

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: September 19, 2018

Attendees

Bob Petruska, Chair, County 6
Brian Cox, Vice Chair, Charlotte
Kurt Wiesenberger, City 2
Loren Schofield, City 3
Katie Filicky, City 4
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Sam Blair, City 6
Alan Sauber, City 7
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Doreen Anding, County 1
Sara Nomellini, County 2
Calvin McGuirt, County 3
John Garrett, County 5

Bob Cameron, Davidson
Kim Hardee, Matthews
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Ben Miley, Mint Hill
Amelia Stinson-Wesley, Pineville
Ben Pecora, York
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Brent Cagle, City of Charlotte (ex-officio)
Stuart Hair, City of Charlotte (ex-officio)
Dan Gardon, City of Charlotte (ex-officio)
Kevin Hennessey, City of Charlotte (ex-officio)
Mark Clark/Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA (ex-officio)

Call-in Participants

None

Summary Minutes

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:00 PM. Chair Petruska opened the meeting and turned it over to Gagnon. Gagnon thanked all for coming and mentioned that we have a quorum. Went over the agenda. Multiple presentations today, so a lot of information to be shared.
- ❖ **Open the Meeting**
 - Approve Minutes:
 - Wright: Noted that her comment on top of page 3 needed to state "...Charlotte has changed, and the airlines/carriers have changed as well."
 - Then on the next page under discussion, the 2nd bulleted comment is not complete so would prefer it to be deleted.
 - McGuirt: He had asked that someone from American speak to their landing and take-off procedures, and it is omitted.
 - Minutes should be bigger font in printout at the meeting.
 - CSS will revise the August minutes with these changes.
 - ACR approved changes as noted.
 - Remind of ACR Goals/Mission/Charter - Hair: Thanks to all for their commitment and for coming – most full we've had the Roundtable. Great attendance.
 - Remind that mission statement and guidelines are available on the Noise page of the CLT website.

- What we are looking for is broad-based community input. Not just how it impacts me or my neighborhood. Looking at practical solutions and recommendations is our goal. Thanks for so many attending. He appreciates the investment from the airport and the community.
- Petruska: The community is appreciative of the commitment that the airport is making. We can see that with the visible investments of the consultants here.
- Gagnon reviewed Ground Rules.
 - Tracy Montross (American Airlines): Asked that these Ground Rules apply to emails and all conversations. She would also like to sit at the main table with us in October.
- Gagnon reviewed Meeting Packet Information.
 - Some of the things in the handouts will not be covered in the meeting tonight. Some of the materials included:
 - “Robert’s Rules of Order” 1-page overview.
 - Summary sheet of the items that were discussed at the last meeting. Gagnon will produce the same tonight and meet with HMMH and CLT staff tomorrow morning to make sure we are all on the same page as to what was discussed at the meeting and how to move forward. We create something like this every meeting.
 - All tonight’s presentations are in the handout.
- Participants Introduced themselves. Newest Participants (John Garrett – County 5 representative, and Cathy Schroeder – CSS representative taking notes/Minutes) were highlighted.
- ❖ **Review Public Input:** The following citizens were given time to address the ACR.
 - Person #1 Name Shannon Muckenfuss
 - Person #2 Name Natalie Rutzell
 - ACR participants shared initial feedback from the speakers.
 - Pecora: We have all experienced what the speakers have spoken of. We are well aware of the issues and will continue to take it under advisement.
 - Petruska: Thanks to the presenters.
- ❖ **Analyze/Uncover**
 - Before presentation Gagnon passed out document to use to take notes during the presentations and if we do breakouts will use this document during those. Hold questions until breakouts, except for questions of clarity.
 - **Presentation #1 (Departure Profile Analysis – Dan Gardon, Noise Abatement Specialist, CLT)**
 - Gardon: At last meeting there was an ask if there was a substantive difference of takeoff altitudes of varying airlines. Flights of American seemed to be lower, per a Public Input speaker from August meeting. There did not appear to be any procedural reasons for differences.
 - This study was done on a specific day following every takeoff of 18C – 399 takeoffs (going West after takeoff over Steele Creek area). Grouped these departures by overarching company.
 - Based on the Gate location selected, the average altitude of 2,390. AA is around the average. Delta is slightly below the average. Altitudes of subsidiaries vary.
 - Many factors contribute to altitude. Lighter planes and cargo planes tend to have higher altitudes.
 - Interesting that of the 399 flights, 92% are operated by American or subsidiaries. Not really a good data set for airline comparatives since not many non-American flights.
 - Ran the same gate about 6 miles down. Average was about 4,900 feet. Conclusion: Not enough variance in altitudes. American right about in the center of the data.

