Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: December 19, 2018

Attendees

Brian Cox, Vice Chair, Charlotte
Kurt Wiesenberger, City 2
Loren Schofield, City 3
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Calvin McGuirt, County 3
John Garrett, County 5
Bob Petruska, County 6
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Ben Pecora, York
Bob Cameron, Davidson
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Ben Miley, Mint Hill
Amelia Stinson-Wesley, Pineville

Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Dan Gardon, CLT
Brent Cagle, CLT
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Tracy Montross, AA
Mark Clark/Bob Szymkiewicz, FAA (ex - officio)
Sonya Busch, FAA
Cathy Schroeder, CSS, Inc.
Call-in Participants: None

Summary Minutes

- Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- Brian Cox opened the meeting. Filling in as chair as Sara Nomellini not able to attend.
  - **Approve Minutes:** Schofield moved to approve. Wright seconded. All voted to approve.
  - **Review Ground Rules:** Gagnon reviewed Ground Rules slide - lots of focus on listening involved. The goal is to be healthy, productive and effective. Great progress with representatives from CLT, AA, FAA.
  - **Review Meeting Packet Information**
    - Gagnon noted information mentioned packet; reviewed the order of items in packet. Some will not be noted during meeting. They are on the CLT website – such as the handouts from presenters.
    - Garrett: Would it be helpful to add the Ground Rules to the agenda for the visitors/public speakers that attend? Share rules of engagement for the audience since they're not here monthly.
    - Gagnon: Yes, we can add a slide of expectations of the public who are not on the ACR.
  - **Review Public Input:** None this month.
- Analyze/Uncover – Gene Reindel, Vice President HMMH
  - **Presentation #1 (Altitude-based Turns –** *Additional analysis to assess effects of Altitude-based Turns.***)**
    - Reindel: Presentation (On CLT website) focused on what was brought up last meeting and going into more analysis. Looking at this for a couple months. Could we disperse the departures by having them turn at an altitude rather than at a predetermined point over the ground?
      - Took one day in 2018. Input the track in the FAA noise model. The modified tracks then turned at 2500 feet MSL (mean sea level – about 1800 feet above the ground). This is a maximum sound level basis - a single event noise evaluation, not a Day Night Average Sound Level (DNL).
      - Lots of graphics in the packet. First, Slide 5, is unmodified. Then modified, but hard to notice differences until they are placed on top of one another. See Slide 7 (red color overlay) - not getting

a whole lot more dispersion, but not jumping to that conclusion at this time. More analysis can be done. Slide 9 is a grid showing noise levels; yellow is at least 70 dB.

- Wright: Can we zoom that out so it's more visible in the Slides?
- Reindel: Will try to in the future. When we see some changes, we might want to zoom in on those to see exactly where they are. It's important to understand the Slides. Want to make sure you understand the yellow and red dots.
  - Turning at 2500 feet had more of an impact to the East than to the West. Noise close-up to the airport has been reduced, but it pushed more to the South. Added the red circles to Slide 12 to highlight the changes.
- Hair: Can you make note of the landmarks? They are noted on each Slide in the key (Went over what they are, per Slide 10).
- Cagle: Just picked the landmarks as places to be recognized. If we need to change, we can.
- Gardon: You mentioned definitely a shift to the Southern part. I believe there is a net reduction in yellow points. Is that correct?
- Reindel: I believe there is a reduction, but our next analysis is the number of events above a certain level of noise such as 70 dB. By going to a turn at 2500 feet, the noise is shifting (see Areas of Change on Slide 13).
- Garrett: It seems like there is a pie there (an opening with few flights) between the flights going straight South and the ones that are turning. Our goal is to disperse and spread the noise around. Seems that there is a wedge in the Southeast corridor that gets no noise. There doesn't appear to be an intention to where the noise is spread.
- Reindel: To address that, the divergent headings will fill in that pie.
  - *Reindel reviewed summary results on Slide 14.* Now they don't have to wait until the aircraft turns to send the next in the air. With altitude-based turns, they will not know when to let another plane go, so that could have a negative effect on airport capacity.

