

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: June 9, 2021

Attendees

Kurt Wiesenberger, Chair, Charlotte

Phillip Gussman, City 1

Priscilla Johnson, City 4

Bobbi Almond, City 5

Thomas Brasse, City 6

Alan Sauber, City 7

Sayle Brown, Cornelius

Natalie Rutzell, County 2

Sherry Washington, County 4

Mark Loflin, County 6

Bob Cameron, Davidson

Greg Chase, Huntersville

Walter Ballard, Lincoln

Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)

Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA Staff Support Specialist – Atlanta District

Pearlis Johnson, FAA Deputy Regional Administrator for Southern Region

Andrese Davis, FAA Operations Support Group Team Manager

Melissa Rivera, FAA Group Innovator for Operations Support Group

Michael O’Harra, FAA Regional Administrator for Southern Region

Kishawn Griffin, FAA Senior Advisor to Regional Administrator

Tommie Dupree, FAA Manager of Memphis District Office

Stuart Hair, CLT Director of Economic and Community Affairs (ex-officio)

Dan Gardon, CLT Noise Abatement Specialist

Kevin Hennessey, CLT Real Estate Noise Manager

Mark Wiebke, CLT Planning Director

Chris Poore, CLT Public Affairs Manager

Amber Leathers, CLT Planning Environmental Manager

Ted Kaplan, CLT Acting Chief Business Innovation Officer

Tracy Montross, American Airlines Regional Director of Government Affairs

Robert Berlucchi, American Airlines Air Traffic Management, Air Traffic Operations

Sarah Potter, Landrum and Brown, Project Manager for the EA

Braxton Winston, City Council Member-at-Large

Elaine Powell, Vice Chair, Mecklenburg County Commissioner

Gordon Holzberg, Congresswoman Alma Adams office

Phanalphie Rhue, Congresswoman Alma Adams office

Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)

Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Summary Minutes

❖ Open the Meeting

- Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- Wiesenberger: Open the Meeting: Thank you for joining us at the June 9th ACR meeting. Call the meeting to order. Call on elected officials to introduce themselves.
- Braxton Winston: City Council Member-at-Large. Here to listen.
- Phanalphie Rhue: District director for Congresswoman Alma Adams. Listening mode as well.
- Gagnon: Gordon Holzberg from Alma Adams office was also present earlier.
 - *Requested other introductions - All the ACR members introduced themselves and told the area they represent.*
 - *CLT representatives introduced themselves. FAA representatives introduced themselves. American Airlines representatives introduced themselves.*

- Gagnon: Quick review of agenda. To give you all an initial idea of what we will be discussing today. *Briefly went over the first couple of items, open the meeting, describe meeting approach, approve minutes, etc.*
 - Ground rules: Healthy conversations, meetings, productive, and brief points. Effective in making noise improvement in our area.
- Wiesenberger: Any comments to the March Minutes?
 - Can I have a motion to approve? *Member motioned to approve Minutes. Brasse seconded. All in favor. None opposed. Minutes are approved.*

❖ **Receive Public Input**

- No public input tonight.

❖ **Monitor: FAA Progress and CLT Updates**

➤ **Reminder of FAA Slate Review/Implementation Checklist and Slate Recommendations**

- Gagnon: Moving forward – page 3 on handout – page numbers at top of page. Phases of review. Checklist that was developed after the Slate was submitted to the FAA. Key phases that we are walking through. We are in Phase 1 according to Andrees in January.
- Gagnon: Next page, based on pre-planning call with Chair and Vice Chair of the ACR, we thought it would be good to review what was in the Slate. Reminder of 2020 CLT ACR Slate of Recommendations. ACR submitted 6 Recommendations:
 - 3 for Arrivals – Greater Use of Continuous Descent Approaches, Maintain 6000’ Arrival Minimum Altitude until Final Approach Course, Return CAATT Waypoint to Pre-Metroplex location
 - ◆ The last was actually submitted in the Fall of 2018 as a standalone recommendation. The FAA came back with 3 alternatives in May of 2019 – one was to raise the altitude 1000’ at CAATT and EPAYE waypoints. The ACR decided to roll that recommendation into the full Slate.
 - Next 3 recommendations on the Slate are for Departures – Remove the 2 mile restriction on Departure, with the note that this recommendation cannot be implemented without one of the other 2 departure recommendations, as this was the only recommendation with a net disbenefit overall in terms of population affected by noise. The other 2 recommendations are Utilize Divergent Departure Headings and Change Headings of First Turns off Runways 18L and 18C.

