

# Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

## Unapproved Summary Minutes: October 24, 2018

### Attendees

Brian Cox, Vice Chair, Charlotte  
Kurt Wiesenberger, City 2  
Loren Schofield, City 3  
Bobbi Almond, City 5  
Sam Blair, City 6  
Sayle Brown, Cornelius  
Sara Nomellini, County 2  
John Garrett, County 5  
Kim Hardee, Matthews  
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg  
Ben Miley, Mint Hill

Cathy Schroeder, CSS, Inc.  
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)  
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)  
Adam Shulton, HMMH  
Dan Gardon, CLT  
Jude Starrett, CLT  
Kevin Hennessey, CLT  
Brent Cagle, CLT  
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)  
Tracy Montross, American Airlines  
Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA (ex-officio)

### Call-in Participants

None

## Summary Minutes

❖ Meeting started at 6:00 PM

### ❖ Open the Meeting

- Brian Cox opened the meeting. Bob P. is interested in resigning as Chair but remain on ACR. Wright made Motion to accept resignation as Chair. Brown 2nd. No discussion as Petruska not there to answer questions.
  - Vote: All in favor except Ben Miley. The Motion passed.
  - Cox opened the floor for nominations or volunteers for new chair.
  - Wiesenberger: Since this is new information, would like to think about this before trying to make a new chair.
  - Cox/Gagnon: It would be preferred to be done today.
  - Wright: It would be good to let folks think on it and possibly a volunteer would surface.
  - Wiesenberger nominated Sara Nomellini. Cox mentioned that he had reached out to Nomellini to encourage her to accept this role. Nomellini accepted the nomination. Wright Motioned to close nominations. Voted to close nominations.
  - Sara Nomellini is the new chair.
  - Cox: ACR has made a great choice.
- **Approve Minutes:** Schofield moved to approve. Wright seconded. There was no discussion. All voted to approve.

➤ **Review Ground Rules**

- Gagnon went over Ground Rules. Great progress with having all the folks around the table, representing the City, County, AA, CLT, and FAA. The goal is to be healthy, productive and effective.

➤ **Review Meeting Packet Information**

- Gagnon: Went over what is in the packet. Highlighted the Motion and Request databases. Any questions on the documentation, check with Gagnon or Gardon. Will get other information as the presentations go forward this evening.
- Wright: Could we cross-reference handouts to Request/Motion databases?
- Gagnon: Yes, we will work with CLT on that.
- Montross: Can this be put online? On the ACR website? The spreadsheets are very helpful.
- Hair: Yes, they can be.

❖ **Review Public Input:** The following citizens were given three minutes to address the ACR. Cox reminded that we (ACR) may not respond at the time of speaking.

- Person #1 Randy Fox
- Person #2 Dirk Lindenbeck
- Person #3 Sean Muckenfuss
- Cox noted that he asked Gagnon to take the reflection from the speakers to be removed from the Agenda to get into the remainder of the Agenda more quickly.

❖ **Analyze/Uncover**

- Presentation #1 Request for Analysis (CLT) – **Expansion of Analysis of Moving Downwind Leg East** – Dan J. Gardon, Noise Abatement Specialist, CLT
  - Gardon – (Showed via map, not presentation) Request by Sauber to look at the number of population affected by changing the downwind approach. Moving this East 2 miles. Gardon only got this information an hour before the meeting, so no slide. At this time the airport is not considering moving the arrival track as it would affect more people (about 50,000 more).
  - Wiesenberger: Did you look at any other places or just the 2-mile band?
  - Gardon: Yes, we looked at a 4 mile band, and that was an increase of about 10k v. where we are now. This area is the lowest population, partially because of uptown and SouthPark Mall.
  - Garrett: When you say the airport is not interested in pursuing, who is that making that decision?
  - Gardon: The FAA. The airport cares about dispersion, and this is not dispersion; this is just a transference.
  - Garrett: While you may be impacting more people, you're impacting people less on a per person basis, right?
  - Gardon: At this time there is no way to spread out the rail. If there was, we would be 100% in favor of it.
  - Garrett: Want to make sure that you are clearly in favor of dispersion, but you cannot be in favor of dispersion and also in favor of concentration at the same time. You have dispersion on departures and concentration on arrivals, but noise is noise, regardless of arrival or departure. It seems a bit of a conflict.
  - Gardon: That's a fair point. It would be more accurate to say we support dispersion when able. If dispersion is available in arrivals in the next few years, the airport will support that.
  - Cagle: We always support dispersion. The FAA decides whether to disperse or not to. If the ACR makes a recommendation, the ACR makes the recommendation, regardless of if we have concerns or not. In this case, I think Dan's point was that this one was just moving a concentrated

rail, not increasing or decreasing the altitude; so it seems to be a simple move that also is over a higher population base, and that would concern us.

