

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: July 14, 2021

Attendees

Kurt Wiesenberger, Chair, Charlotte
Phillip Gussman, City 1
Darren Crosby, City 2
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Thomas Brasse, City 6
Doug Pray, County 1
Natalie Rutzell, County 2
Sherry Washington, County 4
Megan Walton, County 5
Mark Loflin, County 6
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Bob Cameron, Davidson
Walter Ballard, Lincoln
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg

Bob Mentzer, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Dan Gardon, CLT
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Theodore Kaplan, CLT
Mark Wiebke, CLT
Amber Leathers, CLT
Chris Poore, CLT
Elaine Powell, County Commissioner, District 1
Susan Rodriguez-McDowell, County
Commissioner, District 6
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Call-in Participants: None

Summary Minutes

❖ Open the Meeting

- Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- Wiesenberger: Welcome to the July meeting of the ACR. Thank you for joining the call today. I ask for elected officials to introduce themselves.
- Rodriguez-McDowell: I represent District 6. Southern part of the County. Thank you for all the work that you do.
- Wiesenberger: Let's transition into introductions. First, the newest member, Doug Pray.
- Pray: Live in northwest Charlotte, a community – Overlook - off of Mountain Island Lake. Lived there about 3 years. Interested in helping to mitigate and work toward common goals. Work in Medicare/Medicaid compliance. Looking forward to learning more about the group.
- Wiesenberger: We are neighbors in the Overlook development.
- Gagnon: I believe another commissioner has joined.
- Powell: I represent District 1, which includes Mountain Island Lake and Lake Norman. I am here because I have been hearing some noise complaints.
- Gagnon: *Introductions followed: ACR members, CLT staff, HMMH representative, CSS staff, area resident.*
- Gagnon: Meeting flow. We are participating via phone and WebEx. Please mute when not talking. Use the “raise the hand” function. Dan will be monitoring that. Please say your name when speaking. We will be recording the meeting and saving the chat.
 - Sharing my screen. *Going through the document that was sent. Page numbers at the top. Went over the Agenda Page 2.*

- Ground Rules: Healthy meetings, productive discussion and brief points. Effective in making noise improvement in our area.

➤ Wiesenberger: I will ask for approval for the Minutes. *Mark Loflin moved, and Thelma Wright seconded.* Minutes are approved.

❖ **Receive Public Input**

➤ No public input tonight.

❖ **Update on Moving Forward – Monitor, Engage, and Improve**

➤ Gagnon: Moving into item 3 on the Agenda. This item - the ACR Response Document to the FAA’s Conclusions on Arrival Recommendations - is the meat of our time together today. We will go over it – describe the process for developing the document, review the document, and discuss the plan for distributing the document.

➤ **ACR Response Document to FAA’s Conclusions on Arrival Recommendations – Kurt Wiesenberger, Chair, and Phil Gussman, Vice Chair**

- Wiesenberger: I can go over the chronology of what we have done since the June 9 meeting. The FAA formally presented their conclusions from the Slate of 6 Recommendations that we had come up with to disperse and minimize the noise impact on Charlotte citizens. We heard the response. The next day, Phil, Ed and I formulated a game plan for getting feedback from ACR members. We introduced an online survey to the ACR members. We got a lot of response and reaction. Where do we go from here? We got a healthy amount of feedback. The following week or so, we had some informal sessions to consolidate and synthesize the information, and we began to draft a response document on June 25th. Early July, we completed the draft and got additional input from CLT staff. We are sharing that refined document tonight. We believe that we got input from everyone involved.
 - The response/reaction document was distributed today to all the ACR members, and it details a bit of history and how people felt as a result of the FAA’s presentation last month. We went through each of the 6 Recommendations and listed what the initial Recommendation was based on all the research that HMMH had done as well as our collaborative work with CLT. We talked about the 6 Recommendations and what we asked, what the FAA responded with, and the questions that the ACR posed regarding the response of the FAA.
 - The one outstanding uncertainty that we want to share is Page 6. This is a page that includes ACR members asking questions about (1) Beyond the Recommendations, how are we to collaborate between the ACR, CLT, and FAA going forward? And there are some pointed questions. (2) Members are concerned about the purpose of the ACR going forward. These are emotional questions. CLT suggested that maybe we separate that page.
- Gagnon: *Sharing the ACR Response Document.*
- Gussman: Thanks so much for all the responses. Makes for complex editing but shows commitment toward the issues. It is important to convey the feelings and concerns and despair that many of us felt. These are our words – we wanted to get it out up front. Then we got into the practical things that need to be done. We tried to keep each question from members in there, and in some we combined them.
- Loflin (chat): Do we know if the FAA is aware of our respond letter?
- Gussman: I do not think that the FAA is aware of this letter. This is the first public sharing of it.
 - We tried to provide enough information so that the FAA cannot imagine that we misunderstood them, as their words are right in the letter. If so, perhaps we will get more information.
 - Regarding Departure Recommendations, we want them to know that we want to get results and we need to hear something more explicit than ‘we’re going to do this later.’
 - Many of us felt like we got blanket responses. We feel like we need to see more of “why” you are saying no. We had a lot of work done from HMMH – thanks to Gene and everyone there –

