

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: November 10, 2021

Attendees

Kurt Wiesenerger, Chair, Charlotte
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Doug Pray, County 1
Natalie Rutzell, County 2
Sherry Washington, County 4
Mark Loflin, County 6
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Bob Cameron, Davidson
Sam Stowe, Gaston
Greg Chase, Huntersville
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Charles Soussou, Pineville
Wendy Burkhard, York (Central)

Susan Rodriguez-McDowell, Mecklenburg
County Commissioner
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Sarah Yenson, HMMH
Dan Gardon, CLT
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Mark Wiebke, CLT
Christina Saunders, CLT
Chris Poore, CLT
Pearlis Johnson, FAA
Matt Felton, FAA
Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)

Summary Minutes

❖ Open the Meeting

- Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- Wiesenerger: I will call the meeting to order. This is a meeting of the Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable, which is a group that includes 25 concerned Charlotte area citizens – concerned about airplane noise from Charlotte Douglas International Airport. We have been together since 2017. I've been with them about 4 years. We are trying to provide to the City of Charlotte, the FAA and the aviation department some broad-based community solutions that are practical/agreeable to help mitigate aircraft noise.
- Gagnon: Thanks Kurt. I would like to ask our new member Charles Soussou to introduce himself.
- Soussou: Thank you. I have a mechanical engineering background, and I have been working in the aerospace industry all my life. Now I do engineering consulting. Some of my relevant experience is at the Montreal airport I worked on the expansion plan. Also, with an airport in Newfoundland, I helped do a lot of the connection equipment. I am familiar with flight paths, and how that happens. I recently moved to Charlotte and live in Pineville. We get all the planes back and forth, and I know there is a new runway coming. I want to sit in and give any input I have. I am happy to help.
- Gagnon: Thanks for sharing, Charles. It is good to have people with airport experience and who have lived/worked in other areas. Please introduce yourselves as we've been doing. *Conducted introductions.*
 - From the Chat – Montross: For reference, American recently released its 2020 ESG report that includes goals and performance related to sustainability: <https://www.aa.com/content/images/customer-service/about-us/corporate-governance/esg/aag-esg-report-2020.pdf>
 - Gardon: Thanks Tracy. I'll also email this document to the group after the meeting.
- Gagnon: Going to share my screen. Go over Agenda. Handout is what was sent yesterday. Page numbers at top. Ways to participate – via WebEx, through the chat, phone. If participating through WebEx and use the chat, we save those comments to include in the Minutes. If you are speaking, please state your name. In WebEx there is a raise hand feature. When not speaking, please mute so no background noise. We are scheduled to go until 7:30. We are recording for detailed notes. *Reviewing the agenda – Went over page 1.*
- Wiesenerger: *Asked for Motion to Approve Minutes: Cameron made motion to approve, and Loflin seconded.* The Minutes are approved.
- Gagnon: Ground Rules - Healthy conversations/meetings - focus on issues and solutions; don't take things personal, don't make things personal. Be productive, clear/brief points. Effective in making noise improvement in our area.

❖ Receive Public Input: No public input tonight.

- Gagnon: If you are listening in tonight and not on the ACR, please note that the remaining comments from the public will be provided by ACR members only..
- Gardon: To register to speak at a future ACR meeting, please view the signup form here:
 - <https://charlottenc.seamlessdocs.com/f/KRTK3p>

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

➤ **Reminder of FAA Slate Review/Implementation Checklist – Ed Gagnon, Facilitator**

- Gagnon: Page 2 on the handout. This is what the process is supposed to be after the Slate is provided to the FAA. We have looked at this many times. Just to reiterate, the Slate was submitted to the FAA on July 9, 2020. This is the process that the FAA has articulated for us, that it walks through when it receives recommendations such as these. The first Phase is to do preliminary activities, doing initial reviews and evaluating feasibility. Once it goes through Phase 1 then you get into design of new procedures. Later, you can see development of operational prep work, then implementation and post-implementation work. Unless it is conveyed otherwise during this call, what has been said in the past when we have asked Andreese to clarify where we are, he shared that we were in Phase 1. Any questions or comments on this checklist?
- Wiesenberger: Yes, just for a reality check, the first step, which is preliminary activities, we have a note “May take 30 days+.” We are going on July to November, that is about (1 year and) 5 months, and I see the next step is 12 months+. Can we get a reality check on where we are more specifically?
 - It is a theoretical checklist. Can we update it to share where we may be, whether we can change it meeting-to-meeting? It seems like we are not really talking about progress here. Talking about what the process looks like theoretically. Is that right? There are check boxes. Have we gotten any done yet?
- Gagnon: This was the process laid out by the FAA and refined by the FAA, and the last time it was refined by them was March 2020. I don’t know if the process is any different, if the timelines are any different. Pearlis/Matt, can you share any thoughts if this is still the process that the FAA uses and if there are any updates on timelines, per Kurt’s question?
- Felton: I am not intimately knowledgeable on this sequence of events and the timelines. I can say that from prior experience from other projects and timelines set forward, it is generally just a guidance. It is always going to be flexible depending on situations. We have been in strange times.
- Wiesenberger: I agree with you, Matt. It is just an ideal checklist of events. I guess my suggestion is that we transition from the checklist to more of a progress check - how we are doing on this sequence of events going forward? For example, on preliminary activities, we would note if we are 50% or 75% of the way done. So, it gives people a sense of movement/progress, if you will. Ed we can talk about that at another time.
- Gagnon: Good suggestion. Any other questions or comments?
- Burkhard: Matt Felton, you are our Ombudsman, correct?
- Felton: Community Engagement Officer, and there is a title of Regional Noise Ombudsman, yes.
- Burkhard: So, you are our public liaison?
- Felton: Liaison, yes.
- Burkhard: And you work for the FAA? You are supposed to be impartial and our public liaison, correct?
- Felton: I am supposed to be a conduit for the public to the regional administrator’s office. As you have probably seen in these meetings and you probably saw in the September meeting, there are numerous, numerous subject matter experts and resources within the FAA.
- Burkhard: Yes, I get that. I have been closely reviewing the FAA’s policy on addressing aircraft complaints and inquiries from the public last updated December 4, 2019. And you are the person, when we have problems getting things done, you are the person who is supposed to help us facilitate and work through this. Is that correct?
- Felton: I would say that is correct in the way that I am supposed to be the person that helps facilitate or, in more laymen’s terms, help be a translator of sorts. I sit in on roundtable meetings for various airports, I listen for what the community is talking about, look for trends, for concerning items, not just one off events but things that can be trends. I can raise those up and start talking at a national level to look for opportunities. I act as a translator to help be there for when you’ve come with questions – I take it back to the FAA. We do a lot of very technical items. What comes back can be very confusing, but the people who are working in the technical aspect of it, it is second nature to them. I look for opportunities to figure out ways to explain it in a different way. When I sit in on these roundtables, I am listening to the public, and I am trying to convey some of the more important aspects back to the FAA. Does that help?