- Miley: For clarification, the changes happened 2 to 3 years ago. Was this downwind leg moved?
- Gardon: Yes, it was moved by a very small number - about 500 feet. Actually the diagonal rail was shifted, but they were quite a bit higher.
- Cox: Sent note to Gardon after last meeting. I don't think there is much value in quibbling about the population. Unless the 2010 census data changes, the numbers may or may not be different. I had mentioned to Gardon that there were very few noise complaints on the northern end of the City. If we move the rail, move it to follow something significant - like the 485 corridor. We have corridors that are industrial, so why are we not using these areas instead of more residential zoning?
- Gardon: I could look at going down 485.
- Wright: 485 corridor is more populated now. Remember that census was done in 2010.

➤ Presentation #2 – **Alternating Approach Rails** – Sam Blair, ACR Member

- Blair: I am not an aviation person, just a person who likes to sit on his deck. Dan's presentation last month made me think. The arrivals have to be in line in pretty distinct rails – narrow – for safety reasons.
  - Pre and Post-Metroplex. We began hearing the planes very early, and we are not even under the rail. We are maybe ¼ to ½ a mile from the rail. We still hear them because they are so low.
  - Reflecting Dan's presentation last month, if we are not changing the number of people by moving the rail, then it doesn't matter. How about alternating the rails every year? The number of miles changed can be debated, but the rails change and then come back in. The idea is sharing the burden - truly dispersion. Our neighborhood gets arrivals and departures, 7 days a week. I am sure that this involves a ton of work. (His slides are showing the routes of the arrivals coming in and changing yearly, moving a mile out each year. Request is to have HMMH look at changing the rails to share the noise).
  - Easing the burden each year, etc. Neighbors think this is good (have a rail 1 year, and then not for the next 3 years) - sharing the noise.
  - Formal proposal to request that HMMH study the feasibility of moving the arrival rails by a distance of 1 mile each year (or this could be a different distance). Hopefully not extending the aircraft travel distance and greenhouse gases.
- Wright: So, are you moving the rails right/left? Where will the turn occur?
  - Blair explained more completely. The turns would be roughly the same area but maybe wider.
- Cox: Sam is not proposing the exact move, but he's making suggestions to share the load across the City.
- Schofield to Gardon: Would we be able to estimate the DBA impact of a shift?
- Gardon: Yes.
- Brown: Are you contemplating raising the downwind altitude 1,000 feet?
- Blair: I think that is a great idea.
- Brown: You can do that, and you would still be able to have the same glide path to get to the final approach.
- Cox: His slide was done using Google Earth. The planes were there before 2016; they were just higher. The altitude makes a difference.