➤ **Update on FAA Slate Evaluation Process – Pearlis Johnson, Deputy Regional Administrator – Southern Region, FAA**

- Johnson: Welcome to the new ACR members and the elected officials. This important project was started in Charlotte 6 years ago with Phase 1 and was completed in 2017. We have seen a lot of efficiencies gained from that project.
- O’Harra: Thanks, and good evening. Not my first visit. Our team is happy to provide updates on the work we have been doing. Some analysis regarding the recommendations that came to us last July through the airport, reflecting concerns – I would say the community – but reflecting what this group, the ACR, has raised of concerns about aviation noise around the airport and the Charlotte area. We will focus on the first 3 arrival recommendations and then lay out a strategy for the departure recommendations. We can address questions or gather them in the coming days, and we’ll be happy to come back to a future meeting. I will defer on the complexity of the airspace in Charlotte to Bob Z. The FAA is sensitive to the noise and quality of life concerns that have been expressed in this group. We want to honor that with transparency about the opportunities as well as some of the challenges and constraints in the Charlotte airspace and some of our air traffic control requirements. Our goal is to communicate clearly. If there are questions that you all have tonight, we will be happy to explain further or come back for a future discussion. Our goal is to support collaborative, productive, open, and also realistic conversations and solutions.

- Szymkiewicz: *Referenced 5/5/21 South Flow slide*. We are looking at a 2-dimensional depiction of the complexity of Charlotte's air traffic control operation in a South operation, meaning the airplanes are departing to the south and landing to the south. Blue lines represent departures, orange lines represent arrivals. When the Metroplex team met and did their project years ago, they added some additional departure options to the east, to the south, to the west and to the north and to the northwest. This sort of dispersed airplanes more than we had seen before. On the arrival side, we have dual arrivals from the southwest, dual arrivals from the southeast, dual arrivals from the northwest and a single arrival from the northeast. The reason why the system works the way it does is that the arrivals are basically descending almost in an automated manner at 9000' with the departures climbing at 8000'. Then the air traffic controller manually intervenes when they clear those conflicts. The nature of the schedule from AA, which is the predominant carrier at CLT, is they ebb and they flow - the air traffic controller has to have a way to absorb the air traffic when it gets busy. As you can see to the north, the base leg continues to creep to the north a little bit. Air traffic control manually makes those decisions on when those turns at base will be. As the complexity and traffic density increases, that line gets pushed further and further to the north and as traffic slows down again, the line gets pulled back into the south.
 - Next slide is North operation. Similar to south departures, blue is departure, orange are arrival. Both of these slides – have about 700 each of arrivals and departures. This is one day's worth of traffic. The arrivals stop at 9. The departures stop at 8 when the air traffic manually clears that conflict, they can climb. You've got to the north, the northwest, 2 to the west, 3 to the east, 3 to the south and some of those departures were designed, depending on the situation on the ground at the airport, the southbound departures can leave either the eastern runway or the center runway.
 - Next is a video slide of weather on June 7th. You can see arrivals and departures coming in and out of Charlotte, you can see the weather building. This is Memphis Center, Atlanta Center, Washington Center, Indianapolis Center and Charlotte with approach control all working in tandem to make the system continue to work even though it was holding on to the northwest and holdings going on in different areas. This was a pretty significant weather event, and air traffic controllers system-wide were able to make this work.
- Dupree: The airport has two major planning studies – one is the upcoming Part 150 which is a sponsor-driven process. The timing of the Part 150, I would refer any of those questions to the airport. The airport is in the process of completing the Environmental Assessment for the Major Airport Capacity and Enhancement of the Airport, that includes the 4th parallel runway; the anticipated completion of the NEPA evaluation for the EA is late summer. I would refer any specific questions regarding timing to the airport. The EA, even though reviewed and approved by the FAA, is prosecuted by the airport.
- Davis: *Restated the ACR recommendations*. Bob set the stage for the complexity of the operation and unique situation at Charlotte. We took a look at the recommendations, and we gathered a team to deliberate, consider and perform analysis on the recommendations. This slide shows the team of folks involved: Stakeholders and Roles:
 - Airport Authority, which is part of the ACR, and to give us specific information about Charlotte.
 - Industry to give us information from a pilot's perspective.
 - FAA, these ensure that we are within policy rules as an agency, Air Traffic that can give us information about the local operation and the adjoining operations to Charlotte.
 - The Environmental Protection Specialists provide their analysis and ensure that we are within FAA Environmental guidelines and policy and along with NEPA. Airspace and Procedures Specialists help to ensure that everything is connected. Also to help vet some of the operational, procedural recommendations or options, and the Airport District Office – anything that is on the airport, they are typically involved in – specifically with the Part 150 – and they are very important.

