❖ Rutzell: Right, and my concern is if something is excluded from the draft, how do we get it back in?
- ❖ Reindel: You won't be getting it back in; you're going to have to find another way.

Gaining Information to Progress on Proposals – Part 150 Data/Analysis Outside the 65 DNL

- ❖ Rutzell: Recap - We have talked about the Concurrent Paths and where everything lands, but when we talk about the Part 150, you may recall that there were 2 main reasons the Part 150 was being revised. One, was to assess the ACR departure proposals that were in our original Slate. And the 2nd was to refresh any procedures that may need to be reviewed before the new runway. We were given the opportunity to add things above and beyond what was in the FAA Slate. We added a handful of new proposals focused more on operational improvements; for example, the 50/50 balance of North/South flow. These proposals did not get the analysis by HMMH and are hoping L&B will analyze.
 - I think there were 26 proposals in the Part 150, and 12 were accepted, 14 rejected. It was explained that the proposals are assessed on 2 key criteria – safety and feasibility, and no impact to 65 DNL. So, they have to be deemed safe and feasible first to move to see if there is impact to the 65 DNL.
 - ACR, we had one of our original Slate rejected, and a handful/majority of the additional proposals were also rejected. I think we have included these in Concurrent Path #4. *Correct.*

- In November, the ACR provided comments on the assessment, and we asked for clarification, specifically on those that were rejected for safety reasons, and we asked for more support. For those that had no impact on 65 DNL, we expressed our concern that we had initially thought that there was an opportunity to factor in the impact outside the 65 DNL. At the TAC meeting, there was talk that maybe it would be considered under certain considerations.
- Follow-up questions: Can we ask for any impact assessment that was performed by L&B for outside the 65 DNL, so we can see how these proposals have an impact on the greater community and the areas that we live in, so we can best support the proposals? The second request is to consider whether we can send a letter to the FAA to address 3 key requests:
 - Has the FAA reviewed our comments? I believe both Gaby and Amber have just addressed, but we can talk more about it.
 - Can the FAA help us better understand the reasons for the excluded proposals?
 - Then a more specific request around North and South flow operations to ask for a more detailed decision matrix on how they make those decisions.
- ❖ Gagnon: Let's take it in 2 buckets: One, the request about the Part 150, and the other is the request that is more related to the FAA. What you are looking at on the screen is a description of the ACR and what they are looking for, essentially if certain items are excluded from the Part 150, then the ACR has to decide whether they want to pursue these. What they are asking is whether the Part 150 team has any data on proposals – included or excluded – that they can share? The last data the ACR has is from mid-November. Is there any data on the proposed recommendations where they hit that second part of the process where they were analyzed for 65 DNL impact to share? When the analysis was done, were any of the flight tracks and the data that was analyzed, did it apply outside of the 65 DNL, and is that something that the ACR could look at for their evaluation on whether to move forward on these? This is potentially an informal request of the Part 150 team to see what data is available, or it could be a formal motion. Any questions on this request to get data? *None*. As a starting point, is what Natalie has conveyed as a request of the ACR a possibility?
- ❖ Leathers: The ones that would have made it through that process and evaluated to see if there is information, I am happy to share that information. In terms of what they evaluated in terms of number of impacts outside of the 65 DNL, that has not been done. That is not something they look at as for what this study is trying to do. If there was something that was on the cusp of something that did or did not have an impact, it would have been a request to look at things outside of that 65 – if there were other items that withheld influence - but those items were not looked at with these. We felt like we got very clear/quantified/objective results in order to move forward with what went through and what fell out.
- ❖ Gagnon: To clarify, did you say there is some data outside the 65 DNL?
- ❖ Leathers: There is data available, but analysis has not been done.
- ❖ Gagnon: So the data is available, but analysis of impact outside the 65 DNL is not available?
- ❖ Leather: Correct.
- ❖ Rutzell: Is that data something that we could have Gene look at, or have L&B do that analysis? It helps us as ACR members to understand the greater impact. I appreciate that the Part 150 guidelines have always been the 65 DNL, but for the community roundtable, we established a broader view of impact.
- ❖ Hagman: To clarify, are you looking for a ranking of all the data that did not make the Part 150 list? Since it did not make the list, are you looking for something like a heat chart?
- ❖ Rutzell: I was thinking more of the noise impact analysis outside of 65 DNL. For example, how is it going to impact Steele Creek?
- ❖ Hagman: The data is there, but it hasn't been analyzed, correct? *Correct*. To your point, if you were to pick a specific area, you would have to see where that ranking was and all the data that did not make it. If something was one point off of making the list vs. Matthews, who is 10 points off making the list. That's why I mentioned the heat chart. You would have to spend time and money to get that analyzed; almost a whole new analysis, and if they judged that it didn't make it on the list, it dropped off, correct?
- ❖ Leathers: It did not proceed forward. Nothing was ignored.
- ❖ Gagnon: Preston, by heat map, you're saying what areas outside the 65 DNL have a positive effect from this proposal vs. a negative effect and trying to figure out what that is?
- ❖ Hagman: Correct.
- ❖ Hair: To answer the initial question and to Amber's point, it did not get analyzed, and so it is outside the scope of what L&B has been working on, and we did not scope what that would look like - whether it is something L&B can support or whether you would need to use Gene or another consultant. I don't know if we can do something like that. I don't