- Garrett: I've said before, the airport is important, and it would be nice if everyone could also share the inconveniences and the disadvantages. I am hoping that the airport folks and FAA will look at this and consider it a viable alternative and figure out if it is feasible.
  - Cagle: I think this goes to the FAA to see if it is feasible. We support dispersion. You're right - it is not dispersion in the traditional sense, but it disperses it over a period of time.
  - Blair: My thought was to have Gene and his folks at HMMH study this. Are there other airports that use similar approaches like this? Do they alternate rails?
  - Cox: I think a Motion is in order.
  - Schofield: Is there a basis for the time period. One year. I would be interested in looking at different time variables, maybe 6 months?
  - Cox: Looking for a Motion to Sam's proposal.
  - Gagnon: Formal proposal on Sam's slide is worded well, allowing HMMH the flexibility to modify the distance, the frequency.
  - Blair: Maybe swap the one mile distance to X miles.
  - Hair: May I make the suggestion that we do some benchmarking before the study so we can understand what is currently being done in the national airspace?
  - Blair: Would like to know what other airports are doing.
  - **ACR Motion** – The proposal is to have HMMH study the feasibility of moving the arrival rails every year by a distance of X mile(s) for as many years as possible before repeating the same rail. This change in procedure would affect the people underneath every X number of years giving them X years without arrival noise pollution. *HMMH has the flexibility to modify the analysis as needed.*
  - Motion made by Schofield, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Garrett.
  - Clarification: Is this for all rails? Yes. Motion approved.
- Presentation #3: Request for Analysis (HMMH) – Gene Reindel, Vice President HMMH; Adam Scholten, Senior Consultant HMMH - **Analyze Noise Abatement Departure Procedures (NADP)**
- Reindel: Noise Abatement Departure Procedures (*note HMMH slides on ACR website*): Looked at modeling using the FAA's noise model with 3 popular aircraft using 3 departure procedures. A) **Standard**; B) **NADP-1 – Close in**; C) **NADP-2 – Distant**.
  - Reindel: We just showed the straight out so you could see the effect on the noise levels. Note: While the FAA allows only 2 departure procedures, the FAA wants to have airlines choose a procedure. This resulted from airports imposing different departure procedures, and FAA thought it was a safety concern for pilots to learn so many departure procedures depending on the airports they are operating from.
  - Reindel: *Noted slide describing the 2 NADP departure procedures (slide 5); gave details.*
  - Cox: What procedure are we using?
  - Reindel: Airline dependent.
  - Montross: AA is using NADP-1. [**This was corrected after the meeting; AA is using NADP-2 at CLT**]
  - Reindel: If you switched from 1 to 2 the noise is just at different places. NADP-2 and Standard are similar at CLT. NADP-1 - the noise is closer to the airport. Noise Abatement Departure results: With all three aircraft, NADP-1 provides a decrease in noise levels close to the airport. Provides an increase in noise levels further from the airport for the 2 larger aircraft (A319 and A321), but not the Bombardier CRJ900 as it is a smaller, lighter aircraft.
  - Gagnon: Just to interject, in the Minutes from the last meeting, Jackson Hole was noted as NADP-1; it was only used in Jackson Hole because of the topography; if this is incorrect, we need to change those Minutes.
  - Cox: *Had clarification questions about the bullet points on the results slide.*

- Reindel: NADP-1 is called the **close in** because you get the noise benefit closer in to the airport. But remember the noise is going to happen in all cases, it is just where. Rule of thumb is that at about 3,000 feet from where they take-off, the aircraft put power back on; so if you are in that area, you are going to get that noise increase.
- Miley: Clarifying question. Is AA always using NADP-1 and not using Standard?
- Montross: It is a combination of the two.
- Miley: Are these numbers compared against standard?
- Reindel: Yes.
- Miley: What is percentage of usage of the procedures?
- Montross: Don't know, but I can find out.
- Garrett: Wonder why there would be a noise abatement procedure that does not do anything different than the standard procedure?
- Reindel: NADP-2 was actually more effective for older Stage 2 aircraft like the 727. NADP-1 is for these more prevalent aircraft. You are not getting benefit with NADP-2 with the newer aircraft.
- Nomellini: I understand the slides but cannot see what areas on the ground are affected. Would like to understand the geographic area that is affected.
- Reindel: You are correct. We are going to do that at the end, to propose a methodology to do exactly that. Here we are introducing phase one of departure analysis.
- Cox: So this is a "to-be-continued."

➤ Presentation #4: Request for Analysis (HMMH) – Gene Reindel, Vice President HMMH; Adam Scholten, Senior Consultant HMMH - **Arrival Turn to Base Analysis**

- Reindel: We have been talking about reducing the altitude on arrival with Metroplex at about 1,000 feet lower now than pre-Metroplex; looking at the trombone effect of where they are going to turn and all the requirements that would occur if we raise the altitude. We cannot predict that exactly.
- Reindel: I thought it would be good to look at what it was before. With the main corridor of where the aircraft arrive, we put in gates; so if they turned "here" or "here" (looking at the slides), we could see where the aircraft are making their turns.
- Reindel: Results are that it really did not change as to where they turned. That was surprising to me. I thought we would have seen about a 2 nautical mile shift. So according to the data, there is no difference to where they turn on an annual basis, and the distribution is really close.
- Blair: What would you think makes it stay the same?
- Reindel: I'm not prepared to answer that, but I have ideas – possibly because level-offs occur at the same place. I was surprised to not see a 2 nautical mile change.
- Gardon: Is it fair to say that we can increase the altitude without any increase in fuel consumption?
- Reindel: I would say no. I don't know why we did not see a 2 nautical mile change this time. I don't think you can make that assumption.
- Cagle: It sounds like it is unclear if there are any impacts, good or bad, based on the analysis.
- Reindel: I meant to introduce Adam Shulton at the beginning of the meeting. Adam has done a lot of this analysis. He is our in-house airspace expert.