- Next slide talks about activities that we have been involved with since we received the recommendations. Starting in July 2020, we had several meetings, formed core team, matrix team with subject matter experts that gave their input along the way. We came up with our strategy roughly in August 2020, again reaching out to external stakeholders so that we'd have a more holistic review and response. As you know, we have been present at several ACR meetings, providing updates, gaining more of the operations at Charlotte, and bouncing ideas, specifically about noise with Airport Authority and other stakeholders, and we are here today.
- Next slide: Our strategy that we determined in August of last year was to review the arrival recommendations and have the departure recommendations be a part of the Part 150. We looked at the arrival recommendations, specifically lumped together for efficiency - individually but together.
- Rivera: I am by no means an expert on CDAs or on Charlotte airspace. We had quite a bit of information. These are some of the high-level notes. What we viewed as the Continuous Descent Approach was basically a pilot maneuver and doesn't have any avionics attached to that. It is a maneuver that starts from the end of OPD – Optimized Profile Descent and would begin at the final approach itself. When we have seen it implemented worldwide, there are issues, where aircraft are in stack holding, which increases miles and emissions, and it is often used during low traffic times. In high traffic times this has not worked. At London Heathrow airport, it is used, and that airport is known for having a lot of holding.
- Szymkiewicz: We view this as a non-starter for now mostly because of technology. When things like terminal sequencing and spacing becomes available, it may become more palatable. Technology doesn't allow it to be used very often. We do not see this as something that we would use because of investing so much time and money into procedures that would not be used. We do not see an operational benefit or a noise reduction at this point. We do know that the primary user would like some sort of CDA that is connected to the OPDs at Charlotte. For now, CDAs non-starter for now because of technology and cost.
- Rivera: Analysis of Recommendation 1. In conversations with industry and air traffic, it was determined that CDAs are not an effective tool for maintaining efficiency and safety at the airport because of the specific design of the approaches at Charlotte. They end at a point in space, so they terminate at a space so that they can accommodate the volume of traffic. The OPDs or STARs are not designed to connect approaches because they would never be used. So there would be a design that wouldn't be used or helpful in this environment. There is not a safety case or model anywhere for this. It is not being used in in any similar environment – triple runways – and it is not being used at one of our major airports. The track miles, moving noise, emissions - all those things come into play when talking about changing the environment so drastically to what it is now.
- Szymkiewicz: Slides 4 and 5 shown earlier show the reason why the determination points were where they were. It allows the air traffic controllers to manually make the turns to base when it is most appropriate for the traffic. The Optimized Profile Descents used in Charlotte actually function quite well.
- Ballard: My understanding is that CDAs are used at LAX.
- Rivera: We thought that as well. In 2008 and 2009 when it was first rolled out, there was that confusion between what CDAs and OPDs mean. It was later determined that those are now the modern day OPDs. CDAs begin after the determination of the STAR. The OPD would take you to the termination of the STAR, and in some places an approach would be connected from the STAR all the way down to the runway. In this situation we do not have that environment. We did quite a bit of investigation, and they don't have that environment that we are talking about here – where the OPDs are connected to approaches and they just kind of glide all the way down to the ground.
- Ballard: My neighbor who is a pilot told me that he flew in that way.