- Aircraft type tends to be the main driver of differences in Altitude.
- **Presentation #2 (Comparative Departure Analysis (August Public Input Follow-up) – Bob Petruska, ACR Chair)**
- Petruska: Differences between airlines because of differences in models of aircraft. Conclusion that Airbus is lowest of the altitudes in takeoff; it has a whine noise. American updated Petruska on the progress in addressing the whine; should be addressed by 2022.
 - For Dave’s house (Public Speaker from August meeting):
 - ◆ The most frequently flown aircraft is the lowest. Some days no flights, and that is because of the way the wind blows determining North v. South departures. Most of aircraft flown out of CLT almost exclusively by one airline, so hard to compare altitudes by airline. One day there were 129 flights. By looking at flights by time-of-day, the “banks” are obvious at various times of day. Also noted that there are no flights at night.
 - Cagle: Runways do not close. Cargo airplanes take off between 10-12 at night. Usually late at night, it’s private aircraft, military, or airline flights that were pushed because of weather.
 - Petruska: Time is seconds between flights at Dave’s house. 306 of 1,172 flights were less than 2 minutes apart. This helps to explain why so many in the community feel the noise, feel something is wrong. We need to identify what drives people to complain.
 - This information is key. Thinks there is a lot of value in doing this type of analysis. (See presentation on website) Public Input presenter from earlier made mention that she had this impact. No procedures changes and no altitude changes, but she noticed them more and more. How does that happen?
 - Gardon: I had a conversation with Petruska about quantifying what constitutes a complaint. Different factors affect people differently. It was helpful that Bob showed the number of quick, frequent flights. It’s helpful if we can assign a number – like a risk analysis number for complaints when proposing new methods. Say Mark’s house gets 50 flights and the ACR comes up with a change. Then we have something to weigh it against.
 - Cagle: People in the airport industry know that this is a problem. The FAA defines significant impact of noise differently than most people. Most people in this room do not live within what the FAA defines as the area of significant impact, but everyone would say that they are significantly impacted. It is frequency vs. individual aircraft volume.
 - Nomellini: This is happening at my neighborhood - The Sanctuary.
 - Gagnon: This gets at quantifying the annoyance, the level of annoyance that is acceptable or not.
 - Anding: It is frequency, but it’s the altitude, too, and it is decreasing. Bigger planes at lower altitude.
 - Pecora: Because of more aircraft at lower altitude, DNL needs to be adjusted. It is not a valid formula anymore. Looked at flights coming in at a different altitude. A couple of meetings ago, we talked about this – there was mention of arrivals coming in, and there was a 3,000 foot variance – they were flying lower and they could fly higher, and I think it needs to be brought back up again.
 - Petruska: If you’d like, please bring that up during New Business.
 - Gagnon: We will have a presentation by Gene about arrivals that relate to Pecora’s breakout group from July.
- **Presentation #3 (Initial Cursory Evaluation: Changing location of downwind arrival path – Dan Gardon)**
- Gardon: One of the factors we’ve talked about was reducing the population affected by noise.
 - Proposed moving the downwind arrival patterns to see the population that would be affected.