➢ **Presentation #2 (Feasibility of divergent departure headings)**

- Reindel: Instead of all planes going to the same place off the runways, have them turn at divergent headings. As soon as the planes can turn, they would turn. Also looked at them turning at different altitudes depending on where they are going. Both approaches would assign departure headings to aircraft based on the aircraft's filed departure procedure (where they are going). Probably could not turn right at the end of the runway. Probably more South but just trying to look at the feasibility of this idea.
  - Pretty even dispersion (Slide 17) if used divergent headings at the end of the runway based on to where they're flying. Slide 19 - Could be beneficial to airport capacity and air traffic controllers. Potential greater dispersion of departures. Larger % of aircraft will start turns closer to the airport compared to today. Would require studies, training and time to implement.
- Garrett: How long would they stay on the heading before going to final destination heading?
- Reindel: Need more analysis for that. There would be convergent points (another Waypoint) after the initial turn off the runway.
- Schofield: Am I simplifying this? Is this like a fanning out? What kind of pattern of frequency do you envision?
- Reindel: Could be random, but not really. Based on where the aircraft are heading. Could have 10 in a row on the same heading, but on a daily average you could see they going different headings based on the averages.
- Cagle: Different headings based on destinations, but I'm assuming that this would be beneficial to air traffic and pilots – less additional work.
- Wright: On the Slide, what are the 1, 2 and 3 representing? Airport boundaries? And, when there is another runway, how will that affect this?

- Reindel: We are looking at what's occurring today. Would have to figure out how to do the same thing with a different runway. Those numbers you asked about are the landmarks. Going to try to keep them consistent on the Slides. If you want us to change the base map, we can. Please look at them to add suggestions.
- Cox: Where there is the red on Slide 13, is that where 485 is?
- Reindel: Yes.
- Petruska: *Asked about other altitudes that were being considered.* What were they?
- Reindel: I believe we went with 500 foot increments (2500, 3000, 3500).

➢ **Staggered Altitude-based turns with the divergent headings (Starts at Slide 20)**

- Reindel: Again dependent on where they are going. First turn is at 1260, then 1860, then 2460. Doesn't have to be these actual feet – these are just notional. Looked at the same percentages since the aircraft are heading where they're heading; to John Garrett's point about the pie, I think this begins to fill in that area that was not getting those departures.
- Miley: *Asked about Berewick.*
- Cagle: As of now, our Part 150 states that we have to get past Berewick before turning - basically 2 miles off the runway. There is not as much air traffic over Berewick because of that. We would have to look at changing that Part 150 for anything that would require turns before that 2 mile minimum.
- Reindel: Two ways to do that: One way is to modify the Part 150 noise abatement feature, or determine we will stay with that and design these other procedures around the Part 150. I think you would want the analysis either way.
- Cagle: Our existing Part 150 program has been in place for many years. We will be working with the FAA probably as the new runway comes online or is approved. We will have to reevaluate those Part 150 measures because of that.
- Garrett: Why no straight Southbound departure?
- Szymkiewicz: We consider Southbound departure to be an Eastbound departure, so they depart 18L - unless it needs more runway for weight.
- Garrett: Is that just how it has to be? If we are trying to spread out traffic?
- Reindel: I think if the ACR wants to ask for a change to runway use, you can ask. I think it is done because it works well for the traffic here. It's often a noise abatement measure to look at runway use, particularly as the additional runway comes on.
- Cagle: The Western most runway is only arrivals today.
- Reindel: Slide 22 Findings: Potential greater dispersion of departures relative to today; better balance of aircraft turning closer/further than today; could be problem for air traffic control and negatively impact capacity due to not knowing when aircraft turn; and would require studies, training and time for the FAA to implement.
    - Possible next steps on Slide 23. Modify date (4/6/18) flight tracks to represent two cases: Diverge headings at end of runways, and diverge headings at staggered altitudes. Generate noise level grids.
- Cox: Any questions at this point in presentation?
- Montross: For divergent headings, there was talk of a request for study of that in the current EIS.
- Cagle: I think it is built into the current EIS but will have to check with the EIS consultant and can email that answer out.
- Cox: With divergent headings it seems to be very complex. Might take years to sort out. Altitude-based turns seems like something that could be influenced more locally. Am I reading that accurately?
- Clark: With altitude-based turns we have concerns over a loss of predictability. Under current constraints, we have to go 2 miles out and then divergent heading by 3 miles. If we introduce altitude-based turns, I'm not sure how we would ensure that. Like Gene said, when the air traffic controllers