- Montross: I'll try to explain. One of the main differences is the number of directional feeds that come into the STARs versus LA, which is all arriving from the east. CDA and OPD are different in their definition. AA is using OPDs from cruising altitude of 20K to 30K feet until 6000'. That's an OPD – a gradual descent. Where the CDA in London Heathrow environment would have you go from 30K feet all the way down to the runway with continuous glide. We can't do that after 6000' because we need the ability to turn onto approach onto the runway in order to meet the flow of traffic. We are doing idle descent until 6000', but then the controllers have to turn the planes onto final approach.
- Chase: I am a current commercial pilot for major cargo carrier in the US. My question is what might limit Charlotte from developing procedures that could have STARs that terminate onto approach so we could just stay at that current altitude until we are fixed on localizer or something?
- Szymkiewicz: I think it would hamper efficiency and harm the schedule and the throughput at the airport. The sequencing tool – TSAS – is not robust enough to make that zipper effect work. We do think that technology is going to come about, and then we will be able to do something like that. In terms of Charlotte operation to function as designed, you need the ability for the air traffic control to make the call when base turns are going to be made, who is first, who is second. I am reminded of a conversation in about 2013 with the tech pilots, and they felt like Charlotte was really efficient in their airspace already, so that the major gains would be from the top of descent to maybe 10K or 6K feet in Charlotte's airspace. We don't think it is never going to happen, just the way the technology and the schedules run at the airport, it will not be anytime soon.
- Chase: So, if I get a release time from an airport flying into Charlotte that is just sequencing me to the end of a STAR right now? Is that correct?
- Szymkiewicz.: Essentially, it is finding a slot in the national airspace system that will allow you to fit into the traffic flow. It is not necessarily to the end of the runway or end of the STAR or the edge of the airspace. It is finding a space in the queue that your airplane will fit.
- Gagnon: Melissa, would you prefer that participants ask questions at the end, after each recommendation, or to interject as you go along?
- Rivera: We'd prefer that everyone hold the questions until the end. *Overview of Recommendation 2. Maintain 6000' Arrival Minimum Altitude until Final Approach Course.* I think we've been clear about what the environment looks like, how we are running triple parallel runways, the number of vectoring altitudes are needed. Vector at 1000' increments in order to maintain 1000' separation between opposing final approach courses. Aircraft are stacked as well as staggered, and there is about 3 miles difference between each waypoint on final for the 3 parallel runways. What you can see from the first two images of air traffic is you see that there is a long downwind, long turns to final. The reason for that is when there are so many aircraft that need to be accommodated in such a small airspace, you see those numerous altitudes used for separation. The environment is – 3 runways, stacked and staggered, dependent on where the aircraft is coming from – West or East of runways.
 - Analysis of R2: If there are 5 altitudes and you eliminate 2 of them, that reverberates throughout the system. It causes problems with efficiency, increased track miles, emissions, and it also causes a lot more workload for controllers and for the pilots. Because it is so efficient now, eliminating 2/5ths of what's available, it would cause delays, cause safety concerns, longer miles, potentially move noise from one area to another. Extended downwinds are much longer – using more airspace to get aircraft from the STAR to final. It could also add delays to other aircraft. All 5 levels of altitudes are required to manage all traffic volume and triple parallel runway layout.
- Szymkiewicz: The way the current system works, where the base leg was continuously moving to the north or to the south depending on the situation, the final controller has about 20 miles they can work to use the altitudes. If you were to push that to 6000' because of the requirement to have airplanes separated by 1000', the opposite base would have to be a 7K meaning the