know what it will entail. Since the time we talked about doing qualitative analysis about 6 months ago, we've concluded that it would not provide any benefit, so we did not proceed with HMMH doing qualitative analysis.

- ❖ Montross: Won't the Environmental Assessment do some of this work, if the recommendations are approved and moved toward the EA? Won't there be a more robust analysis that actually considers the headings, the placement of flight paths that could be helpful?
- ❖ Hair: Any sort of environmental analysis that would be necessary to be done on recommendation for changes included in the Part 150 would provide a broader base of analysis, but we are talking about just the stuff that is in the Part 150. Natalie, I think you are concerned with things that did not make it into the Part 150.
- ❖ Rutzell: I do not feel like I can talk to my neighbors with any positive information of what the Part 150 will do for us. We really do not know how we will be impacted. I do not feel prepared to talk to my community.
- ❖ Montross: Noise grid analysis that you did earlier, we do have initial analysis of these recommendations. Could that be presented in a way that connects back to what is in here?
- ❖ Reindel: To some extent. My example is what's still in the Part 150. I think what is still in is the removal of the 2-mile restriction with dispersed headings. We did analysis on those. We did not put those together, but we could do that. But again, the EA that would be required would put them together, as well. In terms of things that are not moving forward in the Part 150, I think it is on a case-by-case basis looking at each of those alternatives. The 50/50 North/South, that is pretty easy to show, but I don't think you will see much of a difference. You're at 60/40 now, and just changing 10% of that - you almost know what the results will be. I don't know whether our analysis would help the ACR proceed with those that are not in the Part 150.
- ❖ Montross: But Natalie is talking about what is in the Part 150.
- ❖ Rutzell: If it ends up being one of the proposals that we did do analysis on, we have a basis of what it was - almost 5 years ago. Population growth over the last 5 years.
- ❖ Reindel: Now, I better understand, so thanks for that. For things that are in the Part 150 and are being recommended, you want to know whether or not the ACR still backs these measures so you can go to your community and say if it is a benefit or not, which our analysis could help do. Once it is known, and it sounds like mid-summer, we will know which ones we might be able to do that analysis. For instance, if they put in the removal of the 2-mile restriction and show what dispersal headings they are recommending, but you need to be careful because it is just a recommendation. We could put that in and run it to see what it would do, but until they do the EA to implement those procedures but also design those procedures, you will not really know how they will be implemented. We need to keep following it, but you could have enough information with the Part 150 that you could recommend it still, or you may ask for us to provide further information to help determine, or you might just have to wait and see when they implement the procedure.
- ❖ Wright: About the excluded items, they seem somewhat related. Should we do the analysis there, and see what items might be combined or could be changed or modified? Of the ones that were accepted, did these address any of the concerns that you had?
- ❖ Pollack: I want to focus on the within the 65 DNL analysis. With respect to the rejected proposals, I am curious if analysis has been done on the within 65 DNL, and as I recall there were some different treatments; for example, there was a proposal that had to do with using the western runway for a limited number of takeoffs that was rejected because of double crossings. I seem to recall a 65 DNL analysis that was done and actually provided a benefit, which is unfortunate that it is rejected. Some other proposals, like the 50/50 distribution that we have been discussing, no information has been given as to within the 65 DNL. Has analysis been done? Has any within the 65 DNL analysis been done on the rejected proposals that has not been shared?
- ❖ Leathers: No.
- ❖ Pollack: Is there a reason some were analyzed and some not?
- ❖ Elizondo: If you remember our alternative evaluation process, the first question is "Is the alternative safe or feasible?," and if it was determined that it was not, it did not move forward to the question of whether it would reduce impact of the 65 DNL. You can refer back to the ACR memo that details that more clearly. The alternatives that were eliminated at that first step, we did not conduct quantitative analysis at all. All the data and results that we have shared is what we have available.
- ❖ Pollack: I think the western runway one was ruled out for safety, but I do think analysis was done within the 65 DNL. So that is not consistent with what we are saying here, but I may be recollecting incorrectly, and I'm curious.
- ❖ Elizondo: That alternative, yes, it was initially thought to be feasible. But when we looked at it from the 3rd step – does it have any operational impacts and concerns deemed insurmountable – when we dug deeper, we found operational issues that also led to safety and feasibility issues. It can be a little confusing. It did make it to the quantitative analysis but was stopped for operational impacts. For that reason, as you pointed out, the treatment of it was a little different.