would not know when they are turning, that could be problematic. Not that it could not be overcome; typically to overcome, we increase spacing.

- Cox: Seems like the altitude-based turns will be more of a local conversation than the divergent headings conversation. Environmental concerns would be probably more required for the divergent headings.
- Clark: You're right, but there would be an environmental review at a minimum for the altitude-based turns.
- Cagle: Think both would require environment studies.
- Reindel: In our experience, the difference between the CatEx and EA and EIS, the consideration is how much impact there would be and how much potential public controversy there would be. Altitude-based turns might be less controversial because it is probably affecting less people – but we can't say that without doing the analysis.
- Cagle: I suspect both are EAs. CatEx = weeks or a month, EA = 6-24 months, EIS = years.
- Szymkiewicz: I agree – both are definitely EAs.
- Montross: The EIS that is underway today may inform the next stage of environmental studies.
- Garrett: How are they turning today? Is it up to the pilots when they turn after a certain point?
- Clark: Cannot issue a turn less than 2 miles and more than 3 miles. It's a controller action, and it's a tight window from the controller.
- Reindel: This is an open departure; it's not an RNAV. Air traffic determines where to turn.
- Brown: We are using 2500 feet. Could use 3000 ft., right?
- Reindel: Yes. Could probably get more dispersion the higher the turn because aircraft will separate more the higher the altitude.
- Brown: When does the air controller let the next plane launch?
- Szymkiewicz: Depends on the weather. Basically, the departure end of the runway gives you 3 miles.
- Clark: The runways are 2 miles long.
- Wright: Question on which runway is arrivals only. Is it near the 120 or 240? (Answer: It is 240 at the most Western runway).

➢ **Presentation #3 (Departure Profiles** – *Additional analysis of the Noise Abatement Profile (NADP 1) v. the Normal Takeoff Profile (NADP 2) v. the Standard Takeoff Profile***)**

- Reindel: Slide 25: We have used the FAA's noise model to produce maximum noise level grid points for the 3 different departure procedures. Using the 3 prominent aircraft here at CLT. Note: FAA currently only allows 2 noise abatement departure procedures, and only one of these can be recommended at a particular airport.
- Reindel: I have questions about the FAA's noise model. Starting to question the procedures that are in the NADP models. NADP-1 is pretty close to what the aircraft are doing – NADP-2 I'm not convinced. I've talked to the FAA, and they are looking at this. They are wanting a study to be done so they are reaching out to airlines to see how they're flying these procedures.
  - Slide 26: NADP-1 less noise close-in to the airport. NADP-2, more noise close-in to the airport. Usually an airport preference as to where folks live and where benefit would be.
  - Slide 27: NADP-1 gives benefit close-in. Thrust cutback less noise, but there are increases in noise where power is reinstalled.
- Montross: Standard and NADP-2 are very similar. I was told we only use NADP-2 in CLT. Is it fair to say that going forward we don't use Standard or does it matter?
- Reindel: This is an area where we could use your help. If you could give us your profiles of how you are actually flying out with these aircraft using NADP-2, we could use that data. I don't think NADP-2 is being well-represented right now. We have reached out to some airlines and would like to not have to wait for the FAA to change the model because I don't think it is correct.