- Of the options given in the presentation (2 miles East of current path and 4 miles East of current path), there is a greater number of industry/commercial development if we stay where we are. Not a great change in residential population number, but what there is turns out to be a population increase. Very cursory study.
 - Sauber: Would the altitude be affected if you go further out?
 - Gardon: It may increase altitude in certain areas, up to 600 feet in certain areas.
 - Garrett: Why does the arrival corridor have to be so narrow? We should share the inconvenience.
 - Gardon: The airport agrees that we need to share. For departures it is easier. Arrivals: They're more complicated – they need to maintain separation and maintain distance over the departures. My understanding is that arrival tracks cannot be dispersed. Before NextGen, 0.8 mile arrival rail; current is 0.6 mile – that's a decrease of 120 feet.
 - Cox: What is source of population data? And how did you arrive at industrial vs. residential?
 - Gardon: 2010 census (explained with his map). I'll have to follow-up regarding whether apartments are considered residential.
 - Reindel: Regarding how the land use is classified, the census data is still counting the residents who live there.
 - Cagle: Some communities differentiate residential and industry in different ways on their census.
- **Presentation #4 (HMMH: Gene Reindel, Vice President HMMH, to present analysis of requests from July Meeting) - *Analysis of Altitude-based turns for South Departures (Related to Sara Nomellini request – increased dispersion/multiple RNAV paths for departures during south-flow operations)***
- Lots of information on slides. First slide: Agenda. (All of this is in the HMMH September handout and on the website)
 - **Raising Arrival Altitude**
 - Reindel: Aircraft flying level tend to be noisier (higher power setting). Based on the corridor reviewed, pre-Metroplex 2014 and post-Metroplex is 2017, level flights are at the same place. The data sets are different – different companies provided the data. May or may not be lower since 2 different data sets.
 - Cox: I'm uncomfortable with saying they "May or may not be lower."
 - Reindel: Altitudes on arrival are lower in 2017; where they're leveling off, that's where we're uncertain they're lower.
 - Cameron: Need clarification on terminology on the slide.
 - Reindel: It was clarified that the red is higher than the green. Red is 2014; green is 2017. So, altitudes lower in 2017.
 - Track distance: FAA and HMMH came up with almost the same information re: track distance, 2+ nautical miles average.
 - **RNAV Off-the-Ground Departures**
 - Definition: Acronym addresses Area Navigation - a departure procedure. Note – slide 11 on website and in handout.
 - Reindel: Possible obstacles are just that (doesn't mean it cannot be done) – slide 12. Limitation on aircraft flight computers. Clarification on limits on the numbers of waypoints in computers on aircraft. Safety concerns for pilots, air traffic controllers.
 - Reindel: We can look at this further.
 - **Altitude-based departure Turns**

- Reindel: How can we “spread the wealth?” A number of flight procedures at airports that have Altitude-based departure turns. Working with Newark right now.
- Reindel: All should impact and disperse the noise out. Turning as soon as possible after the runway.
- Reindel: Looked at 18C altitudes. See slide 16. If they all turned at 1252 feet (AGL or 2000 MSL) may have some dispersion. If at 3500, the difference of dispersion is larger. Aircraft differ how they get to certain points. Wanted to show the extremes. 3500’ (MSL) is an extreme. Higher altitude before turning = more dispersion.
- Gardon: Would lighter jets turn quicker and heavier later?
- Brown/Reindel: No, more performance-based.
- Reindel: Slides 17-18 should say “18L,” not “18C.”
- Reindel: Altitude-based dispersion could be a possibility. Current procedure is that, but it’s not being implemented as true Altitude-based turns because of noise abatement measure in place.
- Cagle: In South departures? What is that altitude today?
- Reindel: 2000 MSL is almost what we have today.
- Cagle: Current North departure routes don’t have the 2-mile noise abatement procedure.
- Nomellini: Thought we could change the south noise abatement.
- Cagle: Noise Abatement procedure put in place 20 years ago and is important for some residents. It’s part of Part 150, and it could be modified.
- **Aircraft Departure Procedures**
 - Reindel: FAA currently allows 4 departure procedures (Standard, Manufacturer de-rated procedure, NADP 1, and NADP 2).
 - Reindel: Some airports have their own departure procedures. Noise abatement procedures have 2 possibilities: Close in (NADP 1) and distant (NADP 2) - trying to protect a close in community or a distant community. The aircraft has to increase power, and that makes noise. NADP 1 will reduce close in noise but increase it later since they’ll still need power to climb further out.
 - Montross: My understanding is that we are not using NADP 1 anymore except at one airport (Jackson Hole for topography reasons, and not because of noise abatement reasons). We are using normal procedure of NADP 2 (here at CLT) because it accommodates noise abatement.
 - Reindel: Orange County has a noise level and you cannot bust. Pilots are given 3 tries, and then that pilot cannot fly there anymore. Orange Co.: The noise levels have not changed in 20 years.
 - Brown: Used to be called *Cut Back Power Takeoff*.
 - Reindel: I believe that NADP 2 is a fuel savings.
- **Moving downwind leg arrivals**
 - Reindel: Reviewed comments on Slide 24.
 - Reindel: We would have to work with FAA to see if this can be done.
 - Reindel: Not on slide: Metroplex did not show a change of arrival width corridor because CLT still using NextGen type technologies here for arrivals. In an earlier presentation, I showed the change in Oakland arrivals and how it went from a 5-mile wide area to a ½ mile wide area. In pre-NextGen procedures there was wider of a path. I am pretty sure that you cannot get there (a wider arrival path) today with the NextGen technologies.