and we want to think that this was not all for naught; we weren't exactly uninformed people by the end of creating the Slate. We'd love to hear what we missed.

- I'd like to motion that we not include Page 6 now in this document. It does address the very real and important questions that we have about what we are doing here, and how we can move forward with our collaboration with the FAA and CLT to try and get the best outcomes. If there is not some sense of compromise, this is going to be a challenging trip, but at the same time, I think that is a different issue. If we can make forward progress on noise abatement or effecting the noise impacts that we are seeing, we need to keep pursuing that. I don't want to slow that process down by asking the questions on Page 6. That is the motion I would like to make, but I know that Kurt and I are open to thoughts.
- Gagnon: Are you making a specific motion now, Phil, or do you want to hear feedback first?
- Gussman: Feedback first. If no questions, I will make the motion.
- Wiesenberger: I would like to elaborate. What we discussed is – let's submit a reaction document and separate out these other items, like collaboration and the future purpose of the ACR in a separate document or meeting. Let's keep this document professional and respectful and not burn bridges with the FAA. Separating the two parts of this may be a more effective way to go about this. We don't want to increase or antagonize the relationship between the ACR and the FAA. Move forward on the Recommendations we have submitted, get some facts and work on those. Address the deal with the collaboration and ACR function later.
- Brown: For the past month, there is a media person up here in Cornelius who has been bugging me for information – what has been going on, why have things changed, why has the noise increased? Before we submitted this to the FAA, I gave him a blanket answer, and he is wanting more. Are we allowed to release this to the media, or how are we going to handle this?
- Gussman: I think our next step after getting this approved is we need to get it to the public and communicate more.
- Wright: My comment is on the purpose of the ACR - I think it could be included as "it makes us wonder if...", maybe just not title it as it is. I think it could be on the document and not title it as: Purpose of the ACR. These are the reflections after the outrage or the disappointment.
- Wiesenberger: I like the terminology – Reflections.
- Gussman: To address Tom's comment in the chat that we need to make sure the FAA knows that this is the overall feelings of all the members, I'm hoping the unanimous vote to support this document will be key to letting the FAA know that this is all of us that are fed up.
- Wiesenberger: Do the rest of you support this?
- Cameron: I support, and I see the importance of separation. I think they are 2 separate things. I don't want them to get muddled.
- Loflin: I would tend to go with separating them but will go either way. I want us to be very clear in the first part of the response when we say to them that what they presented is unacceptable, unprofessional – are we making that clear? I felt like we were just pushed to the side and 'we don't care about you.' I just want to make sure that sentiment is in this document.
- Pray: As one of the newest members, if the FAA was clearly dismissive, if we want to keep the communication going, are there other roundtables that can provide precedence, provide places that have had effective change? Is there anything that we can do to get the ball picked back up? It seems like they have shut us down.
- Wright (chat): What I share will communicate that this is a pattern.
- Wiesenberger: I don't know of other community roundtables who have worked out a common goal/solution with the FAA. Often it is contentious, and there are lawsuits and separate groups formed. Can HMMH weigh in on that?
- Powell (chat): Maybe this roundtable will be the first to make a difference? I applaud your approach to find solutions.