middle runway would have to be at 8K or 9K. You take that fairly large swath of airspace that the controller has to maneuver airplanes, and that gets pushed back to the north or the south because the airplane has to be on the glideslope when they intercept final. You are reducing that vector space to about 12-14 miles, which means that there is very little space in which to do sequencing vectors. Which means there has to be ground delay program or in-route spacing or airborne holding. This would be a negative impact on the AA schedule and how it works, which would create delays. There is a historical need for how this works. Very limited space and limited altitudes to work with that would create a safety issue. This would probably be the hard non-starter for us.

- Rivera: Overview of Recommendation 3: Return CAATT Waypoint to Pre-Metroplex location. That would mean relocating the fix or replacing the fix with a new fix over the position formally known as PELOY. This is also not feasible as changing flight tracks - oftentimes when evaluating, that moves noise from one area to another. It would not be feasible to move noise. It would also increase track miles.
 - ATC offered an alternative to increase both CAATT and EPAYE altitudes by 1000', which would place aircraft higher on the east downwind specifically where PELOY was formally established. It would place aircraft approximately 300' higher – to 9,300' at PELOY.
 - The way this would work - the altitude at CAATT would be raised from 9K to 10K, the altitude at EPAYE would be raised from 6K to 7K. No changing or moving of the tracks. If we were to do this, because everything is so integral at Charlotte, they would have to increase the altitude at termination fixes and the fix before the termination fix at at least 4 other STARS.
 - On JONZE STAR: AAIRE would be increased from 9K to 10K; JRDEN would be raised from 6K to 7K.
 - FLIPZ STAR: CEDEX increased from 9K to 10K; VALLL increased from 6K to 7K.
 - STOCR STAR: LEEKS increased from 9K to 10K; HANDO would remain the same at 8K.
 - This is to create continuity because of the change in the south area of airspace. If the ACR would accept the alternative as proposed, these are the other changes that could be expected later.
- Davis: The only thing that I would reiterate, the recommendations are not easy to implement. Ripple effect. *Provided a Summary*: First 2 recommendations are not feasible and the 3rd not feasible but alternately proposing to raise certain fixed altitudes.
- Szymkiewicz: Adding 1000' theoretically adds track miles, and we have said that it wouldn't add track miles. I think that is explainable in that the way the current system of vectoring works, you are not necessarily adding or reducing track miles even though you are raising that altitude by 1000'. Back in the Metroplex project, they thought they were saving a couple of miles on one of the procedures, and it was actually a couple of miles were added to the procedure because of the nature of the schedule and the number of airplanes that were involved.
- Davis: Just to recap. Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 are not feasible because of the complexities of the operations, throughput at Charlotte. But for Recommendation 3, we offered an alternative, and if you concur with that alternative, we could move forward with raising the altitudes at several waypoints. The reason you need to raise them at several waypoints is because of the ripple effect, so that all plays a part in the operation.
 - If we gain airport and ACR authority and concurrence we would move forward and prioritize this along with other projects in the national airspace system. We would convene a full working group for design – to include all stakeholders involved, to include industry, air traffic, gain perspective of the community during the process, and have a team to do the necessary outreach to ensure that everyone's perspective is included per our guidance and NEPA. Then move forward with implementation. The first step would be a concurrence from you guys and the airport authority. A lot of work, and I hope that you got that we had a

lot of personnel and reviewed each recommendation time and again. We are still hopeful about this last recommendation and the response to that.