- **Presentation #5 (FAA - FAA response to August ACR Motion – Mark Clark/Bob Szymkiewicz)**
 - *Motion: ACR requests that the FAA review the feasibility/viability of a Proposed RNP CDA and identify limitations regarding the locations analyzed by HMMH.*
 - Szymkiewicz: On ACR motion, we reached out to Gene who sent Bob Sz. information, who sent it to tech folks and designers at American and FAA. RNP Approach is not available at this time in Charlotte because of the way the traffic ebbs and flows here. American did not think that enough planes would utilize it. American is in favor of this procedure.
 - American was pleased to know that we were looking again at this. Have to have trained flight crews. Training issues but not insurmountable.
 - TSAS - Technology that Gene mentioned previously. Means Terminal Spacing and Sequencing. Enhances time-based flow management. TSAS set to come on in 2019 in Denver. Charlotte will get it pretty quickly. Can be made to work. He talked to the folks that would make this work and they feel there are some challenges at Charlotte at this time.
 - All flights would fly that pattern and because of environmental reasons, don't feel like it is viable now. Any change that is made would have to go through federal actions.
 - Apply scrutiny. Felt like the motion would not be viable at this time. Pretty good ideas to do at some time in the future.
 - Here are written notes from the Szymkiewicz presentation:
 - ◆ ***Notional RNP:** We made enquiries of various lines of business concerning RNP approaches at Charlotte. While the technology exists to produce and fly this type procedure it is not considered viable for CLT at this time. The ebb and flow nature of CLT traffic would severely restrict the number of aircraft that could use the procedure.*
 - ◆ ***Airline:** AAL does have an interest in this type of procedure but they realize until more advanced technology tools are deployed few aircraft could utilize the procedure. Aircraft equipage and crew training could be an issue.*
 - ◆ ***Technology:** Terminal Spacing and Sequencing (TSAA) is an enhancement to Time Based Flow Management (TBFM) and is expected to start deployment in 2019. Denver is the first facility to receive the technology and CLT is on the list. There are concerns, given the nature of traffic at CLT, as to whether TSAS, in its initial deployment, would be viable at CLT.*
 - ◆ ***Environmental:** Informal interactions with environmental specialists indicated the FAA would need to do its own study to determine environmental impacts. Currently aircraft fly in the area of the notional RNP and as such there is no reason to believe this would create any significant impacts. However, if all aircraft were to fly the specific track of the RNP this could trigger a need for more robust environmental study. The procedure would be viewed as a new Federal Action and thus subject to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements.*
 - ◆ ***7100.41A:** The regulation contains specific requirements with regard to procedure design and implementation. Interactions with a Lead revealed that although an RNP is a viable procedure it would not be scored high when compared to other requests and as such, it would not be a priority.*
 - Szymkiewicz: Summary: FAA would not be in favor right now, but they believe in the technology.
 - Reindel Clarification: NEPA is National Environmental *Policy* Act.
 - Pecora: Interesting that that may get increased scrutiny now, that that would trigger an environmental review.
 - Szymkiewicz: All procedures are subject to NEPA (He began to discuss the level of review through Metroplex).

