

# Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

## Unapproved Summary Minutes: October 16, 2024

### Attendees

Phillip Gussman, Vice Chair, City 1  
Nakia Savage, City 3  
Michael Faust, City 4  
Sayle Brown, Cornelius  
Sherry Washington, County 4  
Mark Loflin, County 6  
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg  
Jacob Pollack, York  
Diane Dasher, York

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)  
Bob Mentzer, HMMH (Technical Consultant)  
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)  
Matt Reese, CLT  
Kevin Hennessey, CLT  
Amber Leathers, CLT  
Chris Poore, CLT  
Pearlis Johnson, FAA  
Tracy Montross, American Airlines  
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)  
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

### Summary Minutes

#### Open the Meeting

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:01 PM
- ❖ Gussman: Call the Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable October 16, 2024 meeting to order. Welcome. *Note the ACR Mission:*
  - **Airport Community Roundtable Mission Statement:** *To provide the City of Charlotte Aviation Department (Airport) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) with broad-based community input into airport-related noise impacts and to find, where possible, practical solutions and recommendations for the FAA to consider when determining aircraft operating procedures at Charlotte Douglas International Airport.*
- ❖ Gagnon: *Facilitated introductions: ACR, CLT, FAA, HMMH, AA, CSS.*
- ❖ Wright: Do we have a quorum?
- ❖ Gagnon: Yes. We have 9 members present, 7 in person and 2 online, and 6 is a quorum. *Went over logistics of the meeting.* If participating in Teams, use the “raise the hand” function. CLT will monitor and let us know you would like to speak. Feel free to use the chat. It will be saved, and the meeting is recorded. When participating, please say your name before speaking. We are expected to go for 2 hours today.
  - Transitioning now to handout document. It is a longer document than normal. Focus on the page numbers in the right upper corner. This document is exactly what was emailed to you previously.
  - *Went through Agenda.* We will have a public speaker, updates on Part 150, the ACR as a group will talk about your approach to engaging City Council regarding the Part 150, Project Team updates. CLT and FAA updates, and then Additional Business.
- ❖ Gagnon: Ground Rules: Healthy meetings – focused on the issues and solutions, not taking or making things personal. Productive – stay on task, make brief points. Effective in making noise improvement in our area.
- ❖ Gussman: Is there a motion to approve the July Minutes? *Wright motioned. Loflin seconded. All in favor. Minutes approved.*

## **Review Public Input**

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 5 in handout – Addressing the ACR - *Went over guidelines for public speakers: 3 minutes to speak. If more time needed, it is up to the Vice Chair. ACR may or may not respond at time of meeting.*
  - The following citizen addressed the ACR:
    - Jason Naddell
- ❖ Loflin: We have so many vacancies, and here we have a volunteer. Is there a way to get him on here?
- ❖ Hair: I appreciate that, Mark. We have received applications and have them in process now. Hope to have an update for you at the January meeting.

## **Update on the Part 150/TAC and Public Meetings - Receive Update on Progress**

- ❖ Hair: It is continuing on schedule. We have gotten the draft noise exposure maps and noise compatibility program – that was all published since our last meeting, published in August. We did public hearings and meetings in September. It was good to see so many of you all there. We – through our consultants – accepted comments through October 4. All of those comments have been compiled and were shared this afternoon with airport senior leadership. The consultant is making sure that they have everything in the right format. A lot of raw comments. It is not cleaned up yet. Trying to get this ready so we can brief City Council members.
  - Looking for approval of submittal on the final document at the Monday, December 9 City Council meeting. We have about 6 weeks to get the comments cleaned up, get it in a final document form; we want to start briefing and having small group conversations with Council. We hope to have something in the next couple of weeks so they can show Council before needing approval. City Council does not like to get the document on Friday and be asked to approve on Monday. As they see fit, they can get follow-up from stakeholders like yourself, AA, etc. From Council approval, it will go to FAA, and then it runs on the FAA schedule. I did see your comments in the draft. Thank you for that.
- ❖ Wright: I was not able to attend. How were the numbers at the events?
- ❖ Hair: Probably over 20 each night.
- ❖ Poore: 57 who attended total.
- ❖ Hair: There were 81 comments total.
- ❖ Pollack: Of the 57, how many were ACR members?
- ❖ Poore: I don't have the breakdown. I do not know that.
- ❖ Pollack: Will those comments be public?
- ❖ Hair: They will be public when the final document is compiled. They will be included verbatim in the final document, when it is published.
- ❖ Pollack: Does FAA review those?
- ❖ Hair: Yes. A key part of the FAA review process is – 1) Did you follow the process? Yes. 2) Did you include everyone that should have been included in that process? We think we can answer 'yes' on that. 3) Are the comments received incorporated, acknowledged in that final document, and that is where it can stretch out in the review process, but that is part of the process. The FAA will review all of the comments and ensure that they are incorporated and acknowledged in the final document.
- ❖ Gagnon: Other questions? *None.*