- Shulton: The only thing I would note is the downwind turn was started earlier in 2014 than in the post-Metroplex period, but I don't think that this analysis is showing that raising the altitude is not feasible. But there is the risk that with raising the altitude higher, the aircraft have to be below the glideslope for making an approach (3 degree angle), and that is fixed. So they may have to fly longer, but we have not seen that necessarily happening in the analysis pre and post-Metroplex.
- Presentation #5: Request for Analysis (HMMH) – Gene Reindel, Vice President HMMH; Adam Scholten, Senior Consultant HMMH - **Noise-Benefit Analyses Template**
  - Reindel: Proposal: We created a grid representative of the ground; put the grid into the noise model to generate results. We are recommending that we use green to represent those places where there is a noise benefit of a potential change, red to show a noise disbenefit, and yellow or clear to show no change in noise benefit. It's an Lmax grid analysis to illustrate not only noise but number of events (such as # or time above 70dB). There are lots of metrics we can study. Are we going in the right direction?
  - Cox: As a visual learner, I like this. What does the group think? Let's use that model, based on the lack of "dissent" from ACR members.
  - Reindel: We can look at using colors that would work for those color-blind.
  - Cagle: Can we add more landmarks on the grid? Along with the airport, other landmarks?
  - Reindel: Yes, we need to create a base map. We can present that at upcoming meeting.
  - Cox: Clarifying that there was a lot of discussion on departure turnout analysis. Is that being worked on?
  - Reindel: Yes, we have the existing conditions model done. We will use this model to analyze all the scenarios that we have talked about, dealing with altitude-based turns.
  - Cox: What about the feasibility of doing analysis on "divergent departures" - planes turning at certain different distances out from the airport. Are you looking at that?
  - Reindel: Not yet. First step is looking at dispersing by doing altitude-based turns.
  - Shulton: There are airports that are doing various RNAVs. But not any are doing diverging RNAVs or alternating paths because of training (aircrews, controllers) and the limitation in the aircraft systems. RNAV departure initial path off the runway where they diverge after that has been done at other airports.
  - Cagle: The airport had discussed in the past divergent **headings**; so the air traffic controller would call different headings to turn, sort of like an oscillating fan. Generally the turn location is the same, but the angle is different.
  - Szymkiewicz: The Metroplex had originally planned to use 3 headings, and it became impractical. I do think there are possibilities of creating Standard Instrument Departures (SID) that could incorporate RNAV off the ground and vectors. I'm wondering if we could design something that was an open departure but also takes advantage of that reduced separation, so you could get some more dispersion.
  - Cox: I have mentioned to the aviation staff that we should spend energy on things that we can change locally without getting into environmental studies. Our goal is spreading things out so we are not inundating certain folks all the time. Do we need a Motion to interject that into your study?
  - Reindel: Adam and I talked about bringing back the altitude-based turns. We do understand the goal, so I don't think we need a Motion. We get your goal of dispersing the departures.
  - Brown: Making sure that we are not giving up on what HMMH is studying for altitude-based turns. I think the tower could handle that.
  - Reindel: One of the problems with that could be that the tower doesn't know when the aircraft is going to turn, so they may have to hold an aircraft on the ground.
  - Cagle: FAA has indicated one possible downside is significant negative impact to capacity.