- Mentzer: I can add that what you received from the FAA is similar to what I have seen from them in responses to other roundtables. In Boston and MIT, for example, the FAA dismissed all 5 of the measures that were given to them after 2 months of review. There have been some where they came up with alternatives, but mostly non-starters. I believe that's happened with other roundtables in California also.
- Rutzell: Would it be helpful to share the Quiet Skies summary of all the FAA abuses that they aggregated? I thought that addendum to the letter was very insightful of the lists of the things the FAA has not done.
- Brown: *For Bob M.* - I was in LA and had the news on. It seems like there was a settlement between the airport and FAA with the surrounding area residents of \$200 million to insulate the houses from noise.
- Rutzell: I just sent around the write-up - sent it to Kurt right before the meeting.
- Wiesenberger: It was a lawsuit that was settled.
- Mentzer: I think it was an outcome from a project, not specifically Metroplex. I do not think it was due to airspace changes but due to airport project or expansion, but I would have to check.
- Wiesenberger: Are others in favor of moving forward with this document as is? I'd like to hear from everyone.
- Ballard: My understanding is that the ACR was established at the request of the FAA. Since that is the case, I don't see the need to separate these. One is a response, and the other is 'where are we going with this because it seems like you have absolutely no desire to work with us?' My opinion is that all of it needs to go to the FAA.
- Brasse (chat): Whoever mandated the formation of the ACR at the Congressional level should get feedback on the lack of teeth. Perhaps that section of the letter goes in a modified form to them.
- Cameron: Another view, in a large organization, if you submit a large complex document, and one paragraph of the document is emotionalism, you give the people who have an agenda that is not in alignment with yours, excuse to say about the entire document, that this is just emotionalism. That is the core of my reason to separate. I want our original document to be professional and not emotional. The second document absolutely needs to go, too. We have already had one official say that the ACR is just looking for reasons to perpetuate our existence.
- Ballard: If we separate them, when and who is the second document going to and when?
- Gussman: I put some thought into this. What I imagine us doing is in one of our next meetings, we get a focus group to see the rest of this letter to the end. Maybe we do need to talk to other ACRs and get others involved in this. Maybe they have had similar responses. No plans for that yet.
- Ballard: Who does the FAA report to?
- Hair: Secretary of Transportation.
- Ballard: Maybe this second letter goes to that person.
- Rutzell: There is some work being done on the national/Congress level.
- Washington: I agree to take the emotions out. We could find a way to work with them. I would love to hear what the other ACR groups did to get the FAA to acknowledge them.
- Mentzer: One of the items was the route proposed was not feasible. The FAA came back with an alternative that involved conflicting airspace. They did find somewhat of a workable solution. It was not the best alternative for everyone, but it was something they had decided to move forward with, and they were looking at doing further evaluation.
- Rutzell: I thought I read that they went over the water at a different waypoint, and the FAA agreed but then decided they would implement it at night.
- Mentzer: I am not aware of that. I do not think that is correct. There were two rounds. They looked at procedures that would be easy to implement and wouldn't involve moving noise, and lately they

are working with more difficult ones like you were looking at with dispersed headings. That study has been completed but not submitted to FAA yet.