- Reindel: We did analysis on the 3 different aircraft - not a lot of change with the CRJ9.
  - Slide 34: NADP-1 – maximum sound levels decreased on initial departure close to airport for all 3 aircraft. Maximum sound levels increased as aircraft navigated away from airport compared to standard procedure. NADP-2 - similar but we didn't really see a change from standard procedure except for the CRJ9.
- Cox: Questions?
- Miley: What does AA use?
- Reindel: NADP-2.

➢ **Presentation #4 (Alternating Downwind Rails –** *Analysis as follow-up to Sam Blair Formal Proposal - relates to CLT analysis of Moving Downwind Leg East***)**

- Reindel: Two months ago it was considered having alternating arrival paths for downwind leg. Proposed and looking at the feasibility of alternating where these rails are located; currently located 5 nautical miles East and West of the airport. Looking at moving the rails every x number of years. This change would affect the sound for certain areas.
  - Slide 37: Consulted with FAA. Considered experience with design and implementation at other airports. (Other airports are not doing this) Developed proposed solution for alternating downwind distances. Only went with the Northflow and assumed the south would be similar.
  - Every time you change rail the FAA has to make changes. Compromise is somewhere in the one-year basis.
  - Slide 39: Looked at 4 gates. Noticed the places where departures and arrivals overlap. Looked at separation today to see if it would have an effect moving the rails, or is it feasible.
  - Slide 40: We don't think there are insurmountable issues to overcome. Spending time on this gate because the others are similar.
  - Moving out greater than 6 nautical miles, you see more departures breaking this plane of where the arrivals would be.
  - Slide 44: Analysis of interactions between arrivals and departures of alternating East and West Northflow downwinds show departures are being held below the current downwind at 5 nautical miles. Shifting downwinds closer (4 nautical miles) will reduce conflicts with departures. Shifting downwind further (6 nautical miles) will increase conflicts with departures and could result in longer departure level offs. Might have to have slightly different changes. FAA has to prepare, and operators have to prepare as well.
  - Slide 45: Challenges to implementing. Modifications to existing arrival procedures; Public would need to be informed, as they are not hearing noise now but will with moving. Environmental reviews; industry validation; training; potential airspace re-design; potential changes to surrounding air traffic control facilities. All these items would take years to implement. It is not done anywhere else. It has not been vetted before. It will take lots of talking with the FAA.
- Stinson-Wesley: Have any roundtables studied it? Is there any other research we can get access to?
- Reindel: To my knowledge it has not been raised before. I think it is a good idea. Lots of reasons why it may not have been raised before. You would be leading on this one.
- Pecora: Is there a reason why we cannot do circling patterns? It's a narrow plane in which we operate. Is there a reason why we are using straight lines?
- Reindel: It is about predictability, for safety. Would increase workload for controllers if curved. We want to be predictable. We want to know hours before it happens when it is going to happen. There are standards that the FAA has in place that we need to abide by.
- Szymkiewicz: When an airport is built, they look at predominant weather and winds, then they set the runways. Then the pattern is based on that; may deal with older navigation aids – pre-RNAV.
- Reindel: Also so pilots can see one another. Airplanes need to know where the others are.
- Pecora: GPS is specific so that we can "fly blind" with RNAV with the instrumentation.