- Burkhard: The thing that bothers me is when you read this – The FAA’s policy of aircraft noise, they say that the noise is a shared responsibility between the FAA, the airport, us, but yet the FAA is the only one who can make the changes. And they don’t make changes based on the volume of responses that they get from noise complaints. They say that when you cannot get these things resolved that we should rely on our noise ombudsman, that is you, to address noise complaints and inquiries that are not resolved at the FAA regional level per the decision of the FAA Regional Office. It seems like we need your help, Matt. We’ve been doing this stuff for years now, and we are not getting anything changed. It is very frustrating to people like myself who it is disrupting our daily lives. We are trying really hard to follow the correct procedures here, and we need your help.
- Gagnon: Just to review. There is a desire to get as much support as possible, not only with technical review of these recommendations and getting the process moving, but if there is anything that Matt can do in his role as Community Engagement Officer to facilitate the voice of our community within the FAA, to facilitate trying to get these recommendations more quickly and effectively addressed, that would be really helpful. That is what I am hearing. How can we tap into Matt’s role, and we don’t have to come up with the perfect solution here, but it sounds like what Wendy is saying is we need to understand how we can leverage or use that role of Community Engagement Officer for some of its intent and how best to tap into this to get some improvements made. Is that where we are going with this conversation?
- Burkhard: Yes, I am reading this policy by the FAA and people are complaining, but the FAA is saying that they are going to only take one complaint per address. The rest don’t really count, and they are only going to respond once. They only respond when you ask them to, when you respond on the internet. Otherwise, all these phone calls, no one gets a response. People are frustrated. There are so many people around me who are coming to me because they know I am their representative. I have been out doing outreach to communities around me. These people have had it, and I don’t know what to tell them. I’ve asked them to please complain, but nothing is happening with their complaints.
- Gagnon: One ask that I have is – Matt, would it be a possibility for you to put together a short document that could be shared with the ACR, and the ACR members can share with their communities’ members? This could talk about your role but also what are the most effective ways to get their concerns heard. What are those venues and methods that are most effective, just so there is better understanding. Is that something that you could put together, Matt?
- Felton: I have been slowly working on that since taking over this CEO role. I think that is something that we can work on that I can provide that will at least give better insight as to what the role of CEO and Noise Ombudsman is to be for the public and the processes and opportunities that are there for the ACR and the public to have their voices heard. The only concerning thing regarding what Wendy said is that many of your constituents are complaining, calling in, and not getting responses. In the Southern Region (basically everywhere from NC south and everything from the Mississippi River east), just in the Southern Region in 2021, we have received a little over 15,000 noise complaints via the online noise portal. That is the primary point of interaction for conveying noise concerns. Every one of those complaints is and has to be addressed. It is not one per address, but we do find instances where a person will submit a complaint, and they will resubmit the complaint because the planes continue to be over their house. In instances like that when those come in and are answered, subsequent complaints will get a reply that says this complaint has been heard and is the same complaint and will not get answered. But every complaint gets reviewed, if it is not a repeat of a previous complaint that has been responded to, gets a response. It gets in some way a review and some information and data provided to it in hopes that at least better educates so the person understands why the noise occurs.
- Burkhard: Yes, you do reply to written complaints. You do not respond to phone calls, so people who call the 800 number do not get a response.
- Felton: With a lot of the phone calls, we won’t get all of the information. Some folks don’t leave their address, etc. The best way to tell your constituents to get in touch is to use the <https://noise.faa.gov> website. It has the data fields that are absolutely required to...
- Burkhard: If they live in the Charlotte area, they are calling the phone number that the Charlotte airport tells them to call for a noise complaint. They ask for your name, address, your phone number, and your complaint. I keep telling people that it takes less than 60 seconds; that is exactly what they are doing.
- Felton: That can go back to explaining what the CEO role is and what opportunities and options are best for being heard. We can work towards that.
- Gagnon: Thank you both. Matt - Dan and I will follow-up with you after the meeting just to confirm next steps and timelines to having you put together something for us.