- Washington: What is the timeline with the other group?
- Mentzer: Overall it has been going on for over 5 years with the two different sets. At HMMH, we concur with CLT staff in not including the last sections. I noticed in the FAA letter that they did offer to raise the altitudes in the one procedure. If you do want to proceed with that, you need to make that request. I did not see that addressed in this response.
- Wiesenberger: We said that we appreciated that with Recommendation #3, plus they had additional suggestions about other waypoints to raise.
 - The one idea I have heard is about separating these 2 documents. On Page 6, while they are raw words in the second part, maybe we could rewrite and summarize in a more narrative way, save the message, and make less emotional. How can we move forward and get better? If we do separate, I recommend we tweak the letter that has more narrative format.
- Gagnon: Is this a good time for a motion? We need a simple majority of attendees to approve any motion.
- Gussman: I would like to make a motion to approve the document as it stands but to remove/separate Page 6 for a separate communication with the FAA. *Loflin seconded.*
- Wiesenberger: I think Bob from HMMH made a good point about Recommendation #3. Possibly phrase that in a more supportive way.
- Gussman: I agree.
- Mentzer: Just knowing the FAA, they will not start looking at it until you make a formal request for them to look at that. When you say that what they proposed sounds great is not going to get them to start looking at it and form a group to evaluate it further. Gene and I can put some language together for you.
- Brown: As long as the FAA doesn't take that as an acceptance of that proposal and then negate everything else that we are requesting.
- Gussman: I'll change my motion to add an element regarding Recommendation #3 that we can take care of in the next day or two.
- Ballard: I thought our expectation was that we wanted to see what noise impact that would make before saying yes.
- Gussman: And I do still want to hear that. You're right.
- Ballard: Instead of telling them to go ahead, we need to say 'you need to provide the data as to what the noise impact will be in our communities and where with their Recommendation on #3.'
- Gagnon: Sounds like Walter is saying that you all want to be clear about whether you are moving forward. And the way it is worded now, this document conveys you don't necessarily want to move forward yet until you see more data first. So, you need to decide on the wording.
- Ballard: All of our information was data-driven. They're just saying 'let's do this.'
- Gussman: They are going to make a group to research.
- Cameron: Do we have the data from HMMH to address that? Show us your data, and ask HMMH to do their own research on it.
- Gardon: We do have HMMH data - we can pull that. I don't think there will need to have additional data.
- Rutzell: I think the questions are good, but the way they are worded we may not get the answers we want; we need to be clear. We have no clear request/data. I am afraid our questions are open-ended.
- Wiesenberger: Are you talking about all Recommendations?
- Rutzell: My commentary is more about the listing of the questions under each response. I think the questions are nice and good, but many are open-ended. I think we need to take a more consistent

approach for each Recommendation. Under each Recommendation we should say – please provide the metrics to support your conclusion. We are looking for number of households that are affected by this, we need to see the analytics of your noise assessment. HMMH should be able to help us to know what we should ask the FAA for, in comparison to what we provided them. I think we will get a better response if the questions are more direct. A bit more editing.

- Wiesenberger: We both believe that we should include the questions and comments from ACR members verbatim to truly reflect their personal feelings and to make it stronger. I think it is a stronger document than a nice, neat objective summary or narrative format.
- Gussman: It speaks to the depth and interest of all of the members of the ACR. If we were creating a more professional response, I think that is the way to go, Natalie.
- Ballard: Does it make sense to try to have a summary at the end to encapsulate the primary questions and go into what Natalie is discussing?
- Gussman: We could. I think that makes it a different document.
- Gagnon: Might I suggest that we take this conversation and break it into two buckets. (1) Make a determination as a group about Page 6 - whether to have that reflected in a separate document or include it here. (2) Then secondarily - whether it is the full 6 pages or the 5 pages - to have a vote to send as is or make refinement. Knowing that next meeting is September, you would want to stipulate how it would get refined, who would be the lead for refining that document, when to get that done so the FAA can respond by the next meeting.
- Gussman: Motion to remove Page 6 questions at this time. *Loflin seconded.*
- Gagnon: Any discussion/questions?
- Wiesenberger: The motion made by Phil is to separate Page 6 from this document. *All in favor; no no's.* The motion passes.
- Wiesenberger: The second point - Do we want to have a secondary editing of the first 5 pages, including what Bob M. thinks we should add about Recommendation 3, and do a summary at the beginning or the end to summarize what we are asking? How do we then manage the 2nd part of the communication from the ACR?
- Gagnon: Motion 2 is to Approve submittal of pages 1-5 with some revisions to include such as...
- Wiesenberger: Such as what Bob recommended, and a summary to be clear.
- Pray: I thought without taking the gist of our reactions to their response out of it, talking about something that is either denied or changed like #3, could we then ask for them - as experts and stakeholders - to provide a model to show us the effects as well attaching the original data that we provided - adding more references so that they don't have to go back and look at our original submission? That might be an interesting thing.
- Wiesenberger: I think we did that on Recommendation #3. We referenced the data, the attachments there.
- Gagnon: That could include sharing any modeling done by the FAA - use that wording.
 - The potential motion is: To approve the submittal of pages 1-5 to the FAA with revisions to include – modifying Recommendation #3, making sure that it is clear the data being asked for, including modeling, prior to giving approval; adding a summary section to clarify the overall key themes.
- Wiesenberger: Is there a second?
- Loflin: Second.
- Wiesenberger: *All in favor. No opposed.* The motion passed.
- Gagnon: I assume Kurt and Phil will be the point on the revisions? Is there a deadline for when that process will work?