- O’Harra: I want to thank our team. I also want to acknowledge that especially with the first 3 recommendations, the ACRs goal has been to keep the approaches as high as possible. I know Bob said it, but here are a couple of points that resonate with me. Having aircraft descend at less power is something we like to see throughout the system. We don’t often see it at the 5th busiest airport with the volume and triple approaches. It is not a no; it’s a not today. It is not done at a Charlotte-type airport anywhere. It doesn’t mean that it won’t eventually come to Charlotte. On the 2nd one, we expressed concern last February – the need for the full complement of altitudes. On the 3rd, I see a note in the chat from Thelma about noise proposals, and I cannot give specific numbers, but I know that the alternative that we brought to the table is consistent with that concept of keeping approaches higher. I think the alternative raises altitudes and also does it at more waypoints than requested. I know it’s not a “great news” story. The dialogue can continue. We got specific recommendations, and we’re doing our best to provide feedback on them.
- Johnson: We hope to hear from you soon. I don’t want to prolong the discussion tonight. We can get in writing as to how you want to go forward. Thank you.
- Gagnon: Thanks for that presentation. Tom Brasse had a chat question for Bob. “Please elaborate on the lack of noise benefit from the CDA. I thought it would have a benefit. “
- Szymkiewicz: I don’t know that I am qualified to make that analysis. That information comes from environmental specialists based on modeling. I can take an IOU and ask that question and get back to the group.
- Gagnon: Thelma had some chat comments: *The last alternative seems like what Bob Z proposed last year.*
 - Yes, it was actually presented in 2019. That is correct, Thelma, except that the FAA expanded on it to raise by 1000’ at some other waypoints as well.
 - Kurt and Phil, do you want to defer additional questions until you get some formal feedback from the ACR members after they have some time to digest this information and the letter that Dan sent out earlier today, or do you want some additional Q&A during this meeting today?
- Brown: Bob Z. and I have had some discussion. I am talking about raising the altitude on the downwind to 6K. I had 36 years of flying in and out of Charlotte, and I never saw 3 parallel runway operations. They might be using that now, but I haven’t seen it. Next, there is a difference between visual flight rules and instrument flight rules. I live in Cornelius/Davidson area, and the airplanes on the downwind when we are using a south runway operation come over our house at 3800’ MSA – Minimum Safe Altitude/Minimum Sector Altitude. What the controllers are doing, they are dropping them down to the MSA and they are cruising all the way up to Mooresville (20 miles north at 3800’ before they can find a slot). That is basically why we requested a 6K’ minimum altitude, to get them over the main channel when they are landing south, so that they could be on the glideslope – low power settings – to get into the landing configuration. They are dropping gear and being as loud as can be. Most of all, when we are in an instrument flight rules situation, we have none of the problems here. The controllers are sending them to a waypoint 18-mile fix and getting them on the glideslope and letting them come in. If we could have some leeway to get some relief to the community, it would probably be a little better.
- Szymkiewicz: It is interesting what you are saying, as it doesn’t really gel with my experience. My experience since 1988 is that the east final controller in a south operation is trying to get to 4000’ as soon as possible so they can turn in when they have the opportunity – a slot – to turn in. This is just my opinion, but I think that we can ask the controller to keep them higher – that’s a conversation worth having.
- Brown: If they’re at 3800’, they’re only 3000’ above us. I know it would increase flight time and probably decrease fuel efficiency. Trying to create a balance between the community and

the airlines is what I am looking for. Metroplex and NextGen did a great job with safety and fuel efficiency, and we are not proposing anything that would go against any safety procedures at all. Just try to keep them a little higher.