- Wright: I heard Kurt’s question differently. Looking at the submission date for our Slate saying July 2020, what I thought he was asking is that based on these numbers, are we on level 11 or 12? Are we in the 12-month period now where there is the analysis of what we have already submitted? At our last meeting, we had the presentation noting they weren’t going to do anything. That is what I heard, and Kurt went back and said “what is our progress?” Assuming that we have presented a Slate, are we now in Phase 2 (Step 12, 13, 14)? Where are we now? That is the question that I heard Kurt ask.
- Gagnon: I will hand it off to FAA. As a reminder, prior to the FAA talking about doing conceptual designs on recommendations #1 and #3, we asked Andrees where are we in this process, and he had said that we were in Step 11, Phase 1. So Pearlis and Matt, are we in Phase 2 in any of these based on how you define the Phases?
- Johnson: I think we are still in Phase 2 because we are trying to get clarification on the recommendations as we go forward. As most of you know, we have asked for HMMH’s help to analyze that and make sure that everyone is on the same page as to what we can and cannot do. Since they did the analysis up front and since you all are familiar with how they shared the data with you, we want to make sure that we are giving the data back to you in a way that you’ve seen it before.
- Gagnon: So, it sounds like for the Recommendation that relates to raising the altitudes - Recommendation #3 - we are in Phase 2 at this point. Are we in Phase 2 for any of the others?
- Johnson: I would say that we are still looking at Recommendation 1 also, so that is where we are. The second option I believe we are all in agreement that we cannot do. But we are looking at Recommendation 1B, we call it, and 3B, we are still looking at those two. The departures are still in the Part 150 Phase.
- Gagnon: So, we are potentially in Phase 2 for both of those, but there may be some question about Recommendation #1 if we are in Phase 2. I know that you all had mentioned doing conceptual designs for Phase 1 which was that OPD/CDA recommendation. The departures are definitely in Phase 1. Is that correct?
- Felton: I would probably say that the alternative to Recommendation #1 is definitely in Phase 1 – bullet 11. I do know that it is actively being worked. We are hoping to be able to come very soon to the ACR with something of a conceptual design in the sense that we have with the alternative to Recommendation #3 - which I think you could very much say is bullet point #12, but the alternative to #1, not quite there but it is actively being worked across numerous lines of business to get to a point where we are comfortable moving forward and getting a conceptual design. I know in the September meeting, Michael gave a hope that we might bring something in January. I am not a pessimist, but I definitely am a “Murphy’s Law” kind of guy, and I can see it pushing past the January meeting. I am not sure when the next ACR meeting is after January.
- Gagnon: That helps. Thelma, thanks for that clarifying question.
- **Update on Evaluation Process of FAA Arrival Recommendations – Gene Reindel (Vice President) and Sarah Yenson (Senior Consultant), HMMH**
 - Reindel: We were asked to review Recommendation #3. As a reminder, the Recommendation was to return CAATT Waypoint to Pre-Metroplex. What we showed there in the graphic to the right - prior to Metroplex is the red altitude. So, these are altitudes, the higher on the graphic, the higher the altitudes actually are. In 2017, we saw the green, they actually were lower coming in on that procedure, at about 1000 feet lower is what we analyzed. And so that was the Recommendation, to bring altitudes on CHSLY arrival closer to pre-Metroplex altitudes. Under preliminary analysis using ACR criteria, this Recommendation was expected to have a net benefit in noise reduction to over 80,000 residents in the Charlotte Metropolitan area. Our analysis looked at raising the altitudes at EPAYE and CAATT waypoints by 1000 feet, and this analysis was completed prior to submitting the ACR Slate to the FAA. Since that time, the FAA has provided an alternative Recommendation for a possible way of addressing the lower altitudes. I will turn it over to Sarah to talk about what she has uncovered with the files that the FAA has sent to us. Those files are called TARGETS files. That is the modeling that they use to evaluate and analyze new procedures.
 - Yenson: We did get this TARGETS file from the FAA where they had proposed some changes to not only CAATT and EPAYE but some additional waypoints. The rationale is they want to keep the altitudes the same on either side of the airport for consistency and management purposes. So CAATT and EPAYE are being raised by 1000 feet - that was FAA proposal, which is in line with what we had analyzed previously. So that would be 1000 feet higher than current restrictions. The intent is to not increase the flight miles or change the flight tracks, which is how we modeled it previously. Again for consistency, the FAA proposed raising the corresponding fixes on several other STARS including the JONZE STAR, the FLIPZ and the PARQR and STOQR. Essentially raising the altitudes at similar points for arrival

procedures into the 36 and 18 runways. The figure on the right basically just gives you the altitudes as they are today and the FAA is proposing – for the most part – to raise them all by 1000 feet, except for HANDO, which will remain at 8000 feet since it already meets the criteria evaluated. Changes are not too different from what was proposed in the alternative in the ACR Slate.