- Gussman: Bob could give us something by Friday. The harder part will be crafting the summary. We definitely need to send to the FAA by month-end - want to give them as much time as possible.
 - Wiesenberger: I think we could get this together by end of next week at the latest.
 - Gagnon: We have our debrief tomorrow morning, so we will finalize revision plans, and we will send out to ACR.
 - Wiesenberger: Sounds like there is a third motion. I think we all feel that we need to collaborate with the FAA. How we do that has yet to be defined. It seems that this Page has a bunch of emotionally-charged questions that may be better served if we do some summarization and be more forthright with next steps - being more proactive and less negative. Is that something we want to talk about further?
 - Gagnon: My recommendation is for Phil, Kurt and myself to talk about that tomorrow. We can identify or request the interest of 3 or 4 people who can work through the refinement process.
 - Pray: I like the idea. Do we then present this to them if it is just lip service? They are the experts. Do we include the Secretary of Transportation? If this is something that is supposed to be happening, and we are supposed to be getting results and instead are being shut down? Do we move it up the ladder? Then hopefully someone's boss says that they need to do better.
 - Wiesenberger: I certainly agree with that. I believe that many government officials would be supportive.
 - Loflin (chat): Local TV investigative teams might love to get on board.
 - Gagnon: And that is a great example of the type of decision that a smaller group working could address and recommend to the full ACR. Not only how to construct the document but also who the best audience would be.
 - Wiesenberger: We should collaborate with the CLT staff, Dan, to get the document to the FAA.
- **CLT Update – Stuart Hair, Director of Economic & Community Affairs, CLT**
- Hair: Update on EA that is related to the 4th parallel runway.
 - Wiebke: Our draft EA is ready, making the final adjustments to the Final EA document which will be given to the FAA within the next 30 days for hopefully their record of decision and FONSI (Finding of No Significant Impact). There has been no change to bring up to the group now.
 - Nothing will happen with Part 150 until the record of decisions from the EA.
 - Wiesenberger: Clarifying: The Part 150, because it affects some of the Recommendations we made, is that completely inclusive of the EA and our Recommendations, and that will be after the fact?
 - Wiebke: Normal process when you are looking at another runway is you get the EA and approval from that standpoint, move on with the design, construction, and implementation of it. Typically operate the runway for about a year to get the data through the community and operations; then you get the noise data from that. The FAA, because of the ACR and where we are with noise around the community, they are allowing us to engage with the 150 study while the runway is under design and construction so that way we can be looking at how to implement operating procedures for those runways.
 - Wiesenberger: Timing is of interest to the ACR. Recommendations 4, 5, 6 are all departure-related. How long would we have to wait to have 150 completed and evaluate these recommendations?
 - Wiebke: A typical 150 takes about 2 years because of public involvement and modeling. Any of the Recommendations that are submitted will need to go through an environmental review even if we were not doing a 150.
 - Gagnon: I believe you put in the letter to the FAA - clarifying timing of those items. That has been conveyed in the response letter – concerns if there would be no evaluation until the Part 150 is complete.