- Szymkiewicz: One of the points that Melissa made was the south and the north operations - they would change them all for continuity.
 - Gussman: I think we need to have this dialogue. I would like to propose another call for the ACR members as this doesn't mesh with what we have been trying to do. All of us need to get together on this. Our members that are pilots understand this better, and we would all like to be at that same point. Suggest a Zoom call in a week to come up with solid list of questions for the FAA.
 - Priscilla Johnson: Then we can respond to them appropriately.
 - Gussman: Can we query the group? Maybe get Gene or someone to help us be our experts in the room. One of the questions is – if we change all these waypoints up 1000' – what does that do to the noise? What do these changes do to the analysis of the noise that has been done?
 - Priscilla Johnson: Let's try to schedule a meeting for one week from today. If we push out too far, it may not be as fresh. This is a lot to absorb.
 - Wiesenberger: That is a great recommendation. Ed, you are the best one to administrate a call.
 - Kind of an overall comment - Lots of information, lots of valuable facts. We appreciate the FAA and the airport staff participating. Looking at the demographics of this meeting, we have roughly 12 FAA and CLT paid professionals, and roughly 12 volunteers from the community. You all have a tremendous amount of knowledge and skill and have worked on this in a paid capacity for a number of months. On our side, we are roughly a group of 20 that come and go; we worked on these recommendations for about 2 years before submitting to you last July with the help of Gene Reindel from HMMH, and the participation of the FAA and CLT staff. We felt a fairly high level of vetting was done. We were cautious about doing reasonable and responsible things. We feel disappointed and a little bit dismissed that #1 and #2 are not valid. I appreciate that #3 has some possibilities, and possible expansion of the recommendation. Other small points: With NextGen implementation, we thought there would be a higher degree of technological ability with managing air traffic and the airspace we have. It doesn't seem that we have improved that capability except perhaps being able to handle a lot more traffic, and I guess that will continue with the 4th parallel runway.
 - We'd like to know how Part 150 will be implemented and include our other recommendations. When will that begin, when will that be completed? How will we be involved in that? Finally, I'd really like to know from the FAA and airport and Gene – our liaison and mentor through all this – what recommendations do you have to improve the noise problems in Charlotte? What are the professional recommendations not only to safety, air traffic efficiency, and revenue but also the satisfaction of the people to have a better life and not be subjected to 700 departures and arrivals everyday making 65 decibels? It is really annoying, and it makes me mad.
 - Gagnon: In terms of next steps, I will have debrief call in the morning with Kurt and Phil. We will look at how to get the game plan for when and how we will meet. We will get the follow-up meeting scheduled. Any other comments before continuing with the agenda?
 - Wiesenberger: Not at this time. Running late on the agenda, and we're short on time.
- **CLT Update – Stuart Hair, Director of Economic & Community Affairs, CLT**
- Hair: You can see the written update that is included in the packet. Amber, can you elaborate on the EA progress?
 - Leathers: We had published the draft EA back in April and that comment period ended on June 1. The Airport and the consultant received 18 written comments in addition to those who spoke at the public hearings, which will also be reported as part of that process. We and the consultant are working to respond to those comments to those who made them, and we are also

doing some outreach with some of our Environmental Justice groups. We hope to have that wrapped up end of June. We intend to submit preliminary final EA in July and hoping that the FAA will be able to issue a final determination in August or September. This is in line with what Tommy, with the ADO, had mentioned earlier. We are on track and moving forward. Thanks to those who joined the virtual presentations and for those who spoke at the public hearings.

- Hair: Update of the Part 150; Kevin will provide further information.
- Hennessey: We are still working through the consultant process. Currently reviewing the draft scope and fee with consultant. Hopefully in the next couple meetings we'll have a consultant selected. We are a ways off from starting this project. Looking at starting this project the fourth quarter of this year. Estimated completion is third quarter 2023.
- Hair: You can also see in the written updates that with operations, we are basically back to pre-COVID levels with flights. You can see the complaint statistics, as well.
- Loflin: When can we get those volunteers into the airport since it's so busy? I think that may help.
- Hair: I appreciate that. I don't have a timetable for that. The coordinator for that was in the office yesterday, and I did not ask.
- Rutzell: Questions on complaints statistics. It looks like a big spike. I would like to see where the complaints are coming from - can we see zip codes from these complaints?
- Gardon: Moving forward, we can do that for you. Typically, we have a spike in May, in Spring. In terms of areas, it is a little more difficult to digest, but we can provide that.
- Rutzell: I think that 60% of complaints are coming from Steele Creek - 28278. I want that to be communicated. What districts are experiencing enough discomfort to register complaints?
- Gardon: Yes, I believe that is correct.