- Presentation #6 - Updates on Motions from September (**ACR Motion – Return the CAATT Waypoint (on the CHSLY3 arrival pattern for arrivals to the 36 parallels) to Pre-Metroplex (Raising Altitudes on Downwind Leg)**) – Stuart Hair, Director of Economic & Community Affairs, CLT
  - Hair: Follow-up on the document that Ed provided for us: Analysis Requests and Motions. Motion 06-18 (approved at the last meeting), return CAATT Waypoint to Pre-Metroplex location. Dan has done a lot of work on how to go about getting that implemented. There are 3 possible ways for that to be implemented. There is a letter that has been drafted for Chair and Vice Chair of ACR to sign asking the FAA to look at one of those 3 ways of moving the Waypoint back. We have that draft letter ready to get signatures and give to FAA later tonight.
- Presentation #7 - Updates on Motions from September (**ACR Motion – Voluntary Curfew Request**) - Dan J. Gardon, Noise Abatement Specialist, CLT
  - Gardon: We had a number of meetings with airport management on the Voluntary Curfew. Still working on that, and it looks like it may be possible at CLT – hoping to get updates to you in 2-3 weeks. Looking at times to do the curfew; may bounce ideas off ACR members.
- **Breakout Sessions/Review of Actions:** Cox suggested that we not do this and move on to Unfinished and New Business.
- ❖ **Unfinished Business**
  - Gagnon: Regarding Unfinished Business, please go over the two documents that we looked at earlier - Request database and Motions database have some unfinished business.
- ❖ **New Business**
  - **Share Airport Noise Benchmarking Information (Kurt Wiesenberger)**
    - Wiesenberger: *Noted he is most affected by southerly operations.* I seem to experience problems every 3 days, the most recently at 4:25 Monday morning. It is not 65dBs, it is 58. It is kind of like getting a painful pinch too often.
      - *Walked through PowerPoint and passed out handouts on research relating to Heathrow airport.*
    - Wiesenberger: I did internet searches and found dozens of airports that have voluntary restrictions on flights at night. Many in Florida. Easier to have restrictions over the coastal areas. But there are big ones as well: Boston, Heathrow airport. Mixed reviews - some airlines abide by the restrictions, some do not. Some airports have reduced landing fees for airplanes that are quieter. Some airports have higher landing fees for flights that land during those times.
    - Wiesenberger: For me, the best in class was Heathrow, regarding airport noise. *Gave information about the airport.* They use PBN – Performance Based Navigation, which uses GPS. They have holding stacks like spiral staircases. No planes get to 7,000 feet until final approach. Different way of landing airplanes. I believe that we can use Heathrow and this website as a benchmark for us as they have done all this. They have implemented a lot of things we are talking about here today. They have a multifaceted set of solutions. For arrivals, they have steeper approaches, landing gear not put out until the last possible moment, continuous descent. For departures, they have quiet procedures that airlines follow. Within each of these categories there are a dozen different solutions. I'd like members to look at the website about Heathrow noise. Read the blueprint that printed for members. It has 10 practical strategies and best practices for reducing noise at Heathrow, and then think about it. We will try to organize this into strategies that may work for us here in Charlotte. We'd like to develop a strategic outline with timelines and get momentum behind this.
    - Montross: What is the source of the comments for the voluntary night curfews?
    - Wiesenberger: It is a range of websites. Restriction may be a better word than curfew.
    - Cox: It would be interesting to have the professionals look at this information and judge what are best practices that might be applicable here. Can we ask the professionals first?

- Cagle: It is clear that Heathrow is advertising things that Charlotte is not advertising. Some of things you are talking about, we have had in place for 20 years. It may be good at the next meeting to bring forward the things that we are and have been doing, relating to noise abatement. Some airports call it different things. Part 150 programs. CLT has a Part 150. We don't allow run-ups after a certain hour. Noise abatement by insulating and buying homes. It might be important to talk about what CLT already does. Start with talking about these things now and then better put the items on the website for more and better understanding.
  - Nomellini: Can we create a matrix of similarities between different airports and Charlotte? Find a common language?
  - Cagle: There are things that we can do and things we cannot do.
  - Gardon: Yes, we can definitely do this.
  - Wiesenberger: I'm sure that Charlotte is doing plenty, but there are still noise issues. What can we do better? Identify and have a strategic approach.
  - Gagnon: I will work with Kurt and be in touch with CLT members prior to the next meeting to have the ACR members ideate under the categories of noise as well as support the CLT in sharing what's already occurring.
- **Requesting City Council attendance at the ACR meetings (Sara Nomellini, ACR Chair)**
- Nomellini: I'd like to propose a Motion that ACR request City-council representation at these meetings. It's a concern to me that the entity responsible for managing this facility is never present at these meetings.
    - *Miley seconded the Motion.*
  - Montross: I want to mention that Councilman Braxton Winston is in the audience tonight.
  - Nomellini: If there are no objections, I will draft something before next meeting so we are not spending time doing it here.
  - Blair: How does that work? Does a specific member of City Council attend, or does it rotate? Maybe Braxton can comment.
  - Braxton: Instead of having a City Council member here at meetings, it might be more effective – instead of one of us being here for a portion of a meeting each month - that we build a relationship with the Transportation and Planning Committee. I sit on that committee. I think that would be more efficient in getting policy changed.
  - Cox: Should we send a request through the Mayor?
  - Winston: We can figure out what's most appropriate. I am impressed at the attendance here and how the meetings are structured. My colleagues would be open to some type of manner of working back and forth. The best delivery is from a citizen, not a City Council member.
  - Cagle: Regarding regular updates to the transportation committee, I can coordinate with the City Manager and Committee Chairman Phipps to see about adding that as a routine Agenda item - update on the CLT ACR.
  - Nomellini: My real concern is that I don't feel like the City-council hears the anger of the citizens or the committees. If Mr. Winston can find a way that's more efficient, I'm all for it.
  - Winston: You can't depend on just me because there are the others who also need to be involved on the Council.
  - Cox: Maybe Sara and Brent need to have a conversation regarding this. The Motion is on the table and has been seconded.
  - Nomellini: I want to rescind the Motion; we need to have more conversation about the best way to do it. I just want to make sure the people are being heard.
  - Winston: It's bigger than having just one of us involved.
  - Wright: Would the Council be a part of the table that has been expanded?