- ❖ Pollack: Was it a safety issue or operational issue?
- ❖ Elizondo: I can expand on that. I want to pull up my notes on that.
- ❖ Hair: Gaby, I want to confirm that we all understand what we are talking about here. I believe we are talking about NA-D-4, which in the Memo that you helped author is on Page 6.
- ❖ Elizondo: Yes, that is correct. When we initially looked at that alternative, we saw there were no – at a high-level review – very obvious safety or feasibility issues. We then looked into whether it would reduce impacts within the 65 DNL and, as Jacob pointed out, it did reduce impact, so we moved onto the next question, which was operational impacts. We found that the runway does have the capability to be used for departures, but again due to its location to the terminal area, it is only used for departures under extenuating circumstances. Implementing the alternative would require routinely taxiing across 2 active runways (Center and New Runways), which reduces operational efficiency. There are limited crossing locations. It would result in increased taxiing, and it would result in delay, as well. This was better understood when looking at it from an operational perspective.
- ❖ Gagnon: I appreciate the questions and the detailed response. That is an example of the clarity the ACR is wanting on the recommendations that have been excluded. Without diving deeper into any one proposal, Natalie, in terms of the data request of the Part 150 Team, is that something that you want to see if the ACR supports it, or do you want to move to the next agenda item?
- ❖ Rutzell: I don't know if we can do anything more now. There is data available, but it needs to be analyzed.
- ❖ Wright: It sounds like analysis happened on some of these items before they were rejected, but we don't know which ones. Jacob just brought up NA-D-4; it was a cursory assessment; there was some analysis. It seems to me that that information might be helpful so we are not going back and looking at items that we should just forget. If it is not going to work, we should not waste time resubmitting it. We want to work on things that have potential. Something very specific was outlined by Gaby with NA-D-4, and I think we need to know other ones similar to that. I think that is a legitimate request.
- ❖ Reindel: I think Amber alluded to it earlier. The memorandum that L&B wrote with CLT, everything that was mentioned on NA-D-4 is actually in that memo.
- ❖ Gagnon: That has been shared at least 2-3 times with the ACR. The Part 150 Team's response document has been sent out and reviewed. I think Thelma is talking about yes, there is analysis that has been done within the 65 DNL, just to be clear about that. What about outside the 65 DNL for those that are included, and what is going to be the effect on the residents outside the 65 DNL? For those that were excluded, are any of those good candidates for the ACR to move forward with in some other manner?

Gaining Information to Progress on Proposals – FAA Requests

- ❖ Rutzell: First Motion – We're considering whether to draft a letter to the FAA. In that letter, we want to ask the FAA if they have reviewed our comments and the response from the airport and L&B. Amber and Gaby have indicated that yes, the FAA has reviewed all our comments and the response to those comments. Do we still need to include this in a letter to the FAA?
- ❖ Gagnon: There has been discussion between the Chair, Vice Chair and some of the Project Team conversations about trying to get information and clarity on several different items. One thought was having a formal request for information of the FAA, which you have done multiple times over the years. These on the screen are 4 motions –the fourth being enabling the Chair and potentially the Vice Chair to craft a letter. Let's look at these 4 independently, and see which motions you want to pass to say what do you or do not want to include in a written request of the FAA. We can see if anyone wants to make the motion, and then go through the process.
- ❖ Pollack: With respect to the letter, I think it would be a good idea to send it, and the purpose of the letter is to make sure that the ACR is officially on record of asking the FAA and providing a copy of the comments we have given to the follow-up comments after the initial set of exclusions and the explanation given, where we asked questions, we made some points. It is still unclear to me. I know it was said that these comments were discussed at the FAA, but I don't know if the actual copies of what we sent were actually shared, etc. I think it is a good idea to send this so there is an official record of our comments to the FAA. I do think that we make valid comments and points. If I am understanding correctly, it seems that the airport is not intending to respond to any of our questions or points to clarify. For example, earlier in talking about taking off on the west runway, the way it was described is that it was excluded for safety reasons, but when we dive into the answers, we find out that operational issues come in, not safety. I am not minimizing these. My point is that the explanation given to the ACR was safety, and now we are learning that it was a lot of operational considerations. I don't think we fully understand. I wonder how many operational considerations came into play with some of the other proposals. I've said on the 50/50, the explanation given is that weather is the determination. It is hard to believe that. My takeaway - Is the FAA actually looking at this? What I am taking away is

that the airport has a lot of control of this process, and they take what they want and throw out what they don't. Is there someone reviewing this? Are they thoughtful answers that respond to the questions, and are they making sure that noise is being considered appropriately and not being thrown out just because there is an operational issue? Again, operations might be important, but there has to be a tradeoff. How are the tradeoffs being made?

- ❖ Gagnon: Thanks, Jacob. To make sure I'm clear, it seemed like there are two pieces to what you are asking about. One, confirming FAA review in some documented manner, and the second, really gets at Motion #2, which is asking about the excluded proposals. You are welcome to make Motion #1, if you'd like.
- ❖ Pollack: I would like to make the Motion to send the letter, if that's what you're asking.
- ❖ Rutzell: This Motion is asking to confirm that the FAA has reviewed the ACR's comments and the airport and L&B's response.
- ❖ Gagnon: Jacob, are you talking about emails or other comments that were made outside of the formal process?
- ❖ Pollack: Yes, I am talking about the email response that we sent. When the airport excluded all the proposals, the email was sent that approved some of the explanations and pointed out some inconsistencies. That is the comments I would like to make sure the FAA are seeing. There has been no response to that.
- ❖ Gagnon: Are you modifying Motion #1?
- ❖ Pollack: When we refer to the ACR's comments, does that include our email comments after the exclusions?
- ❖ Rutzell: I would have to go back to the emails. I know that we have the draft and the actual document that summarized our comments. I believe that is what I was referencing when we say the ACR's comments. Not an informal email.
- ❖ Gagnon: This is talking about the formal ACR response, not informal emails that may have been sent outside the formal process. If you want, you can add that into the Motion and see if there is a second.
- ❖ Pollack: When were those comments sent, what time period?
- ❖ Gagnon: To clarify, the public meetings and TAC meetings were held in mid-November, the ACR responded with a letter to the Part 150 Team in December, Part 150 Team responded to the formal ACR's set of questions in January, and that is the document that Natalie was referencing earlier that was sent back out to the ACR a couple of times.
- ❖ Pollack: Then their response in January came out, and I think there was some correspondence then with some emails that went around. It is those emails that I am focused on. I would like to modify the motion to include whether those comments have been shared with the FAA, because those were pointing out the logical inconsistencies and questions around what was being sent back to us.
- ❖ Gagnon: I can reword this to say what Jacob says.
- ❖ Pollack: Motion #1: *To ask who within the FAA has reviewed (A) The ACR's comments in response to information provided to the TAC and in Public Meetings in November as well as (B) The Part 150 Team's response to the ACR's comments. ACR comments includes informal correspondences that have been shared with CLT and/or Part 150 team members outside of the formal process.*
- ❖ Loflin: Second.
- ❖ Rutzell: My only point is that L&B and Amber have indicated that they have communicated our comments to the FAA.
- ❖ Reindel: Did we ask, because this is new information, if the Part 150 team forwarded those emails to the FAA? What is the point of asking the FAA if they reviewed if they weren't sent?
- ❖ Leathers: Yes, we have shared everything with the FAA. That is why the memo was put together. It fully goes through all those items. It does talk about NA-D-4 and the exact type of scenario that played out, and it does that for each of the alternatives. I encourage you to put this letter together if you feel like you are not getting that reassurance from the airport.
- ❖ Rutzell: All in favor say Yes. *6 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions. Motion #1 passed.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Motion #2: *To ask what the FAA can do to ensure the ACR has a more specific understanding of the analysis and rationale used for exclusions of its proposals submitted through the Part 150 process.* Does anyone want to make this motion?
- ❖ Wright: I don't think we need a motion. Now that I have read the email explaining why the exclusions were made, I don't know what the purpose is. I think it was a good review. I don't see how this could add any benefit. *Nobody made the Motion.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Motion #3: *To request documentation that the FAA utilizes to guide decision-making for determining North v. South Flow for a given day at CLT. Examples could include a matrix or decision-making table with criteria noted.*
 - This came out of the Local Operations Project Team. I know that you have made requests twice. This is looking more at documentation rather than a response to your questions. Would anyone like to make that motion?
- ❖ Pollack: *Makes Motion #3. Wright seconded.*

- ❖ Rutzell: Any discussion?
- ❖ Libby: If you want this information, there is a process – a FOIA request.
- ❖ Gagnon: I know that the ACR has made a FOIA request in the past for some Tower Orders, so thank you for that. You could still make the motion; the process would be a FOIA request.
- ❖ Rutzell: *Asking for a vote. Each member polled. All in favor. Motion passed.*
- ❖ Gagnon: The fourth Motion: Authorization of Chair/Vice Chair to Craft/Send a Letter to the FAA. You have done this multiple times in the past.
 - The Motion: *To authorize the Chair to develop a letter with the approved Motion(s) and submit it on behalf of the ACR to the FAA.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Is there a Motion? *Wright made motion, Loflin 2nd; any discussion?*
- ❖ Hagman: Draft the letter, and circulate it through email.
- ❖ Rutzell: Yes, I think we will circulate it via email.
- ❖ Washington: Based on the analysis that is supposed to be available by next summer, this is not going to make that cutoff by then. Are we aware of that?
- ❖ Rutzell: The letter should go out before we get a response from L&B. They are saying late summer, and I think we can draft something.
- ❖ Hagman: Our next meeting is July, if we circulate that draft, we can say yes to it in July, and send it.
- ❖ Rutzell: Are you talking about getting the response?
- ❖ Washington: We will not have their response until after the analysis comes out, correct?
- ❖ Rutzell: The North/South Balance proposal was rejected. This is just for more transparency for the ACR.
- ❖ Gagnon: Any other discussion? *None.*
- ❖ Rutzell: All in favor? *Yes (via acclimation). Motion passes.*

Updates from Project Teams

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 8 in the handout. This is the quarterly ACR Newsletter – has lots of information with ACR members and other stakeholders. Please review, if you haven't already. A couple of Project Team updates:
 - Community Engagement Project Team (CEPT) – There have been conversations about continuing to share collateral pieces on the ACR, how to complain, the Part 150. There is a desire to elevate the Part 150 discussion and the promotion around the April timeline, which is now.
 - Local Operations/Improvement Project Team (LOIPT) – We've had excellent participation at the two meetings between the January and April ACR meetings. They talked about the TRACON and Tower Tours, they talked about the Technical Working Group where Preston, Sayle, and Phil are looking to engage TRACON. They looked at their focus on local operations, adherence monitoring. There was some discussion about the new Concord airport carrier and discussion about Part 150 Team's response to the ACR's comments.
- ❖ Hagman: Government Engagement Project Team (GEPT) – I presented at the Charlotte City Council meeting. It was a brief 3 minutes. The goal is to make sure that we told the City Council that there would be delay on the Part 150. They have the Part 150 information, and they seemed receptive to it. We are keeping it in front of the Council.
- ❖ Gagnon: Preston has presented two times at Charlotte City Council. Dusty and Phil have also offered to speak to the City Council at some point. If anyone wants to volunteer to present, Preston has good pointers and has great lessons learned.
- ❖ Montross: If you have a chance to watch the video from Monday's City Council meeting where the airport presented their budget, there also were questions about the Part 150 and good dialogue on Council.
- ❖ Gagnon: In terms of next steps, the GEPT has drafted a letter that can go to Council members as a follow-up to Preston's talk. Once the GEPT refines this, it will be shared with the ACR. You can send it out to your representatives.

CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations

- ❖ Hair: We continue to see operations exceed any of our past history. On Thursday before Easter/Spring Break, we had our highest single-day TSA throughput at 43,800 of your neighbors going through TSA Checkpoints. On Good Friday, we had our 2nd busiest day ever for local passengers (42,600). We expect that those records will be broken this summer. Part of that is driven by Tracy and AA – On Thursday/Friday, AA had their all-time high passenger enplanements, as well. Incredible growth and demand for our airport and facilities. Concourse A Phase 2 expansion is progressing very well. Expect them to be delivered on schedule. Terminal lobby expansion is going well. Nice to see new infrastructure

to meet the demands of local traveling public. There is also a lot of earth being moved around. We are looking to open up the new overlook - early July - before the next ACR meeting.

- ❖ Reese: Want to debut the new style of reporting that we're going to use on the CLT website. Under Noise Reporting, you'll find these new noise reports. Airport Flow Report generated by Dan Gardon. It shows, by individual runway, North v. South flow. You can see runway by runway, exactly how many aircraft are taking off and departing, and you can see on the right side, the overall breakdown. For March, we see Northbound traffic was 64.9%, Southbound traffic 35.1%. I encourage you to go online and look at January and February. We have also supplied the past 5 years. The website shows yearly changes. On the second page of the report, it gives the Flow Per Runway Pairing. On the monthly reports it gives you day-by-day breakdown. These reports were generated for transparency/inclusivity.
 - Noise Complaint reporting- March - 39 households made 1982 complaints. The Top 25 reporting households generated 93.4% (1851) of the monthly total of complaints. Even though the number of complaints went up, we saw a reduction in the number of households. You can see the individual zip codes: 28278 – Steele Creek – had the most with 15, and you can see the impact in different areas. Second page gives you a Top 25 complainant ranking. This gives an idea of which folks and where they are making the complaints. For example, we had one person in Lancaster who generated 703 complaints. Next page – interesting: In Indian Trail, there is one individual who is responsible for 133 complaints. This person is talking about planes that are at 11,000 feet.
 - Next page - Heat map – shows 2 different things. It shows which zip codes are more involved in terms of complaints. The darker the blue, more folks are complaining within that zip code. The orange circles are representative of individual complainants. If the orange is bigger and larger, that means that one person is complaining a lot. If you see darker blue, that means that the community has more complainants within that location. A quick, easy reference. These reports are available on the CLT website.
- ❖ Pollack: I really appreciate the flow information, as presented. It is very clear and helpful. Thank you.

FAA Update on Implementation Process for Alternative Recommendation #3a

- ❖ Gagnon: The FAA is in the process of implementing this alternative recommendation that was a part of the ACR Slate. It is focused on raising 7 waypoints 1,000 feet.
- ❖ Jackson: We updated that one of the waypoints was going to be raised 1000 feet, and then we said that all 5 waypoints were going to be raised 1000 feet. This is the first time I am hearing 7. I confirmed 5 before the meeting – 4 at the corners of the airport. They are scheduled to be raised next month.
- ❖ Gagnon: The request initially from the ACR was to take the 2 waypoints proposed by the ACR, CAATT and EPAYE, which are on the East side of the airport, and raise them 1000 feet. The FAA came back and identified 5 additional waypoints, largely to the west of the airport, for a total of 7.
- ❖ Jackson: That may be it – those 2 plus the other 5. If that is the case, it is my current understanding that all the waypoints will be raised 1000 feet by end of next month.
- ❖ Gagnon: Very good news. Thanks, Shane.

Unfinished Business

- ❖ Gagnon: The last 2 pages of the handout are Requests for Actions and Motions from last meeting. You all were asked for input from 2 Project Teams, you completed a survey and provided input on items. You asked for feedback from the Part 150 Team on your ACR Response Document, and soon after the January meeting, you received that document from L&B and the Part 150 Team that we have talked about today. You requested HMMH Analysis of proposals likely to pass the Part 150 evaluations; that has not been acted on at this point, because there has not been an update since the November meetings on what is or is not excluded. And then support in determining how to address the ACR proposals excluded from the Part 150 process - we had some conversation on that today. You were seeking information on those excluded items to determine which ones you may want to move forward.
- ❖ Rutzell: Does anyone have any New Business to discuss? *No.*

Adjourn

- ❖ Rutzell: Is there a motion to adjourn?
- ❖ *Wright motioned to adjourn. Washington seconded, all in favor.*
- ❖ Meeting adjourned at 8:04 pm