- Gagnon: More concerned with us moving forward for the sake of time, not revisiting how Metroplex was done. When would this technology be available – 2019?
- Szymkiewicz; 2019 first system deployed at Denver airport. Charlotte is in the top 3 or 4 that would get it. Can try to track down a more definitive timing. We will know more when it is implemented in Denver, and their airspace is larger and different than at Charlotte.
- Nomellini: Had a question about saying it may not be used in CLT.
- Szymkiewicz: Because of the schedule - the first airplanes arriving from the Northeast could probably use the procedure, but as the downwinds push and the base pushes to the south, you then get back to manually vectoring airplanes. You would get very limited benefit for the time and expense and resources that are involved in the maintaining and production of the procedure.
- Blair: Fixed point: Does the FAA choose EPAYE or the airlines?
- Szymkiewicz: It was a cat fight. Controllers want to “turn base here.” Some aircraft can turn at different places. Old and young controllers, aviators, environmentalists talking about the points. It was a true collaborative effort.
- Cox: Wants to know if we can table the breakouts and move to Unfinished Business.
- Petruska: Getting lots of information. Thanks for the presentations – they were great. Do you want to hang out for another hour? We will table the breakouts.

➤ Breakout Sessions/Review of Actions

- Tabled for this meeting.

❖ Additional Business

➤ New Business

- **Voluntary Curfew - Sending letter to airlines asking for voluntary curfew.**
 - Petruska: Doreen mentioned this a few meetings ago.
 - Anding: Would like to see it done. It is voluntary. Some airports have curfew, but they are grandfathered in. A senator was with us a few meetings back. Maybe he could help to try to get this done.
 - Petruska: How would we do this, Dan?
 - Gardon: Right now we do not have any or much traffic after 11. Best case in Charlotte would be to try for a reduction in private traffic and military. The airport and our legal team would have to discuss it.
 - Petruska: ACR wants to send a request to appropriate airlines asking for voluntary curfew. This would happen after Dan does a deep dive.
 - Hair: It would be appropriate to make a motion.
 - Anding makes a motion, and Cox seconds. After discussion, Gagnon summarizes the motion: The motion is that ACR wants to make a motion to send a request for a voluntary curfew for the appropriate airlines or carriers. The specific ask of CLT is to determine the feasibility of how to do that.
 - Gagnon: Stuart, are there any considerations we need to have from a Robert’s Rules perspective for this type of motion?
 - Hair: From a Robert’s Rules perspective, it doesn’t matter what the actual motion states. Doesn’t think that the airport could support without it being an action that the City Council would support. Thinks that it is more than just a letter – it is a policy.
 - Petruska: He questions this. First stated to make a motion and now saying that the City Council has to get involved.
 - Gardon: I think Hair is saying that City Council would have to get involved with a policy change but for this motion to investigate, it wouldn’t need to go to City Council – it would just need a motion.