- Nomellini: Initially, I just wanted the Council showing interest at what’s going on at this table.
  - Cox: Thanks to the councilperson for coming; it’s very helpful. I know you have a lot of commitments.
  - Winston: I’m glad you guys are here. You should be recognized for what you are doing.
- **Discussing “When will the CLT be presenting to the Transportation & Planning Committee?” (Sara Nomellini, ACR Chair)**
- Nomellini: We want to know when discussion will happen at the Charlotte Transportation and Planning Committee because my neighbors are interested in attending that meeting.
  - Cagle: The committees choose the agenda that they want to hear. Those items are usually items that will be referred onto City Council for vote. It is not that the airport routinely presents at the Transportation and Planning committee; I don’t know if I’ve ever presented to them.
  - Winston: This group (ACR) might want to insert itself in conversations around the comprehensive plans. Someone from here should be part of the advisory committee.
  - Cagle: UDO - Unified Development Ordinance. Would you like me to request that Taiwo Jaiyeoba come to this meeting to see how the ACR could get engaged?
  - Cox/Nomellini: Yes, thank you.
- **New business - Gagnon: Amelia Stinson-Wesley was going to speak about how she goes over ACR business with the Town of Pineville next month because she could not attend tonight.**
- **Review ACR Decisioning Process Maps (Ed Gagnon)**
- Gagnon: I am going to quickly go over the last document in your handout. Regarding the overall map of decision-making for the ACR, that is still a work in progress. Bob Sz. from the FAA has done lots of leg work on this. Essentially, Brian wants to know what can we do locally? What can we implement here using local resources? But if we have to go through the national FAA, this document tells how that gets done.
    - The FAA would prefer to get a package from the ACR. PBN – Performance Based Navigation – was brought up earlier. Different FAA phases: Phase 1: Initial review, Phase 2: Design phase, Phase 3: Development and operational preparations. Getting into a lot of details in Phase 3. Phase 4: Implementing the design. Phase 5: Post implementation review and evaluation. Timelines involved with each phase. Then Environmental considerations on bottom of 2<sup>nd</sup> page talk about the times that certain things need to be reviewed, and this lists when and how that procedure would proceed – typically based on the altitude where the procedure change occurs.
  - Szymkiewicz: Anything that can be category excluded is a good space to be in. That moves quickly. Lots of things to review. Quickly means “less than a year,” so try to stay local in changes to have things done quickly. There are some things that happen below 3,000 feet that can be changed as a CatEx; if so, they can often happen quicker (maybe less than a year).
  - Cox: If I could see this in a chart, I’d understand better. Let’s try to put things in buckets – what can be addressed more locally v. what needs to be put in a package?
  - Blair: On Page 2, are these altitudes ground level?
  - Szymkiewicz: Yes, above ground.
  - Wright: For tracking purposes, need footnotes with dates. Using lots of paper.
  - Gagnon: We will work toward a more graphical depiction of the overall process. Also, we are becoming very collaborative in this group; Bob Sz. is being very proactive.

➤ **Review Attendance Policy – Tracking Calculations (Dan Gardon)**

- Gardon: Attendance policy - 50% of attendance in a year. We want to move the calculation to be based on a 12-month period based on your start date instead of a rolling 6-month period.
- Cagle: The attendance policy was a Motion adopted by the ACR. The requirements are not in the Charter.
- Cox: I'm not hearing any concerns. Do we need a Motion?
- Hair: We'll just need to clarify the Motion from Oct. 18, 2017, with the information today; no Motion required.

➤ **Meeting Scheduling**

- Members: There was discussion regarding changing dates. HMMH and CLT staff will have a difficult time getting everything done by an earlier November date. Also members have travel plans and schedule around the meeting dates that are already proposed.
- Cox: Based on discussion, we will leave it on the 19<sup>th</sup> of Dec. We will cancel the November meeting.

❖ **Adjourn**

- Blair motioned to adjourn. Nomellini seconded; all were in favor.
- Meeting adjourned at 8:41pm