- Rutzell: Can you articulate that once more? In order for those Recommendations to be considered, first you do the 150, then the Recommendations? I am just trying to get a better sense of the timelines.
- Wiebke: 4, 5, 6 are going to be part of the 150 study that will start once we have the FONSI/ROD decision on the Environmental Assessment. That is about a 2-year process, and that will all be included in the 150 study.
- Gagnon: Any other questions? *None.*
- Gardon: *CLT Operations Update* - Page 8 highlights things. I ran the numbers for the month of July. We are at 95% of operations of July 2019, pre-pandemic. All this data is a 6-month period, from January 1 to July 1. You do see the dip for 2020, and we are in a state of recovery. Percentage of North Flow operations: What we have always said is that we would love to have a 50/50 split between north and south flow when able. That has not been the case for the last 4-5 years. There has been a predominance of North Flow operations. In 2021, we're tracking closer to 60% North flow.
 - Typically, cargo is measured by tons of cargo moved, not number of flights. We really don't have that many cargo flights. For the 6-month period, we are at less than 20 cargo flights daily.
 - Pages 5, 6, and 7 - this is just percentages of runway use, arrivals, and departures per runway.
 - Page 9 – This is information that was requested by the group. Would like to reiterate that it is very difficult to establish trends from complaint data. There have been many studies done about annoyance v. aircraft operations. We have covered it extensively in the last 4 years. This is just a part of the story. January-July 2021 = 126 complainants. The majority of those came from Mecklenburg County – 69%. A large portion of complainants come from Charlotte. *Showed zip codes and their numbers.* The top 3 zip codes are the 3 areas that the ACR studied when looking at noise metrics. Population is always a hot button, so the right-hand column notes complainants based on population. Did the same kind of thing with complaint numbers.
- Rutzell (chat): Thank you Dan - I like the detail breakout!
- Powell (chat): I don't think most residents know how to officially complain.
- Wiesenberger: It seems that we have had a tremendous number of South operations in the last 2-3 weeks. What causes that change?
- Gardon: Seasonal wind patterns in the summer months. You almost always see a prevalence of South Flow operations in the summer months. I have not looked at wind directions in the last few days. Wind direction is the primary factor, airspace congestion, anything happening on the ground.
- Rutzell (chat): It's been about 80% for the last month - South.
- Gardon: I think that sounds right.
- Crosby: What type of avenue does the airport provide to tell people how to complain? No one really questioned why they flew the way they did long ago. My dad was a pilot. We accepted and expected it. I think that if the people thought that their complaints mattered, you would have more complaints. I've seen A 340s climbing at 400 feet trying to climb out of Charlotte. I'm not sure that people know they can complain.
- Rutzell (chat): airnoise.io
- Gagnon: Dan, can you give a brief description on ways to complain?
- Gardon: We have had these conversations before and for a long time. It is a very valid point that there is a difference between people who are annoyed by planes and people who perform some type of action and complain. This data set is very limited, and we are aware of that. In terms of advertising how people can complain, we are open about that. If we receive a comment or complaint, we direct them where the complaints system is. We have neighborhood updates. I wouldn't say there is a campaign to push people toward using this system.
- Hennessey (chat): How to File a Noise Complaint

- In a continuing attempt to maintain an efficient and responsive Noise Compatibility Program at CLT, the complaint process has been made more accessible and responsive. You can ask questions or file noise complaints using any of the methods below. To file a noise complaint, you must include your name, street address, city, state and zip code. Any noise complaints that do not include all of this information will not be recorded or responded to. Be advised that any and all information received by the Airport is subject to North Carolina public records law.
- You can click on the below link to submit a web complaint:
<http://www.planenoise.com/cltairportnoise/>
- You can call in a complaint to: 704-359-HEAR (4327)
- You can mail a complaint to: Kevin M. Hennessey; Real Estate & Noise Manager; CLT Center; PO Box 19066; Charlotte, NC 28219
- When making a complaint, a specific date and time of the aircraft noise disturbance is very useful.
- Crosby: If people thought they could complain, they would complain. I am on the glideslope on the north side between 2 runways. I just don't give much credence to complaints.
- Gagnon: That is a good point, Darren. That is why HMMH looked at operations instead of complaints. Operations are the root cause of complaints – how high they are, how frequent they are.
- Gardon: I am more than happy to provide data. We recognize that it is limited.
- Wright: I am in 28214. Complaint fatigue. The airport would send postcards about noise meetings. We would flock to the meetings and comment. As time went on, fewer and fewer neighbors would comment and complain about noise. I did not know about the complaint process but found out about noise monitoring, which is how my name got in the database. Why comment or complain when it does not seem to make a difference?
- Walton (chat): Yes - complaint fatigue. agree!
- Walton (chat): Flightradar24 app is free and tells you what airplane, the height, and you can see if it is an arrival or departure.