- Cox: Does the way Dan rephrased it meet the spirit of your interest?
 - Anding: Talked about curfew at Heathrow and their voluntary agreement with the airlines and the authorities. I just want to kick this off; I'm fine with an assessment.
 - Cox: Confirms his second to the motion. We understand that a deep dive needs to happen before sending a letter.
 - Gagnon: Restates the motion.
 - Montross: Can you please define curfew?
 - Anding: In answer to a question about what defines curfew – at Heathrow it is 11p-5a, no scheduled arrivals or departures.
 - Petruska: We just want to make it better for all involved. Do we have a vote? Have we discussed it? We know that - before a letter - Dan will look into it more.
 - VOTE: All in favor except Sauber – not convinced a motion is necessary.
- **Information on Noise Abatement Takeoff Profile and consideration of request for analysis v. Normal Takeoff Profile.**
- Cox: Summarized that at last meeting we had a speaker who was a retired AA pilot, who still flies, who addressed the ACR regarding departure profiles. He has a handout of the email that was sent out to the members and presenters here. There is a Noise Abatement Procedure – also mentioned by Gene (HMMH) that allows planes to fly higher quicker, and he would like to examine this more closely.
 - ◆ His motion: Request the ACR to review the attached information and consider requesting HMMH to review and evaluate the Noise Abatement takeoff profile. Specifically, and assuming the Noise Abatement profile is a valid option for Charlotte, what are the potential positive and negative impacts for Charlotte residential areas compared to the “Normal” takeoff profile?
 - Cox made the motion; seconded by another member (Petruska).
 - Cox: The pilot provided me the information that I am providing for you.
 - Gagnon: Other comments?
 - Montross: NADP 1 is what we're calling the “Noise Abatement” takeoff profile. NADP 2 is the normal takeoff profile. NADP 1 profile is not used in the US except Jackson Hole because of topography. NADP 2 is used in this market. Saying that AA is not using it is incorrect because it is not available in US markets. It is used in international markets. I think it is an interesting concept and would like it studied, but it is not used now because it is less-than-feasible.
 - Cox: I was left with the impression that it is used in more than one airport in US, but I'm not positive as I did not write it down. That's why I want HMMH to look at it.
 - Miley: Why “allowed” in certain European markets? Can you define “allowed?”
 - Montross: ICAO – International Civil Aviation Organization states that in European communities NADP 1 is the procedure that must be used. It is a requirement of that international organization. It is not a requirement in the US. Was previously used in Orange Co. as a response to noise abatement procedures. Not currently being used in that market right now.
 - Cox: We will let Gene take a look at it. Will put Gene in touch with Ken Smith, the pilot.
 - Cox made the motion. Sauber seconded.
 - Petruska: Any discussion? All in favor?
 - VOTE: Unanimous.

➤ **Rescheduling October Meeting**

- Reindel: Adam Scholten is our airspace expert at HMMH. He did the analysis presented to the FAA. He is doing most of this work, and I thought it would be nice to introduce you to him. He is involved in other roundtables on our date so can only come on October 24.
- October meeting is now Wednesday the 24th.

➤ **Gagnon: Other Business?**

- Discussion Point #1
 - Sauber: Would like to see more of Dan's study of moving the downwind 2 miles. What are the pros and cons, and what is the bottom right corridor affecting?
 - Gardon: It is a bit difficult.
 - Sauber: I would like to know more about that because I think moving it would be a benefit to those affected. Do the analysis and that will show the benefits. Need more information.
 - Gardon: We don't need a motion. Will treat as a data request.
- Discussion Point #2
 - Nomellini: Gene's analysis on Altitude-based turns was interesting. Seems like we start a bunch of things and never follow through.
 - Reindel: Like was done with the RNP approach is to ask the FAA to implement. Before that it would be worth doing a noise analysis to see what that would look like in terms of in the areas where we would be turning those aircraft - what that looks like in terms of noise. What are the noise levels and where in the communities? I don't think you want either of the 2 ends (2k or 3.5k) but somewhere in the middle is doable. Do we want to ask the FAA to look at feasibility while we are doing the analysis, or no more analysis? Do we want to disperse and tell them to do it?
 - Cagle: Would want to hear from either the FAA or Gene on what it does to the arrivals and departures rate. If it significantly impacts the throughput capacity, then that would have all kinds of other impacts downstream.
 - Nomellini: Before we go to the FAA, what's the next step?
 - Reindel: We have done preliminary analysis that, even out to the 3500 mark, the planes are below the 5000 feet arrival path. The FAA will have to determine the actual conflicts.
 - Gagnon and Nomellini: Noise study with population impact?
 - Cagle: Look at impact on efficiency or the airport capacity from an FAA standpoint and what that does to arrival and departure rates at different levels. If the airfield capacity reduces, it does not mean there are less flights; it typically lengthens the day. This may be a simpler way to get to the result desired through the multiple RNAVs.
 - Gardon: I like the order Ed put that in (on the Flip Chart) with noise then population. If there is no reduction in noise, it is not worth it. Prioritize in that order.
 - Motion: Request a **noise** study with **population** and impact on **throughput** (efficiency of arrival and departure numbers) for Altitude-based Turns.
 - Motion was seconded by Cox and voted on. Unanimous.
- Discussion Point #3
 - Blair: Can we discuss moving that waypoint back?
 - Cagle: That would raise altitude 800' and extend the leg 2 miles.
 - Pecora: If we're raising the altitude back, should they be using a more continuous descent instead of the level offs?
 - Clark: We need a period of level flight.
 - Gagnon: The points that Sam and Ben are referring to are on page 8 of Gene's presentation.