## **Develop Approach to City Council and Community Engagement**

- ❖ Gussman: Thanks for all that submitted comments. I hope that the document that we created did a good job of addressing many of our concerns. I know that each of us has specific, individual concerns that I want to make sure are reflected in the document. Next step for us is how we can best represent our collaborative interest and effort on the City being informed about how the Part 150 process went. Two of our Slate items are in it, giving the best opportunity to move forward. At the same time, there are many of us that thought things could be better, and that is what the comments were intended to address.
  - Next step is to determine how we can best represent our effort and have an impact. We have created a document – initial response – and everyone should have seen that. I have created a document with a few talking points. We may look at that later.

- With that said, this is going to take some work and extra effort by the ACR. We are going to have to try and get in front of elected officials as well as communicate with the public. We want to share what we think works well, the successes that we have seen. It is also a time to highlight who we are and what we are doing and how we think we can help improve airport noise impacts. I would like to open it up for some brainstorming, with the assumption that we'll need a couple of speakers to speak at City Council, may need someone to talk with media. We'll need people to reach out to your elected officials. This is not a simple process. Our elected officials are going to need more than a document to make an informed decision.
- ❖ Wright: Earlier in the year or last year, we had designed a letter, and my representative was Victoria Watlington. I sent the letter, and she responded back that she was aware of the ACR. My comment is that I am not sure that we need to convince City Council because I think they will rubber stamp anything that the airport or FAA says. I don't believe that they are getting enough complaints to have any concern about the airport noise because it is bringing in revenue and jobs. I think they will rubber stamp the Part 150.
- ❖ Pollack: I do not know if the ACR has a duty to reach out to Council. Personally, I did not find the Part 150 process to be a very open and transparent one. I was very disappointed in the way that a lot of our measures were casually dismissed with explanations that were not convincing. Even by appearing, we are endorsing it, even if parts of it you do not approve. I feel like we did not get much. We did not get constraints; they removed constraints. I would not give it any indication of my approval by showing up.
- ❖ Gussman: Anyone else have comments?
- ❖ Brown: I think they will pass it. We were a part of the process, we have done studies, we have made comments and suggestions. I feel like the FAA comes along and gives us the same answers for the last 4 years. Do we have any leverage?
- ❖ Gussman: I will speak to that. The only clear intersection with the political part of the Part 150 is through our elected representatives on City Council. Is it a louder comment to make by not commenting, addressing or participating? That may be true. But that also means we won't have a voice. I hear you saying that our voices may not be heard anyway - I appreciate and respect that perspective, definitely. I do know that if you can get a seat at the table and address the issues from our perspective, which I think is different than CLT's and Landrum and Brown's, it is the only way baked into the process for us to have an impact. I'm reluctant to say we will completely give up on addressing City Council, but if that is the ACR's intent, I would probably ask for someone to make a motion that we are not going to participate in the outreach to City Council.
- ❖ Wright: Jacob presented a different thought process than what I was thinking. It does imply that we are in favor, and we have pages of our questions about the Part 150. We are not trying to stop the growth that is happening; we are concerned that the growth that is happening has noise impacts on the community; there are 621 residents in the contour, and we have over 1 million – I don't know how many there are – that are not in the contour. I am not sure what would be the purpose with us engaging with City Council.
- ❖ Washington: Is it possible that the City Council would persuade FAA and airport stakeholders to change their mind?
- ❖ Gussman: They would not have any input directly with the FAA. Theoretically this could make noise abatement procedures more of an interest at the City level. I think that is a longshot, but what else are we doing with Council if not that.
- ❖ Pollack: The Council has to approve the Part 150, so hypothetically if you persuaded, they could reject, then they are back to the drawing board. I am concerned that often the ACR's purpose is to give the appearance of community involvement in the process to make it look good. But in reality, it does not produce a lot in terms of changes. The question is, if you are going to engage with Council, are we taking a position? Do we support it, or not support it?
- ❖ Hair: City Council members are our bosses. We are a department of the City of Charlotte. We have to receive Council approval for any action. Submitting a document like this to the FAA requires that City Council approve us to submit that action. That is what we are going to be asking Council to do.
- ❖ Faust: I want to support what Jacob said.
- ❖ Loflin: Are we in a position to educate Council as to what this does and doesn't do? Are they aware that some noise is going to shift?