- Reindel: In summary, that is basically all we have done at this point. We also agreed to do the noise analysis to show the changes that we have seen with the grid analysis. Unfortunately, that takes a little bit more time and effort. Sarah has given our noise monitors this information, and they are not adjusting the flight tracks at these suggested altitudes other than what is being flown currently. That is where we are in this process. It does appear that they are raising the altitudes about 1000 feet which should essentially return the aircraft at CAATT and EPAYE to what they were flying pre-Metroplex, but it also is going to provide additional benefit to those on the other procedures to the west of the airport and take advantage of raising those altitudes for consistency. Not only for consistency, but it is the way that they need to manage the air space. This is what we learned from the TARGETS files that the FAA provided.
- Gagnon: Thanks. Does the FAA have anything to add?
- Johnson: I have nothing to add to what Gene has indicated.
- Gagnon: Any questions or comments from the ACR members?
- Burkhard: These are arrivals from the North, correct?
- Yenson: They are arrivals to North and the South - both 18 and 36 runways.
- Burkhard: So, it would raise the attitude for 36 arrivals from the South?
- Yenson: For some of them, the ones on these particular arrivals. I believe there are some other arrivals that may not use these arrivals specifically.
- Burkhard: Dan, what is the waypoint near Fort Mill that impacts so many people that are lined up with 36L?
- Gardon: I will point out that these fixes are on the downwind of the approach, not the final. It may or may not affect your residents. It is hard to say at this point.
- Burkhard: Thank you, Dan.
- Gagnon: To clarify, the grid that HMMH puts this on is a 60-mile by 40-mile plot around Charlotte airport. Those grid points are relatively small. No matter where someone lives, if there is an effect of this increase in altitude, it will be shown.
- Pray: How does this correlate with the 3-degree glideslope? If I am 8 miles north of the airport, and they are basically coming in right over our head – you can hear them decelerate. Are they going to be at the same altitude basically over me even though they are higher up farther out?
- Reindel: They are going to be 1000 feet higher when they are on the downwind, which are the legs that are shown there east and west of the airport. As they turn toward base leg and enter final, which is when they are aligned with the runway, those altitudes are not being changed.
- Pray: So, I am about the same distance north as Wendy is south, nothing is really going to change because they are on final approach?
- Reindel: That is correct, and remember this is what was recommended by the ACR to go back to pre-Metroplex in terms of the altitude on the downwind arrival to the east of the airport but the FAA – in order to do that – is also increasing the altitudes on the downwind legs on the west of the airport.
- Soussou: Was this study done on the types of aircrafts? As we know that narrow bodies are typically louder and older than newer airplanes, or was this done generally?
- Reindel: This is taking into account the existing fleet in Charlotte International airport as of 2018. So, the aircraft that were flying in 2018.
- Soussou: Was it looked at switching the path for the noisier planes to one that doesn't fly over as many residents?
- Reindel: That was not looked into by the ACR.
- Cameron: Gene, you frequently provided us with numbers of how many residencies that would be positively and negatively affected by each of our alternatives. If the FAA does adopt what this is saying, do we know how many residencies will have a net benefit?
- Reindel: That's what we don't have that at this time; that's what we are doing now - running that into our noise models as we speak. We should have those in the next couple weeks.
- Brown: Raising these altitudes by 1000 feet. Say you are downwind landing 18 runway, will that keep the controllers from shortcutting and turning them in early? We had a Recommendation to maintain 6000 feet until final approach. I am wondering if by raising the altitude by 1000 feet on the downwind, will that inhibit the controllers from turning them in closer?

- Reindel: I don't know if the information that we received from the FAA included that level of detail, but clearly if they are up higher, they are not ready to turn to final.
- Brown: That is what I was thinking. They would have extended further before they could turn them in to get them into glideslope altitudes.
- Reindel: Sarah, we did not see any indication in the files we received that there was any increase in flight distance. So, somehow they have addressed that to some extent, but you're still right, Sayle.
- Burkhard: With the Part 150 that was approved February 1996, we were supposed to be at all Stage 3 aircraft by 2000. Are we there?
- Reindel: Yes.
- Gardon: I wanted to speak about the logistics of the next step. To put it shortly, the FAA is waiting on the ACR to make a decision about this alternative. So, if the ACR adopts this alternative as the new preferred approach to this recommendation, the ACR will have to submit to the FAA in writing. Based on what we know now, the ACR does not have the complete picture. We are waiting on HMMH for final data set. We will be in talks with Kurt, Phil, Ed, and Gene. I am hoping to get this to the ACR body and to have a vote – possibly before the January meeting. Just wanted to point that out. I assume that the ACR would want to move forward on this as soon as possible.
- Chase: Is that written proposal for all of the recommendations or just the CAATT/EPAYE one?
- Gardon: I believe in the proposal that it would be for all four arrival procedures that we have data for.
- Reindel: Dan is right. This is their proposal of how they would go about implementing what the ACR recommended. The only way to raise on the east side of the airport is to raise on the west side, as well. So, that is their proposal. When you respond back to the FAA, you're responding to their entire proposal.
- Burkhard: If we are doing it on one side, shouldn't we do it on the other?
- Wiesenberger: Yes, that's what we're doing.
- Gardon: North and south, east and west. Four total arrival procedures.
- Gagnon: With that understanding and as HMMH completes this analysis, CLT and CSS will work with HMMH, Kurt, and Phil to do preliminary review and to figure out how to get you all information and - if there is an opportunity to have a vote before the meeting in January - we will do that. With the guidance of all involved, we will figure out the most appropriate way to address the recommendation, assuming the data looks good.

❖ **CLT Update – Kevin Hennessey, Real Estate & Noise Manager, CLT**

- Hennessey: Stuart sends his regrets for not being here tonight; he was double-booked. We are still planning on starting the 150 following the EA record of decision, and that is targeted for the spring of 2022. Mark, do you have anything to add?
- Wiebke: We had public meeting/public hearing for the revised draft EA on Monday and had 3 or 4 speakers for that; so, that is concluded. We will respond to the comments that we received either through the public meeting and hearing or written comments. I believe that will be ready to be submitted in the next 30 days to the FAA. We are on schedule to get a FONSI by February 2022. The Part 150 contract for the analysis for the consultant services for Landrum and Brown is scheduled to go to City Council on December 13.
- Hennessey: Stuart did ask me to talk about the Community Engagement Communications Strategy. It is now starting to be implemented. As you may remember, airports develop branding around how connections aren't just made at the terminal. They have been collecting images and stories for an ongoing informational campaign about the role of the airport in the community. Stuart said he had a meeting yesterday to discuss where it will be located on the website; looking to push out this information in the new year. He wanted to reiterate that stories of the long-term work of the ACR will be in there.
- Gardon: Page 3 Key Measures document. The most important metric is the change from 2019 for operations per day. Currently, in column D, we are at 1,388 operations per day. That is a lot of aircraft, but it is about 11% down from 2019. Flights are still making their way back up but way below 2019. Cargo is still a relatively small proportion of our flights. I would like some feedback from the group on this format of data. Is this what you want to see? It is concise. I don't need answers now, but if you have ideas on how to share this information, please let us know.
 - From the Chat: Cameron: Dan, FYI, I do like the CLT Update format in the operational update - thanks!
- Cameron: Since we have a number of new ACR members, I would request that in the January meeting could we get a Part 150 "101" very basic overview. What it is, how it works, who is responsible, how the flow works, who does the approval, and when and how does the ACR have an opportunity to influence the 150. Just a plain language rundown, as a guide.

- Gardon: Bob, that's a great idea. We are planning that. In January we will likely bring on the consultant for a brief introduction. It is likely that the next meeting is when we will have that full breakdown of what the Part 150 entails.
- Rutzell: How can we be engaged in providing feedback on the Part 150?
- Gardon: We definitely expect the ACR to be a regular feature of the Part 150 planning process, not only because that is the way we are operating now but because recommendations 4, 5, and 6 are a part of it. So, we will have specifics as to how the ACR will be involved.
- Burkhard: One comment on the Part 150. The previous Part 150 that approved 36L and 18R. York County was not mentioned anywhere in the Part 150, and we are greatly affected by the flights that arrive to 36L. I just hope that in this Part 150 ongoing for the 4th runway, that York County is talked about.
- Gardon: That is definitely the plan. Just as an aside, in the previously approved Part 150, current runway 36L was not constructed yet. So, when you see comments referred to runway 36L, it was then 36L but is currently 36-Center that had been constructed in 1979. At that time, there wasn't a lot of talk about activity.
- Rutzell: Dan, when was the current Part 150 drafted? I thought it was 1986.
- Gardon: You're close. The current approved Part 150 was drafted in 1996 - 25 years ago. We are well overdue.
- Gagnon: Natalie, did you have a question or comment about the measures?
- Rutzell: We do see that complaints have increased about 60% year over year. Dan, I believe that we have talked about breaking it out by area. I think that - out of the complaints - about 60% come from Steele Creek. It would be nice to see which areas, by zip codes like you showed before, where the complaints are being sourced.
- Gardon: This operations data sheet is probably not the best for that sort of stuff because of spacing issues. As we have always talked about, these numbers only share a small part of the story. At our January meeting, we are scheduled for 6-month update on noise complaints. We can definitely talk about geographical areas then.
- Rutzell: So, there is one for you all and one that you share with ACR?
- Gardon: Yes, this is basically as high level as you can get. I don't remember the first time we looked at this key document, probably summer of 2021, kind of looking for key metrics. There is very little detail about complaint statistics here.
- Gagnon: The last time we had measures in this format was September meeting, and it was to try to get a sense of key metrics on the same page in a simple, repeatable manner moving forward. In a prior meeting, there were additional documents in the written updates section that showed a tremendous amount of detail regarding complaints. It sounds like in January, Dan suggests we keep the year-end data and also supply the detail on the complaints.
- Burkhard: To follow-up with what Natalie said and what Dan's figures are showing, we continue to get hammered with northern flow. People underneath 36L, look at the percentage of flights in north flow, and 36L just has arrivals. We are getting pounded down here.
- Rutzell: We also get a lot of departures; a lot of areas are affected.
- Gagnon: Feel free to reach out to Dan if you would like more detailed analysis of any of this data.

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

- Gagnon: Page 4. Phil is away. This is the information that was last supplied when we shared the last written update for the Community Engagement Project Team. You see the goals and the ongoing ACR member requests, but there has been a lot done since the last written update. Kurt, anything you would like to share?
- Wiesenberger: Unfortunately, I have not been able to get with Phil in the last couple of weeks. I can share that Wendy Burkhard has been doing a lot with community communications in her area. I applaud her efforts. In my example, I prepared a PowerPoint that I shared on Zoom meeting with my community homeowners association about 3 weeks ago. It was then shared by email and Facebook page to about 500 homes. I am happy to share that with the ACR members.
- Rutzell: For my residents that have asked what they can do, is there an opportunity for them to get involved in some of the activities under our subcommittees?
- Wiesenberger: I remember your email, and I think that is a possibility. I think we refer to those groups as Project Teams by government meeting rules. They can certainly participate and volunteer to do things like community engagement, government engagement, community activities of different kinds. I don't know of any objection to that. It is just a matter of organizing it.
- Gagnon: I will move to the Government Engagement Project Team. Bob Cameron provided information on Page 5.

- Cameron: Our goals for 2022 – we would like to define specific steps that we would like to ask if we brief government representative and they say “that is interesting; what can I do for you?” We should have an answer for that. If the answer is “we are just letting you know” that is fine, but it might be “please support House Bill 123” - that is a different kind of answer. As a group we would like to come to a consensus and have ACR concurrence on that – so we know exactly what we are asking our government representatives to do or get involved with or do.
 - We are also hoping to re-brief the groups that we have already briefed and request that they stay tuned to us. We continue monthly calls within the team. I contacted the Charlotte EPA office and solicited their engagement. They basically said that it was the FAA’s business in this regard, and the EPA - outside of the very specific rules of the EA going on with the new runway- didn’t have a role in that. I was disappointed to learn; we are reviewing the briefing provided by Kurt along with the last briefing that Sayle and I briefed our town councils on to use in future meetings. I saw on the chat that County Commissioner Susan Rodriquez-McDowell has joined the call, and I would like to welcome her.
- Burkhard: I spoke with Congressman Ralph Norman, and he said that he did not know how he could help. So, I need concrete things to bring back to him. The Senator Michael Johnson advised me to go to Ralph Norman. Norman is very pro-growth, pro-business, pro-airport, but where he lives is not affected by noise.
- Gagnon: Thanks all. Local Operations team. [pg.6] This document is a reminder of where that group was 5/6 months ago. They essentially paused their work prior to the June meeting. You can get a feel for where they are; this is a similar report from what they provided about that time.
- Wiesenberger: One of our initiatives was to network with other airport groups and, unfortunately, we have not pursued that the past couple months. We need to have a call and get back on track.

❖ **Request/Address Additional Business**

➤ **Unfinished Business – Note written updates on Motions/Requests for Support**

- Gagnon: Page 7. These are the requests that came out of the September meeting:
 - Determining approach to addressing the 9/8/21 FAA presentation.
 - FAA is developing Conceptual designs on Recommendations 1 and 3, as discussed earlier. They talked about where #3 was in terms of HMMH analysis, and they are still working through some conceptual designs on #1.
- Gagnon: Page 8 are the Written Updates documents. Communication strategy development - Kevin gave us a verbal update. At the bottom, Tracy provided an update on the vortex generators. They are supposed to have that done by March 1 and only have 9 aircraft left. That project is pretty much completed.

➤ **New Business – ACR Focus Areas**

- Gagnon: A couple of different items under new business. Kurt will start and then we will share the one slide from his PowerPoint. There are 3 main items: 1- ACR Focus Areas, 2- ACR Meeting Frequency for next year, 3- How frequency plays into the Project Teams’ roles and activity. Kurt, did you want to talk about what has transpired since the last meeting, and how that has led into the focus areas for next year?
- Wiesenberger: This list/slide originated because I wanted to present to my community some future focus objectives and goals that I felt were in consideration for the ACR moving forward. They are not 100% representative, but I wanted to give my community some idea that we have not stopped after submitting the Slate to the FAA. We are still pursuing other avenues of improvement. That is the origin of it. Some of these we have talked about before and some are new, and I think we could consider going forward.
- Gagnon: *Reviewed background/slides while Kurt had temporary technical difficulties.* There were several different meetings that took place since the September meeting, talking about how does the FAA’s response relate to how this group should have a focus moving forward. There were frustrations addressed and conversations about the role of the ACR moving forward. Kurt provided in that draft email - a 12-slide PowerPoint that he has shared with you all previously, which is included in presentations for community members. *Shared Kurt’s slide of Top Ten Set of Next Steps for the ACR:*
 - Staying engaged with the ACR recommendations that have already been submitted particularly #3, which HMMH presented on today.
 - Engagement with the Part 150 process, especially with 3 departure recommendations included.
 - Government Project Team-related. Making sure the government officials are aware of what is going on, whether local or national, and can take action on your behalf.
 - #4, #5, and to some extent 6 – Community Engagement Team-related – media outlets, community outreach, simplifying the noise complaint process for residents.
 - #7- Working with the carriers to try to move the fleet mix to quieter planes.

- Wiesenberger: I'd like to comment on that one. That arose because of speaking to other airport noise management groups; one of the most effective strategies has been working with some of the airlines, major carriers at those airports and having a good dialogue with them about managing noise. The one particular comment specifically – aircraft are manufactured to meet certain noise reduction areas, Stage 3, 4, 5 - Stage 5 being the most modern and quietest to my understanding. There are a number of Stage 4 aircraft that are produced to be quieter but currently not required to operate at Stage 4 procedural levels by the FAA. They are louder. That is what that statement is in regard to; happy to get clarification on that from the experts.
 - Burkhard: Tracy, what do you have to say about that?
 - Montross: I previously provided Kurt quite a bit of information about our Stage 3, 4, 5 fleet mix. I want to be very clear. All of American's fleet meet the threshold for Stage 4 measurements. However, FAA only requires Stage 3 certification. So, while everything is capable of Stage 4, there is a process to certify each aircraft for Stage 4 which we have not pursued for all of our aircraft because it is not required for FAA. But every aircraft is capable of Stage 4. Kurt, I wonder if what I shared with you was to be shared more broadly.
 - Wiesenberger: I think we need to boil it down from what you sent me. It is very comprehensive stuff, but I think certification and what is operating and what is the capability are a bit unclear. I wish we could dialogue so that we define it a bit more clearly. I think there is an opportunity in the Stage 3, 4, 5 to find some improvement area. That is the point of this particular step that I suggested.
 - Burkhard: With American having their hub and most of the planes in and out of Charlotte, it certainly would behoove them to be better neighbors for people that live in Charlotte considering that most people that fly through Charlotte and don't live in Charlotte. I would push that, for the quietest planes that we could get.
 - Montross: Yes, ma'am. I will make the point that 56% of the aircraft that go through CLT are regional aircrafts, less than 80 seats. Smaller airplanes. There is something to be said about the size of the aircraft and its contributions on noise. But I want to state again for the record, that 100% of American's fleet is Stage 4 capable. Just because it has not met certification, which is a lengthy and costly process, does not mean that it is not flying under Stage 4 measurements. I will say it again – 56% of the fleet operating out of Charlotte right now is a regional aircraft operating on E concourse at CLT. These are CRJ 700, 900; E 170, 175; BRJ 140, 145. The A321 aircraft that is being used transatlantic is less than 22% of the fleet that is coming out of CLT. I just want to add that perspective, the majority of the fleet mix is smaller aircraft and all of the fleet that operate out of CLT and across our network is Stage 4 capable and meets that noise threshold. American has the youngest fleet of any network carrier. The average mainline fleet age is less than 10 years. We have invested \$23 billion over the last 7 years to take delivery of 550 new aircraft. We are making significant investments to update our fleet for the customer experience, emissions reductions, for a better aircraft in both operation and for the customer. Charlotte is a unique airport compared to other hubs in that the majority of aircraft that come through the system are regional aircraft. You cannot say the same in New York or Los Angeles. We are serving a regional market with smaller aircraft that meet a Stage 4 noise threshold and do not emit the same noise levels as larger, wide body aircraft that many other airports might experience.
 - Wiesenberger: Thanks, Tracy. That idea was just an opportunity that I thought we could improve upon. If that is not the case, we can modify how we are stating that. The 8th point is simply stating that people in different areas want to know – What is the altitude flights should be at my location with a 3-degree arrival slope? Many people who are 8-10 miles away are complaining that flights are at 2500 feet. So why don't we publish that and let people know when there is a violation?
 - 9th point is what the Ops team is interested in – benchmarking, collaborating with other airports.
 - 10th point is something that we have been believing in since we formed this group, and that is working professionally with the airport, FAA, and all groups that are involved. Having no antagonist relationships. Those are things that we can consider next year going forward.
 - Gagnon: To summarize, some are government-related, some are community-related, some are local ops-related, and some are stakeholder-related. You can see there is a lot of good alignment with the structure of the Project Teams.
- **New Business – ACR Meeting Frequency/Approach for 2022**
- Wiesenberger: It has come up in planning, debriefing these meetings, whether having the meetings every other month is best. When I joined, we were meeting monthly, but at that time we were very actively researching, discussing, and learning how to put a Slate together. Since then, we have submitted our Slate and are kind of in lock step with the FAA responding to us. Their commitment is to respond quarterly. The question came up: Should we change our meeting schedule to be more in line with the

FAA updates and with the activities of the group? One other side note, perhaps it is not as necessary to meet with the entire ACR group more than quarterly but the individual Project Teams can meet on a more frequent basis - monthly basis, small group calls, different activities.

- Cameron: I appreciate what you are saying. My recommendation is the ACR press forward toward getting in person meetings every month. I think that our getting engaged physically looking and talking with each other is a positive thing for the progress of the ACR. I would hate to see us meeting even less frequently than we are now.
- Burkhard: I personally do not want to meet in person. I'll meet as frequently as you want but with COVID and personal health issues, I don't want to meet in person. I would love to meet you all someday. I'm fine with monthly meetings.
- Brown: I agree with Bob Cameron. I believe that we need to meet in person, with the members, FAA. I think we need to meet monthly; we were getting a lot done when meeting monthly in person. Since we have gone virtual, I don't think we have been as effective.
- Hennessey: To weigh in, the FAA has agreed to update quarterly. With what they are reviewing and studying now, even meeting quarterly with good information to provide is tough. Meeting monthly, I don't even know that they can commit to coming back monthly. Also, I don't think they would have much to pass on, and I understand the potential frustration that things are not moving as fast. When we first started, as Kurt stated, monthly was perfect because we had a lot going on, working through a number of ideas to get to the recommendations. Now that the recommendations have been submitted, now there is a lot of work involved that does not require the majority of the people on this meeting, myself included. HMMH did a great job and worked overtime on trying to provide what was presented at today's meeting, and they still don't have all the stuff. It is going to be that kind of back and forth. I am at a loss as to what we are going to do if we were to meet monthly. Up to now, our options are quarterly and bi-monthly. Monthly has not even been mentioned. Walk me through what we would do every month. I don't have a preference, but if we are not being productive, I'm afraid that people and groups will get frustrated and leave. As I look at other groups around the country, they tend to expand their timeframes and move to bi-monthly or quarterly, and that helps keep the team that we have engaged. You all have learned a tremendous amount over the last 4 years, and I would hate for that knowledge to go out the door. I'm afraid if you push for monthly, especially in person, people are going to drop off. Just my personal thoughts.
- Soussou: Putting my consultant hat on, regarding complaints and where they are – what are the tools that CLT and FAA have? Tools like purchasing land, or there is a body of water here, let's put a flight path there. What are the types of tools that are there and what are other airports using?
- Hennessey: My Recommendation is we ought to set up an hour and a half meeting – me, you, Dan offline – so whoever wants to be a part of it, we can meet and go through and show you how these questions that you are asking have been answered previously. Honestly, there is not a route to fly airplanes over industrial/commercial areas or bodies of water. But we want to show you what we have done. We are not trying to be dismissive. I will have Dan reach out to you, and we will set a time to show you everything that we can about Charlotte's setup, flight tracks, and what the ACR has done up-to-date.
- Reindel: The tool is really the Part 150. The FAA has come up with the Land Use Compatibility Planning Study - that is what a Part 150 is. You are looking to minimize people exposed to high levels of aircraft noise. That is the tool and the process that CLT is about to undertake. That really is the mechanism to do what you are talking about.
- Hennessey: Thanks for that Gene. To add to that, the Charlotte airport to-date has spent in excess of \$100 million in buying out properties and noise insulating properties for that very reason. I realize that it has not helped those sitting here in this group, but we have done a number of things on this front. Looking at the current Part 150 would be good to review and hopefully this new one will have benefits.
- Rutzell: Can we also address the noise outside the 5-mile radius, which is under the Part 150, to come up with solutions for residents that are impacted outside the normal radius?
- Cameron: Back to the point, it seems that this would be an easy thing to take a survey of the ACR members. I appreciate that the FAA and CLT may not have additional information to share at each meeting, but this is an ACR – not an airport or FAA group. It seems that it is up to the ACR to determine.
- Brown: I would like to know how we are going to influence the 150 if we only meet quarterly?
- Wiesenberger: To summarize, I've heard several strong comments that we do not want to decrease the frequency of our meetings, that monthly may be a good interval for the ACR volunteers to keep on their calendar; it may be that the FAA does not participate in those monthly meetings, but we can plan for those calls, and perhaps they are in person at some point in the future; at least have WebEx or Zoom

calls to talk about Project Teams and progress; to have a more frequent basis of various meetings than less frequent. Is that agreed to?

- Almond: I would go with the quarterly. I agree with Kevin. I don't know what we would do if we go back to monthly.
- From the Chat:
 - Loflin: bi monthly
 - Wright: Survey
 - Chase: Survey please
- Gagnon: It may be that we go with a survey as Bob Cameron mentioned. If we still go with our January meeting, our normal timeline – which is January 12 – between now and then we can do a survey and get the lay of the land from all 19 members in terms of frequency and focus as well as in person, hybrid, those kinds of things.
- Wiesenberger: I think the survey is a good idea.
- Wright: I'd like to see the survey and also if you could send out that list of 10 areas of concentration that would be helpful.
- Gagnon: Yes. Kurt how does that sound as a next step?
- Wiesenberger: That is fine.
- Gagnon: With the normal schedule, we are looking at January 12 for our next meeting, and we will be in touch with the full group about multiple points that we covered today. We have a lot of requests coming out of this meeting today that we will be summarizing and getting out to you all. Any other new business?
- Burkhard: Kurt, do you want to mention the hearing that we were at on Monday?
- Wiesenberger: There was a community hearing to get public comments on revisions to the Part 150 for the 4th parallel runway in Charlotte. The city had determined that they would modify the runway position 100 feet, and so there was another opportunity to have public input much like, I believe it was in April to have initial input. It was a Zoom call, and it was Wendy, I believe it was Doug Pray, Thelma, and myself and possibly others on the call. We gave our 3 minutes of why a 4th parallel does not really make sense when we have a noise problem with 3 parallel runways. We did put that into the public record.
- Pray: We also published that as well. There were homeowners on that call, as well.
- Wiesenberger: That was another activity we did this week.
- Wright: I don't know if it relates to the Top 10 list, but of the meetings I attended earlier this year, I don't know if we have the environmental impacts, other than noise that some of the other airport groups are dealing with – the emissions that occur and how the airport particles affect the environment, as well. There has been additional emphasis on environmental issues, not just noise. I don't know if that was on the Top 10.
- Wiesenberger: You are absolutely right, Thelma, and the mission of this ACR excludes environmental pollution beyond noise at this stage. We talked about this 6-9 months ago, and at that point we were just trying to get our ducks in a row around noise.
- Burkhard: I think it should be included, Thelma.
- Wiesenberger: That was my position, but we did not feel we had enough horsepower at that stage to do anything differently. Happy to explore that going forward and to add to Top 10 list of things to pursue in the future.

❖ **Adjourn**

- Wiesenberger motioned to adjourn. Wright seconded. All in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.