- Reindel: Restates that the level offs are still occurring at the same geographic points surprisingly. The level offs don't seem to be affected by raising the altitudes. Shouldn't get additional noise by raising the altitudes. Should get less noise by 800-1000', which is less than a 2 dB level.
- Gagnon: Sensing that there are 2 ways to go with this motion. 1) Send the request to the FAA to review viability/feasibility or 2) Actually do some data analysis to look at the affected areas.
- Cox: I thought we did ask the FAA to look at this?
- Reindel: 2 things that came from my presentation last month. You would get more noise benefit if you did a PBN – performance-based navigation approach – and the FAA looked at that. And they said today that it is not feasible today. Do you want to revisit raising the altitude back up?
- Cox: Yes. I don't think it harms anyone in the room.
- Reindel: A difference would be that some aircraft will travel further south by 2 nautical miles.
- Cagle: It's not a concern, but it's a consideration. If it's higher over one area, that means it will be lower further down the path over another area. There would be a cost to American for fuel and 2 more miles flown by aircraft. Multiply that by thousands of flights. City Council wants to reduce greenhouse emissions, so I may need to talk with them about it.
- Cox: I would welcome that conversation. We have been talking about this for 6 months. This is where we are spinning our wheels.
- Brown: Regarding flying 2 more miles, the trombone effect is affecting them anyway.
- Cagle: I don't know that, but the other point is - Is raising an airplane 800 feet going to make a difference on the ground?
- Pecora: (Lives in a rural setting and says that it does every day) You cannot compare urban and rural. Do I need to make a motion for the FAA to see how that DNL is calculated? When you put lots of planes coming back to back over that distance that low to the ground the whole calculation goes out the window. Noise impact cannot equate rural and urban environment.
- Cagle: The federal definition of significant impact and the DNL calculation should be revised/reviewed because it is out of date. I think the FAA agrees and is in the process of doing that. The change of 2 miles will only be noticeable if you're under that 2 mile change. Metroplex changes were 1-3 miles.
- Cox: Before the waypoint moved, how many years had it been in that place?
- Mark/Bob Sz.: Ballpark 5 years in place...not something new.
- Wright: We are talking about potential results before having analysis.
- Blair: Let's put a motion out there. I understand what Brent's saying; anything we do will affect someone negatively.
 - ◆ Motion: To formally submit moving the waypoint back to previous location. Seconded by Cox.
- Petruska: All in favor?
- Gagnon: Everyone but Bob Cameron. Cameron opposed.

- Gagnon: Any other business before we adjourn?
 - Cameron: November meeting is day before Thanksgiving. Should reschedule.
 - Gagnon: We will discuss between meetings.
 - Wiesenberger: Received something written by Heathrow's airport management re: noise with community support. 10 practical steps. Can we adopt some of these?
 - Cox: It would be a great topic for the next meeting.
 - Petruska: I sent this out today.
 - Gagnon: Thoughts about today's meeting?
 - Anding: Understand levels of frustration. We still need to keep our tempers to ourselves. Can we be respectful? Take deep breaths before we get upset.
 - Gardon: This was one of the more productive meetings over the last year. We have gotten a lot of new information from sources, and we are moving in the right direction.

❖ Adjourn

- Petruska motioned to adjourn. Cox seconded, all in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 8:42 pm.