➤ **Engage: Updates from Project Teams - Community Engagement Project Team Update – Phil Gussman, Project Team Lead**

- Gussman: Community Engagement Project Team. We are working through our scheduled items. We did have opportunity with WSOC – looks like that got pushed back, but we will notify everyone when that will air. One other thing that we did adjust - there is a chance of in-person meetings in September. Moved the town halls back to September from July. I will talk to CLT about coming up with something helpful. I was hoping to roll out exciting news from FAA, but we will see if we can still get there.

➤ **Engage: Updates from Project Teams - Government Engagement Project Team Update – Bob Cameron, Project Team Lead**

- Cameron: We did contact the city council and the county commissioners. We did have several county commissioners at our last meeting. Tonight, we had Braxton Winston from City Council join, the Mayor Pro-Tem had to cancel out yesterday. We had a very good meeting with our Congresswoman, Alma Adams - thanks to Sayle Brown for coordinating that - and she was encouraging and supporting us. She wants to stay in touch and monitor our progress. Gordon Holzberg was on the call tonight, and he is her point of contact for aviation matters. We continue monthly Zoom calls. Commissioner Elaine Powell is on this call, as well, and she has been very supportive and understanding of our plight. Pending next week's meeting, if that comes about, we will be taking a hard look at what direction we need to take. We knew that tonight would be a significant milestone in the whole ACR as well as government engagement.
- Brown: Also, Phanalphie Rhue, Adams' Chief of Staff, was on the call. Good turnout from the Congresswoman.

➤ **Improve: Update from Local Ops/Improvement Project Team – Kurt Wiesenberger, Project Team Co-lead**

- Wiesenberger: This team is committed to identifying and implementing local-controlled noise and other environmental improvement opportunities. We are looking at other facilities and communities with airports who have noise problems. We have had meetings. We have begun

benchmarking with other airports and reviewed previous operations reports. Talking with Gene and HMMH and are very interested in what SFO – San Francisco airport – is doing recently. There is an Airport Communities Solutions Summit involving other community airports on June 18 and July 17, and we would like to participate. Our Project Team’s membership has decreased a bit. We could use one or two additional members. If anyone is interested, please let us know.

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

➤ **Written Updates**

- Gagnon: Thank you, Kurt. Pages 9 and 10 are some written documents. As a reminder, this includes requests/motions from the last meeting, and we always document that. We will update after this meeting as well.
- Then page 10, for informational purposes, there are not a whole lot of updates. We’ve moved - several months back - some of these items to the main Agenda. Tracy with AA did provide an update on the retrofit of the aircraft with vortex generators. There are only 28 aircraft left, as of June 1.

➤ **Update on Revisions to ACR Mission/Charter**

- Dan, Phil, and Kurt have continued to update ACR Mission and Charter. They will continue to refine that document to reflect the current membership mix and how we are operating now. The initial mission statement talked about submitting those ideas via the Slate to the FAA; our focus now has changed – to monitoring improvements and operations, engaging community and government, and still seeking additional improvement efforts. They will get a draft out later this year to codify the current focus of Monitor, Engage, Improve. Bring it to the ACR to review.

➤ **New Business**

- Gagnon: Any new business? *None.*

❖ **Adjourn and Next Meeting**

- Gagnon: Next meeting is July 14 at 6p. The initial thinking is to keep that meeting - make it brief. A working session where we may look at some initial revisions to the mission and charter, talk about the questions that will be or have been submitted to the FAA, and get a review of project team activities from today until July. Please keep that date on calendar.
- Wiesenberger: We would like the July meeting to be virtual. September 8 will be in-person at the airport.
- Hair: That would be the aspiration for CLT to host that September meeting in the Eagle Conference Room. May have different guidance from CDC and the governor at that time. Hope that other external partners, like FAA, can attend if travel is approved.
- Priscilla Johnson motioned to adjourn. Member seconded, all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:39 pm