➤ **Engage/Improve: Updates from Project Teams**

- Gussman: Community Engagement Project Team update: We are focused on getting our letter out to the FAA and their response and then getting that out to the community. See if we can get the word out about what our efforts are and where we hope they will lead us.
- Cameron: Government Engagement Project Team update: We are in a hold pattern. We have a call scheduled later this month. We will be trying to figure out if we want to take a more targeted approach than what we have been doing. We look forward to our next meeting.
- Wiesenberger: Local Ops/Improvement Project Team update: Similarly, we have been waiting for this meeting. No meeting scheduled yet.
 - Comment on complaints. There is a way to complain on the airport's website. It takes about 1.5-2.0 minutes to file. I have a flight over my house about every 2 minutes. I cannot complain for every issue, or I'd be continually filing complaints. It is kind of a bottleneck to file complaints if you're really mad or annoyed.

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

➤ **Note written updates on Motions/Requests for Support**

- Gagnon: Page 11. These are the requests for Action that came out of the last meeting. The first one, Dan just addressed. And then the next 2, getting the PowerPoint that Dan sent out and having those follow-up discussions from the ACR, which occurred. That has taken place.
 - Normal Written Updates document is on Page 12. Nothing new on this page. No additional updates at this point.

➤ New Business

- Wright: I attended Airport Community Solutions Summit on June 18 which was Part 1 – it was a couple of hours, and there is a follow up on Saturday that is a 6-hour meeting.
 - What is happening between FAA and other community groups is a pattern. The groups that were on the phone call were from the east and west coast. The first slide is describing implications for large populations in near airport communities that rank high on environmental justice metrics. What I found is that the groups emphasize the environmental effects of noise rather than focusing on DNL. On the first map, the dots represent places that have major airports that have major effects of noise. These groups have been around for many years. They're not just in the US.
 - A comment was that the problem with community engagement is that the decisions are already made before the FAA engages with the community. The FAA does not, with a few exceptions, change its direction because of community engagement. What we are experiencing is not new.
 - Note key findings - 1. Airports adversely impact air quality over large areas located downwind of the airport. They talk about these particles that come down. When I had my car checked, the mechanic asked if I worked at the airport. I said no. He says you have a yellow film on your car. I parked at the airport when I travel. There are environmental things that we don't notice.
 - Aviation activity at LAX in 2014. It shows ground-level ultrafine particle concentration that is evident near the airport. The study was done by Tufts School of Civil and Environmental Engineering.
 - Montgomery Quiet Skies Coalition. This group was formed in 2016 because of what had happened in the skies - you can read that. These are all excerpts that I found interesting.
 - This is what the coalition did – Legal remedies, Legislative remedies, and Local remedies. And the results: Legal, unsuccessful because of the timeliness. Legislative is very long-term, and local remedies, some success. They do get political persons involved, and this slide shows the representatives that are on the Washington Community Working Group - representatives from MD, VA, and DC; representatives from airlines, FAA, House and Senate staff. They met monthly for years; now quarterly via Zoom. This is like us, the ACR. FAA did not invest resources.
 - Basically, what you are seeing is what other ACRs are experiencing with the FAA. They are very focused on environmental impacts, on children. The meeting that is happening on Saturday will include breakout meetings trying to focus on solutions to what is happening in their communities.
- Gagnon: Thanks for sharing that, Thelma.
- Loflin (chat): Please share Thelma's slides.
- Wiesenberger: Thanks for participating in that.

❖ Adjourn

- Wiesenberger motioned to adjourn. Washington seconded; all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm