Airport Community Roundtable
Unapproved Summary Minutes: August 15, 2018

Attendees:

Bob Petruska, Chair, County 6	Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Brian Cox, Vice Chair, Charlotte	Bob Cameron, Davidson
Kurt Wiesenberger, City 2	Kim Hardee, Matthews
Loren Schofield, City 3	Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Bobbi Almond, City 5	Ed Gagnon, Customer Service Solutions
Sam Blair, City 6	(Facilitator)
Doreen Anding, County 1	Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Sara Nomellini, County 2	Stuart Hair, City of Charlotte (ex-officio)
Calvin McGuirt, County 3	Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA (ex-officio)

Call-in Participants
None

Summary Minutes

- Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- Open the Meeting
    - Approve Minutes. Cox moved to approve. Anding seconded. All motioned to approve.
    - Reminder of ACR Goals/Mission/Charter by Hair
    - Review Ground Rules by Gagnon. Includes: every suggestion possible solution; avoid acronyms; listen to all input; focus on listening; first, seek to understand; speak the truth; no us vs. them mentality; be respectful of others point of view; don't take it personally; don't make it personal.
        - Petruksa suggests adding: withhold judgment until idea is full evaluated. Wiesenberger seconded this idea.
    - Review Meeting Packet Information by Gagnon. Left side of packets included agenda items while right side of packet are information for members but may not be reviewed during the meeting.
    - Introduction of Participants
- Discuss Attendance Policy by Gagnon
    - Petruska: we have two members who have bumped up against the attendance policy. They will no longer be members.
    - Cox: concerned about the 50% being based on a six month basis.
    - Wright: Not sure the use of the phone line has been useful.
    - Wiesenberger: Considered using the phone, but there is so much visual information I felt that it wasn't helpful to call in.

- o Cameron: believe that we voted that calling in did not count towards quorum, nor did sending a substitute
- o Gagnon: seems like we need to review this during meetings and potentially bring back any suggested changes
- Review Public Input: the following citizens were given three minutes to address the ACR.
  - o Nancy Nyberg
  - o Bryan Stevens
  - o Ken Smith
  - o Dave Chavoustie
  - o Roundtable participants shared initial feedback from the speakers.
    - ▪ Encourage speakers to apply to sit on roundtable
    - ▪ Interested in the take-off profile differences, including differences at other airports
    - ▪ Would like to understand AA perspective of take-off profiles
    - ▪ Dan Gardon of CLT offered to run data on altitudes by airline
- Analyze/Uncover
  - o CLT Continued Aircraft Operations Evaluations Presentation by Reindel
    - ▪ *ACR Motion 01-12/02-18 Increase Base Leg Altitudes on Arrival into CLT*
    - ▪ Reviewed the arrivals pre-metroplex and post-metroplex. Data shows aircraft are lower on arrival than they were pre-metroplex.
    - ▪ Altitudes can be increased without traffic conflict, but increasing altitude may reduce some of the airspace efficiency
    - ▪ *ACR Motion 01-17 Optimized Profile Descents into CLT*
    - ▪ Reviewed Continuous Descent Approach for Runway 36R and modeled the flight tracks with South Park Mall as a reference point
    - ▪ Modeled with common aircraft types into CLT.
    - ▪ Determined that the level off flight segment results in higher noise decibel as the aircraft is under power. Otherwise, the noise profiles were similar.
    - ▪ May see noticeable improvement of 3-4 dB less than existing conditions by using continuous descent profiles and minimizing leveling off areas
    - ▪ CDA could increase the workload in the tower to effectively and efficiently land aircraft. Current conditions are a very effective use of airspace
    - ▪ *ACR Motion 00-18 Delay Runway 18L Turnout on Departure*
    - ▪ Reviewed altitude conflict points
    - ▪ Analysis show that delaying departure turns would result in potential traffic conflicts with south flow of downwind arrivals
  - o Petruska: asked Reindel which of the scenarios he would suggest the ACR pursue for further work.
    - ▪ Reindel: does not believe the FAA is ready nor is the capability there to pursue optimized profile descents in an area where arrivals and departures are crossing. Recommends ACR ask FAA to implement when it is reasonable.
  - o Cox: are there other ways to skin the cat to make changes? Perhaps some of the fixes?

- Reindel: you can raise the fixes but it will require the planes to fly further south. This would decrease the efficiency of the system, which describe the flexibility of the tower to turn aircraft onto final approach when there are slots.
- Szymkiewicz: the definition of efficiency can change depending on where you are in flight. Aviators and tower controllers would see things differently. As Reindel described, it we raise the fixes, we lose some of the efficiency.
- Wright: do smaller airports around Charlotte have anything to do with the flight patterns for CLT?
  - Reindel: it is an integrated airspace. Looking at the areas south of the airport and this close in, we don't see those as a factor. That said, one doesn't have to go out very far without there being conflicts
- Wiesenberger: could you comment about the departures and the leveling off scenario?
  - Reindel: can certainly explore this area. We can look closer in to the conflict area and see what the aircraft are doing now. I can take this back and see if there are gains that can be had on departure.
- Breakout Sessions/Review of Actions
  - Increase Base Leg Altitudes
    - Reindel: 1,000 ft altitude change results in 1 – 1.5 dB change which is barely perceptible.
    - Gagnon: based on that, does the ACR want to move forward?
    - Cox: I am less concerned about moving noise if we are moving the noise back to where it used to be.
    - Reindel: before you forward it as a request to the FAA, you would do your due diligence. We can do analysis to see the difference in noise levels if we revert back to the prior operation.
    - Cox: think most people would agree we should focus noise over less populated areas instead of more populated areas. Perhaps we should examine moving the tracks over less populated areas in South Carolina.
    - Blair: if we were to move the 8,000 limit further south, could we raise the departures?
      - Reindel: these are two different operations.
    - Schofield: I think we should target the industrial area around Westinghouse?
      - Reindel: that is an approach used in Part 150 studies over land use studies. Looks at where we could operate aircraft to reduce noise exposure
    - Nomellini: find the use of the term efficiency confusing. Can we clarify?
      - Reindel: in this case, efficiency is when the aircraft can turn onto final sooner. Helps to prevent arrival delays into the airport

- Wright: would like more clarification of the terms. I think we also have to recognize Charlotte has changed, airlines have changing. Look to the future instead of going back.
- Gagnon: sounds like we are not ready to move forward with a decision on this action right now. What are thoughts?
- Wiesenberger: Think we should back-burner this for now.
  - Optimized Profile Descents
    - Gagnon: think I heard Reindel say this is probably not best action in near term
    - Reindel: correct. The technology is not there to make this feasible at Charlotte right now.
    - Cameron: could a CDA be used when feasible - when traffic is lighter (especially early morning and very late at night) which is also when people are particularly impacted?
      - Reindel: I imagine they may already being doing that. Airlines want to do that because it is fuel savings. HMMH can look at whether they are being used currently. HMMH can also look at the number of operations by times of day.
    - Gagnon: is this something we want to ask HMMH to do?
      - Brown: think this sounds like a good idea.
    - Wiesenberger: I thought we were going to get some data on night operations?
      - Gardon: I will work on that.
    - Petruska: can FAA give us initial thought on CDAs?
      - Szymkiewicz: this is something FAA is working on – called Trajectory Based Operations. It is in the foreseeable future.
    - Petruska: does the technology currently exist for RNP approach?
      - Szymkiewicz: yes. The technology exists
    - Gagnon: is this something we want HMMH to analyze?
    - Petruska: what is there to analyze? What keeps us from implementing? Or, how do we move this forward?
    - Hair: need to make a formal motion.
  - Departure Turn Analysis
    - Gagnon: sounds like we are going to do additional analysis
    - Reindel: yes. We will work with FAA to understand existing procedures in place. We will come back.
- Unfinished Business
- Motion 01-2018 and 02-2018 have not further action pending at this time
  - The breakout requests from last meeting are still being reviewed. Roundtable still wants HMMH to pursue these.
  - Cox: want to phrase this appropriate with input from FAA. What are your thoughts?
  - Szymkiewicz: I am not sure where you want to go. We cannot review individual recommendations month to month. We need a basket of recommendations to review?

- o Cox: I make a motion that based on HMMH findings on Slide 16 that we request an analysis and consideration from the FAA to implement this.
- o Hair: let me clarify this process. To implement a CDA, this will require an analysis that will take 12-18 months.
- o Petruska: let's just get this done. Let's change this motion to ask the FAA to do a look-see if this is feasible as this step
- o Cox seconded.
- o Discussion:
    - ▪ Wright: do we have all the information ready to pass to the FAA based on the questions we put to Reindel?
        - • I think you have enough information to have the FAA review and identify limitations for this specific flight track
    - ▪ Petruska: is this an overall benefit to the community?
        - • Reindel: there is the possibility that some may see an averse effect – this did happen in Los Angeles
    - ▪ Cameron: we asked the FAA to look into this in November 2017 and we didn't get anywhere. We need buy-in and partnership form FAA. We need more than a yes or no. I would like to know the exact wording of the motion.
    - ▪ Cox: Ed, can you please read what you have captured?
    - ▪ Gagnon: Request the FAA to review the feasibility/viability of Proposed RNP CDA and identify limitations regarding the locations analyzed by HMMH.
- o Vote: All members present voted for the recommendation (2018-06, expansion of 2017-01)..
- • Proposed Request by Nomellini: Request to study SW multi-path RNAV departure routes
    - o Nomellini: look to spread the love of noise across the areas in the southwest.
    - o Brown: a little concerned that Brent noted the airport asked for this before and it was turned down. This is why I made my request broader to give the controllers some additional flexibility.
    - o Schofield: is 1C realistic? Isn't this part of the Part 150
    - o Hair: that is correct. This is part of a federal approved Part 150 program so including a turn sooner would require a much broader process
    - o Reindel: when you say look at RNAV departure routes are you requesting only RNAV/distinct routes or are you looking for more broad range of recommendations?
    - o Nomellini: broader range of recommendations is fine
    - o Reindel: we can find information we need in the data and we understand the procedures pretty well so I think we can start and see what is possible to do to 'spread the wealth'.
    - o Petruska: don't think we should assume all changes are zero-sum
        - ▪ Reindel: probably best to do the analysis and see
- • Petruska: have the idea we should look at a new noise complaint and see what happened right before the noise complaint so we can see what thresholds people object to.
    - o Reindel: we have found this to be very subjective. People notice change. Sometimes the change happens in the house, such as when someone retires.

- Cox: various aviation industry groups are urging US Senators not to consider noise abatement as part of the FAA's reauthorization bill.   Providing an aviation industry letter prepared by Airlines for America and other groups not to consider. Are we interested in the ACR as a body to sign a letter to the US Senators asking them to include noise abatement.
- Nomellini: we have been told that time is of the essence and that the Senate has the most control over the FAA reauthorization.
- Gardon: I think there are quite of few of these recommendations which are very good and which it makes sense for the ACR to request. There are a few that are ambitious, and there are a few that may hurt the credibility of the group, and there is one that is very odd. Recommend we take a look at these and review more thoroughly.
- Cox: I am fine with looking at these further.
- Nomellini: I am concerned we don't have enough time.
- Wiesenberger: I acted myself on this today and sent letters to my Senators. We could express our general support of noise abatement in the reauthorization bill.
- Anding: I agree with Kurt. I have some reservations about these and don't want to do carte blanche. At a high level, I think it is wrong for an industry group to write what they did, but I do think there are certain things need to be discussed.
- Cox: can Dan and Kevin take a look and then Bob and I can send a letter to Montgomery County offering a general level of support about what they are doing.
- Gardon: the Airport cannot formalize a stance in a week. We can look over these and weigh in and provide these to you. As private citizens, you can then send it as you want.
- Nomellini: I think it would be safe for the ACR to go on the record that the Senate should include noise abatement as part of the reauthorization.
- Petruska: that sounds reasonable – will you take the lead on that?
- Cox: I think this should come from Chair and Vice Chair
- Cameron: I am concerned about a general letter going out without knowing what it says.
- Nomellini: is there is concern with us writing letters where we state we are on the ACR?
- Hair: No. In fact, I would encourage you to do that.
- Petruska: would like to revisit the three minute rule. Motion to revise the public speaker motion. I think this is important and we should extend it.
- Cameron: Motion - we should change the motion to say that the 3-minute or 15-minute timeframes can be extended at the discretion of the Chair.
- Petruska: second.
- Vote: all in favor.
- Adjourn
    - Cox motioned to adjourn. Cameron seconded, all in favor.
    - Meeting adjourned at 8:53pm