- ❖ Gussman: This portion of the meeting was to debate this and how we want to move forward. We have no motion at this point. What I was proposing is that we pattern after our comments, which were – ‘yes, thank you for the things that you did. These are the things that we found that are wrong with the process, things that did not come through for us. I felt that this was a way to highlight to City Council that we need to do more than just for the 65 DNL.’ If that is not what everyone agrees with, that’s fine. What I’m hearing is “We don’t participate, in protest?” Is that accurate? Or just don’t say anything?
- ❖ Pollack: I’m not saying don’t participate in protest. I don’t think we go to Council to say “you guys need to decide this or that.” They are not educated. I think they are looking to us since we’re involved in the process. So, if you are going to talk to them, you have to have a position. They did not only not analyze things that were outside the DNL, but there were proposals that were positive inside the DNL that they rejected. We proposed, and they rejected. There were proposals that they did not even assess the noise effect inside the DNL. I am suspicious. I believe that if it was negative inside the DNL, we would hear that. Maybe I’m wrong. I would like to know the analyses of some of those proposals. I was not convinced with their explanations.
- ❖ Dasher: I agree, I’m not sure that they really care what we think. But as a former board member, it helps for people to see us, to know we’re there. They would look at us as constituents, and they know that we’re watching them at that point. Just having an occasional presence at meetings is important, it would be helpful.
- ❖ Gussman: Our Government Engagement Team has made 3 meetings this year. We made presentations at City Council. I view this as a continuation of that. How do we want to advance through this item?
- ❖ Brown: Are we going to submit these questions (*referring to the Local Operations Team questions*) to the FAA?
- ❖ Gagnon: That’s another part of the Agenda. What I am hearing – Some are saying “What is the benefit of talking to Council about how it relates to the Part 150?” Some of the comments are about the 621 that Thelma brought up, concerns with how the analyses are done. Are those points beneficial to highlight for Council? If so, then you would want to speak with Council, communicate with them 1-on-1 or in some other form. If you don’t think it is important for them to know this information, then you would not. Diane – who talked about this from the perspective of someone who was in a Council-type position – mentioned that it is valuable to know that people are watching you. Basically, if you think it beneficial for your voice to be heard in front of the Council, even if you don’t think it will affect their vote on the Part 150 - that’s what you need to decide – the value of having that voice, even if you don’t think it would change their vote on the Part 150.
- ❖ Pollack: Is it necessary to make a plan right here and now?
- ❖ Gussman: We have 6 weeks. We are not meeting again in person until then. We could certainly table this and hand it to Government Engagement Team. In order for us to carry it as from the ACR, we would have to hold a vote. To hold a vote outside the meeting, a lot of things have to be considered. By making a decision at least on a position paper or course of action tonight, we would be able to put it into play.
- ❖ Faust: I think you are both right. I think we should vote, and I think all our concerns should be voiced. Fairly short and simple, a written statement to Council. Then we have record of how we feel. That seems to me to be our best role as we don’t have any power.
- ❖ Gagnon: Sounds like the group could vote to craft a statement or short-form talking points that could be conveyed to Council. What those are, how they would be delivered, could be determined later. At least you all are approving a process to identify your position or key points and the specifics of which you all would craft, refine, and deliver over the next few weeks.
- ❖ Faust: Yes, I think that works great. Just make the decision to do that, if that’s what we want to do. I hear a lot of people not thrilled, so that could be crafted into a short point-by-point statement. Have people give input via e-mail or other means.
- ❖ Gagnon: I am crafting a motion (*on the computer screen*) – Michael does this convey what you are saying?
  - **Motion:** To craft talking points that convey the overall perspectives of ACR members, with specific points and methods of delivering the message to be determined prior to the formal presentation of the Part 150 to Charlotte City Council.
- ❖ Faust: Yes.

- ❖ Gussman: So, we are not necessarily drafting an approach to reach out, but we would still try to create that “talking point” document or “position” document. I did draft up with a little bit of explaining what the process was; it’s near our comments document – it brings up some specific things that we are not happy about. It might be that we could use that as a starting point. I am volunteering that as a way to get that ball rolling. Obviously, this is offline if we get this motion passed.
- ❖ Wright: Are we talking about a motion that has not been made? We need to make the motion so we can have questions and comments about it.
- ❖ Faust: I make the motion as it is presented on the screen – *Loflin seconded*.
- ❖ Gussman: Any discussion?
- ❖ Wright: Preston had a presentation that was an introduction to the Part 150. In the course of the last 7 months, we are finding out that we are not happy with the result, and this is why. So, the Council asks “what do you want us to do?”
- ❖ Gagnon: This goes back to the point earlier that it sounds like several of you all have the assumption that nothing will change the vote, so what are the other benefits of presenting to Council? Is it raising awareness of the noise issue, or raising awareness of the ACR? Are there other things that make it worth having these points? Preston would probably be good to speak to that, since he presented twice, but he’s obviously not here this evening.
- ❖ Faust: It might be that the ACR is doing work that is not being considered. Making proposals that are not being considered. That might be the message we are trying to send.
- ❖ Gagnon: Do you mean at the Council level?
- ❖ Faust: Correct. Somebody was talking earlier about how the Council is looking to us to educate them, but maybe we need to educate them that the process was not very good, and we don’t feel like what we do is being listened to.
- ❖ Brown: Some of the bullet points that we presented to the Part 150, they are not being addressed. They are just passing them over, not giving us an answer.
- ❖ Faust: How can we educate them if they are not addressing what we proposed or asked about? It makes it hard if that is what Council is looking to us to do.
- ❖ Montross: I will try to summarize my concerns with some of what I’m hearing. Which is that 2 of the recommendations that this group spent 3 years and HMMH consultant money, public money, to assess, analyze, evaluate recommendations. You have 2 Slate recommendations included in the Part 150. And you say in the comments that you support them. They were analyzed at length; they were included in your reports. They are a part of the formal Slate of recommendations to the FAA. The other recommendations that came up over the last 2 years were not sufficiently analyzed by this group, by HMMH, without the length of analysis as done with the other two. As a reminder, the Part 150 is specific to the 65 DNL and will consider proposals that affect that perimeter. We knew that going into it. You spent time, you spent resources and a lot of energy making recommendations that are included in the report, including effect outside the 65 DNL. If I was on Council and I wondered why 6 years of time had gone by, and you have this outcome, and the Part 150 and the recommendations that were analyzed, money was spent, I would really wonder about the relevancy of this body. Whether or not to continue this work. If you cannot make everyone happy, why continue doing it? I am a little frustrated. I have been sitting with you all since 2017. I think you have done incredible work, facilitated well. You have recommendations in here that will create dispersion and improved noise for communities outside the 65 DNL. That is something to celebrate and recognize. Recommendation #3 is another reason to celebrate, and FAA took time and resources into that. That reflects on your good work. I would really caution about not participating in the process, not representing what you have done because it could call in the question as to what the point of the ACR is. I don’t want that to happen. I hope that is helpful - one perspective. Happy to support you where you need.
- ❖ Gussman: Any other discussion?
- ❖ Brown: Thank you, Tracy. And you are correct. Some of the things that we put into the Part 150 were already studied during our Slate. We tried to put them back in there to try to get them through, so we were not just throwing those things against the wall. A lot of that had already been studied.

- ❖ Montross: We know the 65 DNL – they either stay in or stay out. I don't think anyone is saying that those other factors cannot be separately considered if prioritized for FAA resources' evaluation. The Part 150 was specific to departure procedures that could be justified to make changes in the 65 DNL.
- ❖ Gagnon: *Stated the motion.*
  - **Motion:** To craft talking points that convey the overall perspectives of ACR members, with specific points and methods of delivering the message to be determined prior to the formal presentation of the Part 150 to Charlotte City Council.
- ❖ Gussman: [*Asking of Michael Faust*] Could we make an amendment that we use the starting point of the comments that we have already submitted? So, we have a place to begin.
- ❖ Wright: I don't think we need to modify the motion. It doesn't tell us how to do it, it just says "to craft" talking points.
- ❖ Gussman: Okay. Just looking for ways to streamline, that's all.
- ❖ Faust: I would not be opposed to what you are talking about – the comments we have already, right? Pages 7 and 8, right?
- ❖ Gussman: Right, just because they are already on record.
- ❖ Montross: For what it is worth, when Council members ask me, I'm basing my comments on the comments that were submitted publicly for the Part 150. You could print this and say "this is where we stand." That could stand for your response. They are going to get it at some level in the document. You can add context to the work that you have done here. Maybe an introduction letter, talking points statement. Submitting the comments is sufficient.
- ❖ Gagnon: Question for CLT to clarify - When the Council gets the Part 150, will they get all the comments?
- ❖ Hair: Yes, they will get that exact document that you all submitted in the final version.
- ❖ Gagnon: The individual members who also submitted their comments, they will also be in that document? *Yes.*
- ❖ Gussman: Everything that we have submitted as comments will be in front of City Council. It's important - in my experience - to highlight the comments outside of just a big document, and that was the intent of this process. I think we are headed there.
- ❖ Loflin: Just to clarify, the ACR is not taking the position that we support the Part 150 100%?
- ❖ Hair: To affirm on that, Mark – This is my take on what you all submitted. You all submitted a nuanced response. "We don't love this; we were a part of this". That's how I read it.
- ❖ Pollack: We are not amending the motion? Correct? *Correct.* In terms of the letter that was crafted, it was supportive of the Part 150. I think any Council member that sees that letter will review that as a supportive letter.
- ❖ Wright: No, we are crafting an additional letter. We are doing something that will highlight concerns in addition to what we already have; we're not just giving that letter.
- ❖ Faust: I think we can use parts of the letter. I would not want to submit something that looks like a complete backing, if we think it will be perceived as that.
- ❖ Gagnon: Specific tone and content, you will have some time to develop.
- ❖ Gussman: *Read the motion.*
  - **Motion:** To craft talking points that convey the overall perspectives of ACR members, with specific points and methods of delivering the message to be determined prior to the formal presentation of the Part 150 to Charlotte City Council.
- ❖ Gussman: All in favor? *All approved.* It passes unanimously. We will move forward with development. I encourage everyone to participate in this process. We will be reaching out following the meeting.
- ❖ Gagnon: It could be early next week before you hear something formal from us.
- ❖ Hennessey: As we talk through our debrief, we need to talk about quorum.
- ❖ Pollack: Committee members' comments should be pooled and distributed.
- ❖ Gagnon: I think Jacob is referring to people who submitted their own individual comments. If anyone submitted individual comments, if I was not copied on that, please send them to me so I can make sure that we get that to all.

## Updates from Project Teams

- ❖ Gagnon: Government Engagement Project Team – that was covered in the prior Agenda item. Community Engagement Project Team - they met a couple of times. We are going to address some community engagement in conjunction with government engagement, noting that there has been collateral developed around the Part 150, getting information out to the community.
- ❖ Gussman: I like to highlight when people get in front of the community. Does anyone have anything they want to share?
- ❖ Brown: I shared information with the head of our HOA at the Peninsula.
- ❖ Washington: I am vice president of our homeowners association. I have discussed the Part 150, and all residents have complaint information.
- ❖ Gussman: Talking in our communities is a key way to get the word out on us, noise, complaints since that's what CLT is looking at.
- ❖ Gagnon: Local Ops Team – since July, they have requested information from you all in terms of your thoughts about the FAA's response to the ACR's FOIA request about North Flow v. South Flow. That group (Thelma, Sayle, Jacob, Sam, Nakia) put together a document in the handout on pages 9-11. Jacob will give an update.
- ❖ Pollack: This document represents reaction to various materials we got when we submitted the FOIA request. Very informative. After reading them, we came up with follow-up questions. Page 10 in handout, Item 1 – Regarding FAA documents titled Section 5...we have the following questions – Can you share the procedure or protocol book from which Sections 5 and 6 are taken? Are they airport manuals or ATC manuals? And how are amendments to the Sections made if we want to make changes to the protocol?
- ❖ Gagnon: If you want to touch on a couple more that would be great.
- ❖ Faust: I read the whole thing. We don't need to go through every one. I love it.
- ❖ Pollack: Section 5 – talks about flow. *Went over some of the questions in the document.* It references calm wind runways, Runway Use Program. We are asking how noise plays a role. Does it play a role? Section 6 - this one lays out how the runways are used. Note on page 10 the questions we have. Who is Tower OS? Item 4 – this deals with Runway 23, which is decommissioned. It's a document from 2013. This document says it is an "informal" noise abatement program. What is difference between informal and formal? Note the other questions on page 10.
- ❖ Gagnon: A lot of the questions are about the origins of this and how they can be modified. What you see highlighted in green is just a slight rewording of what was sent in the handout, and the motion is below that. Does anyone want to make this motion?
- ❖ Pollack: The rewording was because it referenced "non-peak times," and we pulled that terminology out because we didn't want to limit these points.
- ❖ *Pollack made the following motion, Washington seconded.*
  - **Motion:** To send the Local Operations/Improvement Project Team's recommended reply document (with noted modifications) to the FAA, and to request the FAA's reply to questions included in the document.
- ❖ Wright: Question: On the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet on the last page: How can the FAA work with the ACR to build into their documents some consideration for noise? – it occurred to me that is where the Part 150 is concerned not just about noise but about the sound frequency. By adding "including outside of the 65 DNL" to that bullet, that would address some of the concerns. I guess I am asking for a modification to the document.
- ❖ Members: *Discussed Wright's point; approved that addition to the document.*
- ❖ Gussman: Any additional debate or comments?
- ❖ Faust: You all did a fantastic job with the questions.
- ❖ Gussman: *All in favor; none opposed.* The motion passes unanimously. Thank you.
- ❖ Gagnon: I'll work with CLT to see the best way to get that routed to the FAA.
- ❖ Gagnon: Page 12 in the handout. As a reminder, we send out a quarterly ACR Member Newsletter. This is just the cover email. Please review that, as it includes information, reminders, special updates, etc.

## **CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations**

- ❖ Hair: Two important things. We had a crazy, busy summer. It continues to astound me, how much traffic we have. All numbers are growing. All operations forecast metrics are on this trend, as well. As Charlotte grows, the airport grows. The second thing I wanted to note: Has anyone tried out the new flight tracking tool?
- ❖ Faust: I have used it, and I don't like it as much as the other one. I feel like the data is different from what was shown before – where the plane is going relative to where you are located. I feel like the information on the first one was better. It does work fine.
- ❖ Hair: We are a new customer of our vendor, so that helps. Thanks for sharing that feedback. New portal out there looking at what is happening around the airport and tracking flights.
- ❖ Faust: I do like the historical feature where you can look back at particular times of the day.
- ❖ Hair: There is also a feature where you can push out messages.
- ❖ Reese: On the topic of reports, we saw in the month of July a fairly balanced North/South Flow. It was encouraging to see that in the month of July. August – we were 71% North Flow. Complaint numbers have been holding steady or going down. July showed 45 households complaining, and in August there were 33 households complaining. We saw a little increase in September. Once we did switch over from South Flow to a heavy North Flow, there was definitely a reaction to that. Folks down in Fort Mill, for example, immediately reached out to us. Any questions, please reach out. I can generate maps about flight tracks and other things for you.
- ❖ Pollack: I have said this before. We know where the noise is coming from. I don't know if it is a great way to measure. In June, it was heavily South Flow, and July was fairly balanced flow. I think it would be helpful to know, what the experience of the airport was in the tower for 2 months straight where they had significant southern flow – how were operations, any near misses?
- ❖ Gagnon: Is there someone from FAA that could speak to that, or we could make a request?
- ❖ Hennessey: Make your request to Matt. I have been here close to 12 years and as general rule, as we get to late Spring and Summer, we fly predominantly South; Fall and Winter, we fly predominantly North. Wind and storm patterns in the summer come from Atlanta. That is not the Golden Rule, but that is how it happens. Put in the request to Matt.
- ❖ Gagnon: I will put this on the Requests and Motions document.
- ❖ Faust: I have a comment about Page 17, zip code 28269. Report states it is Mooresville, but I don't think that is Mooresville – that's my zip code, Charlotte.
- ❖ Reese: I'll look into that.
- ❖ Wright: I had spoken with Ed and emailed Matt; 28214 departure traffic – the planes are higher, so noise is not as heavy. Also, they appear to be smaller planes. There is construction affecting runway 36L; that is the one that goes over my home. Arrivals have been occurring, but those have been weather-related, I believe. I was also in the 28216 area code, and we had a community person make comments that they were in the Hornet's Nest area, and I saw a plane arrival, and I was sort of surprised. It was high up still and about 10 miles from the airport. That may also be a part of the change with construction. The comment is maybe they are getting increased traffic because of construction going on that affects departures and arrivals. Maybe the airport could let the community know that they may be hearing noise that they did not hear before, but it may be on a temporary basis.
- ❖ Gagnon: So the suggestion is when these changes are planned...
- ❖ Wright: It could be posted on the airport website or wherever that “this is going on, and it could affect...”
- ❖ Gagnon: Thank you. Anything else from CLT? *No*.

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

- ❖ Gagnon: Pearlis, we had the raising of the waypoints recommendation that was implemented on May 16; you had preliminary information you shared at the time. Any updates at this time?
- ❖ Johnson: I do not have any new information, but I'm speculating that it could be part of the reason that the complaints are lower. We'll have to look into that better.



- ❖ Gagnon: CLT is beginning a process of tracking data to do some analysis. Is it still the case that the data collection process is still in the works?
- ❖ Reese: One of the benefits of switching vendors is new software. But one of the downsides is we have 11 years of data, and that requires conversion and uploading. We are patiently waiting for that data to be processed. As soon as the data is uploaded and converted correctly, once that happens it will be published. Once the data is converted correctly, I can run the gates and do the analysis, and I am anticipating that to be by the January meeting.

### **Unfinished Business**

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 33. Requests and Motions Document from last meeting. The ACR was asked to convey interest in key ACR positions, and we did follow-up emails after that meeting. ACR was asked about their questions about the FOIA response. Local Operations team was asked to review the document, and they reported on that today. Request to provide Baseline Data on waypoints relating to Recommendation #3a, which is what Matt is talking about. Request for Noise Disclosure Overlay Information – I sent this out on behalf of CLT a week and a half ago. And the motion to form a Temporary Working team to craft and submit that Part 150 response.

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

- ❖ Gussman: We need a Chair. I have not had anyone show interest yet. We have lots of wonderful folks in this room and online, and a few are missing. We will call for nominations. The intent is to vote in January. If we can get email nominations over the next month, we can get it out so we know what we are looking at. Does anyone want to make a nomination?
- ❖ Wright: Are our positions in perpetuity? *Laughter.*
- ❖ Gussman: At this point, they are not. So, no nominations at this point? Please consider where we are going. We will send out another appeal after this meeting.
- ❖ Wright: Stuart, how many applications do we have for our vacancies?
- ❖ Hair: I think we have about 6 viable applications. We will bring the information to you at the January meeting.
- ❖ Pollack: I remember a conversation where it was asked if we could get a map of the waypoints.
- ❖ Gagnon: We have a New Business presentation, and that is the perfect segue to it.

### **New Business – HMMH Update on ACR 2020 Slate Recommendations**

- ❖ Reindel: I thought it was timely to see how we are progressing through the Slate, given that FAA just implemented some changes to altitudes, and CLT is making recommendations to the Part 150 that came directly from this group. ACR Slate 2020 - 6 recommendations for the Slate, 3 arrivals and 3 departures. FAA, at that point, suggested that we put the departures in the Part 150.
  - Next slide - Objectives of 2020 Slate: Have aircraft arrive higher and with lower power. We made recommendations to raise altitudes, and you made recommendation to use Continuous Descent Arrivals or Optimized Profile Descent, and that is tabled for now because FAA sees no way of having more aircraft arrive using OPDs because of volume at CLT. The other one was disperse departures to spread operations throughout the communities so that no single community is getting all the flight traffic. There are 2 recommendations in the Part 150 that address this – NA-13 (north departures) and NA-14 (south departures); removing the 2-mile restriction to the south is NA-14.
  - Waypoints on the map. The ACR request was to raise altitudes at 2 waypoints – CAATT and EPAYE – but they affected all of these waypoints. So, here are the 2 CLT recommendations in the Part 150 which is a direct result of the work that this body has been working on, which is NA-13, to have multiple divergent headings to the North, and NA-14 - to have multiple divergent headings to the South while also removing the 2-mile restriction.

- Score Card: October 2024 in relation to 2020 recommendations. If you look at arrivals, Greater Use of CDAs – there is no progress on that. You wanted to maintain 6000 feet altitude until final approach; the FAA rejected that. Return CAATT Waypoint to pre-Metroplex location (changed to raise altitudes 1000 feet at CAATT and EPAYE), and then in May the FAA implemented altitude changes at many waypoints. Departures: CLT is making 2 recommendations – Remove 2-mile restriction on departure, and utilize divergent departure headings. They did not recommend changing headings of first turns off Runways 18L and 18C, but that was not required if the divergent departure headings recommendation was implemented successfully. That is basically a short, easy review of the status of ACR Slate to the FAA.
- The following occurred because of you - altitude changes on arrival, and CLT recommendations in the Part 150. I believe these should be celebrated by the ACR. I don't think any of this would have happened without your hard work. I know that you are disappointed with the Part 150, but it is restricted by the 65 DNL, and a lot of things that you were recommending had effects, but they were probably well outside of the 65. I thought it was pretty good that divergent headings actually had an effect on the 65, so they put those through.
- As you are preparing your thoughts on the Part 150 process and conveying that to Council, just keep in mind that Part 150 is a regulation, they followed it, and the things that you want – just because they weren't included – doesn't mean you can't still work on those items and figure out other ways outside the Part 150 process, which is limited to 65. Part 150 is about land use compatibility very close to the airport, and the fact that you got 2 recommendations in there is pretty significant.
- ❖ Pollack: Down legs. I seem to recall it was mentioned at one of the points, the altitude was raised, but there was a reservation of authority for the Tower to bring planes in at a lower altitude under vague standards. If someone could refresh my memory.
- ❖ Gagnon: Gene, he is talking about EPAYE and how that was addressed.
- ❖ Reindel: Remember the request was to return CAATT waypoint to pre-Metroplex location, which was 1000 feet higher. They were able to raise the altitude at CAATT waypoint, but they didn't necessarily raise everything by 1000 feet. In order to make that one change, all the others had to be raised. Remember they did come back to us and ask about this. We agreed with that. All of the waypoints had to be changed to make the change. Some altitudes might have been raised, others have not. The proof is going to be in the pudding, when Matt can get the data and see the statistics, we will know what we have.
- ❖ Reese: Our airport is a class B airport. The airspace normally begins below 10,000 feet MSL. So the airport is not technically in control of traffic until they are below 10,000 feet. There are 4 waypoints at the corners in which the aircraft are coming in between 9000'-9999'. Theoretically by raising these waypoints, what we are actually looking for is to see if it is carrying downstream. Is the altitude raising carried all the way down the downwind? That is what we are going to be looking for. When they enter our airspace just below 10,000 feet, how is that carried forward?
- ❖ Gussman: When our Technical Working Group was at the Tower, post-implementation, we asked specific questions. We saw that they were bringing them in higher. Can they come in lower? Yes, they can come in whatever height they need. We need the data, but I think we will see something coming.

## **Adjourn**

- ❖ Loflin motioned to adjourn. Wright seconded, all in favor.
- ❖ Meeting adjourned at 7:59 pm