- Reindel: Not everybody can "fly blind." Many aircraft are not instrumented so that the pilots have to see where they are going. One of the benefits of NextGen is that we can now think outside the boxes, start to plan the future where everything is instrumented and flies exactly where it is supposed to. We are in the infancy right now in this era to make some of these changes.
- Wiesenberger: Of these 3 areas of focus of these studies: (altitude-based turns, divergent headings, and alternating downwind arrivals), can you compare as to the degree of impact they may have? And how difficult implementation might be? High, medium or low - where might we want to focus?
- Cox: We need to decide what's next. Or do we want to let any of this sit?
- Reindel: Don't hold me to this:
  - **Altitude-based turns**, I think would be least impactful as you are affecting the same people. Just dispersing it among the same people. Certainly have issues that the FAA and airport would have to deal with.
  - Feasibility of **Divergent Departure Headings**, not as feasible. It will affect more people. Planes in more places. Not just changing procedures but introducing new procedure.
  - Analysis of **Departure Profiles** might be one of the easiest. All aircraft have NADPs built into their procedures. May not require as much environmental as others, but I could be wrong.
  - Implementation of **alternating downwind arrival distances** would be the most difficult. One, it has not occurred anywhere before, and we would have to figure out how it would happen as well as what it would do environmentally.
- Cox: Is there interest in moving forward? Deeper dive on altitude-based departure turns?
- Petruska: Yes.
- Cox: What do you (HMMH) need from us regarding a deeper dive?
- Reindel: Do you want us to focus on different altitudes and/or to focus on where and how often you will have noise levels? Downside of going into the higher altitudes is you're shifting everything down to the South. Once you do that, my analyses in terms of impact goes away because you are flying over new people.
- Cox: We are interested in different views in which they have long-term value.
- Clark: Altitude-based turn is unpredictable. That is why there is more diversion. That introduces a problem with us.
- Cox: So, is it say to say the greater the altitude, the more unpredictability?
- Clark: Logically I would think that, but the greater the altitude the more challenging it would be for us. We are not allowed to run side by side. There is a point where we have to turn airplanes - right now that is 3 to 4 miles. So if we say 4000' or 5000', that won't work.
- Cox: Perhaps we should get more depth in impact data and then decide how we want to pursue it?
- Reindel: Given what Clark said, it might be worth it to look at 3000 feet as well because we're still within a tolerance. We thought that 2500 would be like it is today, and it mostly is.
- Cox: So, let's look at 3000.
- Reindel: We'll do the # of events above a sound level.
- Clark: With your data, what temperatures did you factor in?
- Reindel: We used standard day temperature. We used the standard noise model temperature for April 6. We should look at seasonality.
- Clark: It is a considerable difference in climb rates.
- Cagle: I think we also have to look at what it would do to the airfield capacity at varying altitudes.
- Reindel: We can look at that with the FAA.
- Cameron: Is there a breakpoint (70 dB) where a human being is really bothered by sound? Is it a 2 or 3 decibel change? Is there an average number that you use?

- Reindel: No; I'm going to use the term n70 - # of events that are above 70 dBs. This has been used a good bit - 65 and 70 is annoying. Normal conversation (3 foot distance), when you get above 65 dBs, some feel that it begins to interfere with the ability to communicate.
- Pecora: That's why I'm here. I cannot have a conversation with my wife on my porch when AA starts flying en masse. Do you have pre-Metroplex noise levels, or can we get that?
- Reindel: We could see that data.
- Pecora: Managing expectations, and ambient noise is a factor. Center City – ambient noise level high. Where I am it is low. At what point do we have a good balance to judge sound impact levels?
- ***Next Steps on Presentations***
- Cox: I am going to steer us a bit or we will not get out of here tonight. Altitude-based turns: Enhance data refinement and we are going to look at different altitudes, add a look at seasonality, then performance metric involved. Anything else we should ask for?
- Petruska: I'd like to ask for 500 feet above that.
- Reindel: We could show where the tracks would end up at 3000'. Incorporating the noise analysis will be about impossible to do this analysis in a month.
- Cox: Departure profiles. What else do we need to talk about there?
- Reindel: I did an ask of AA. How are the airlines implementing NADP-2? How is it flown?
- Cox: What about interest of the group in pursuing the standard, NADP-1 and/or 2?
- Pecora: Seems like NADP-2 is better.
- Reindel: Airlines will have different procedures. Based on what we see today is it beneficial to continue to pursue both NADPs at the airport and - if so - the next step is to get AA to give us more details to put into the model to have a better representation of these models.
- Cox: I want to see whether the models represent actual practice, and it doesn't sound like we know that.
- Reindel: Pretty sure we will not have any results next month but by February.
- Cox: Feasibility of divergent departure headings. That seems like a mound of complexity. Maybe we need to devote a portion of a meeting on what's next. Sara is very interested in that, and she is not here tonight.
- Clark: Divergent headings are more conventional than altitude-based turns. I had a question about what HMMH based the percentages breakdown of different headings on.
- Reindel: We based it on the waypoint it connected with.
- Clark: That's more conventional air traffic. For 31 years we have asked for divergent headings. There are conflicts because they have to protect for possible go arounds. To introduce multiple headings off the West would be more challenging. To the East there are no conflicts now. Departure headings is something that has been in our tool bucket for years.
- Brown: I proposed that in July. We thought it would be easier for the tower to have control.
- Clark: It is pretty standard for the tower to issue the heading before sending them for departure. There are challenges of multiple headings.
- Cagle: I need to verify that we are already actually looking at this. There is already an environmental process underway today that may take this into account. We need to verify that. I do think that in the 7 years that I have been here, the airport has far less concerns in that there are not as many unknowns with traditional definition of divergent-based headings.
- Cox: Why don't we come back to that next month. We need to devote more time on this.
- Gagnon: We can table additional analysis now and ask Brent to report as to how the EIS is addressing, and then we can determine in January if we need more analysis.
- Cagle: I would recommend because Gene did assume unrestrained, so at a minimum to put the constraint of 1 mile on the divergent heading. Might be good to see the results of leaving the constraints at 1 mile headings. Then take the next step of unconstrained.

- Cox: Regarding feasibility of alternating downwind rails, how much time do we want to deal with this now?
- Garrett: I don't know if we need a lot more data on this. By the next meeting we decide whether we want to make this a recommendation or not.
- Cox: If I am interpreting right, it seems that it would take a lot of analysis with the FAA to do this.
- Clark: I would bet this is a non-starter. Quite honestly, I don't know how you could do that.
- Cox: That is fair. I appreciate your candor.
- Reindel: I think you would need more analysis to make this recommendation, especially based on what Mark has said.
- Garrett: We are here to suggest ideas to abate noise. It is our job to propose ideas and let the authorities decide if they can be done.
- Cox: I'm sensing that we are tabling this item. Any objections? (None). Thanks, Gene. Very helpful.

❖ **Additional Business**

➢ **Unfinished Business**

- Gagnon: Went over handouts, one is request database, one is motions database. These are updated and kept by Dan each meeting so they are there for us to review.
- Sonya Busch (FAA) introduced herself. FAA air traffic manager at CLT since October.
- **Motion 06-18 Update on return CAATT Waypoint to Pre-Metroplex location**
  - Clark: Spoke to the Regional Administrator today. We got the recommendation, are looking at it locally and regionally in Atlanta. Looking at some alternatives that may be quicker and accomplish the same end.
  - Cox: Thanks for steering us in that direction. Possible improvement mitigations.
- **Motion 07-18 Voluntary Curfew Request**
  - Gardon: Still in preliminary stages. Tentatively looking at 12a-6a. Realistically 1a-5a. Better than we have today.
  - Cagle: Voluntary curfew is just that. No way airport can enforce. Maybe sending a letter on behalf of the airport and the ACR asking airlines to understand the impacts to the community of those nighttime operations have and to be cognizant of that. Mandatory curfew is not an option.
- **Wiesenberger: ACR Strategic Benchmarking Update**
  - Wiesenberger: *Walked through summary presentation.* I am representing a way that I think of this challenge – creating a Strategic Framework. Accessed/analyzed source of ideas/opportunities – existing initiatives of ACR. Gagnon and I looked at major categories/causes of noise and then put them into a spreadsheet to see everything at once. Today hopefully we can talk about next steps as well. These are a representation of existing and known CLT initiatives.
  - Gagnon: CLT is a part of this process, and they provided an overall grid that noted how the airport is addressing overall noise concerns.
  - Wiesenberger: There are lots of ideas from the Benchmarking efforts. Thanks to Loren for all his analysis/ideas. Some are quieter airplanes, quieter approaches and methodologies. Thinking about root causes of the problems. Categories: I lumped some of these ideas in buckets to help us have a conversation on our benchmarking call. It's not perfect. It is meant to stimulate ideas. How can we view this in a more strategic way?
  - Gagnon: *Described Noise Cause/Impact/Solution handout (i.e., Noise Improvement Matrix).*
  - Wiesenberger: The intent of this handout is to be more aware. Questions to consider:
    - Is it complete? Probably not. Lots of empty cells.

- Is it accurate? How do we address the empty cells? What is the best use of this? What is next best step? Lots of questions. This is a conversation starter. To keep us on track with options available to us.

- Gardon: I think it is a great way of organizing this.
- Cox: Who would be the keeper of this?
- Gagnon: Kurt has taken the point on it, and I will help. We can keep updating the document.
- Wiesenberger: I will take the lead but want it to be for all. It is to help us all stay organized.
- Cox: We need to incorporate this into the Agenda planning. We need to work with the airport and the folks we have involved now. Let's differentiate locally controlled items in the Matrix.
- Schofield: This needs to be on the website. Yes, will make it available. It is difficult to talk to other people about what we do in this room.
- Wright: Was Heathrow incorporated into this document?
- Wiesenberger: Yes. In January, when we meet, can folks have reviewed this, make any edits or additions? I can accept those by email and update for the next meeting.
- Montross: Can I use this as an opportunity to update on vortex generators? AA has retrofitted 21 aircraft since my last update, so we are up to 44 out of 283.
- Cox: AA wants to finish this by 2022. Is it feasible to get these planes done? Seems like a lot of planes out of service.
- Montross: Still on track and on schedule. Older aircraft need to be done. We acquired new planes with merger with USAir.
- Schofield: On the existing CLT initiative, CLT reference numbers; where can I see that?
- Gardon: Still a work in progress. We are working on Thelma's recommendation to link the #s on the Motions/Request databases to everything we do.
- Cagle: Column D should be Existing Initiatives not Existing CLT Initiatives since – for example – we can't initiate initiatives relating to aircraft because we don't own them.

- **Bob Petruska: Update on Noise Sensitivity Study**
  - Purpose of the study was to look at how could the ACR make a future state that's better.
  - *Reviewed presentation slides.* Took ton of hours to do this. Don't have a consistent complaint coming in. The map locations and the number of flights that came over the house at a one mile radius in less than 5 minutes apart. Studied 2 minutes apart also but roughly the same results.
  - Instead of total number of complaints, I used total number of unique households. The differences of the complaints is in the flight frequencies; altitude is the same. Frequency is the problem. We don't capture all complaints because complaining is done differently. In the Nextdoor app, people are complaining, and these are not captured. Only phone and web complaints captured. Bottom line: If we can reduce the frequencies, we can improve the quality of life of the people. Not saying altitude does not matter.
- Cox: Folks give up complaining. I don't know if our complaint methodology is valuable and what it captures.
- Pecora: Most people complain to neighbors and where you have an outlet. Before Metroplex: there was a notification in the paper about it. Not on social media, not places where folks normally look.
- Cagle: Great analysis. The airport understands. We know it is frequency. Maybe one recommendation the ACR could make is for the FAA or the federal government to revise the noise model. That does not create an immediate win because most of the folks that complain are not in an area that is defined as significant impact by the FAA.
- Pecora: I brought this up 3 meetings ago. How do we get this changed, add our voice to that?
- Schofield: I am frustrated that we don't have the data rolling in. If we have proper monitoring, we can collect all the data and analyze it.

- Cagle: Virtual monitoring is what the FAA uses to determine noise impact. When folks have a trailer in their yard, it proves there is noise impact, but it will not change the model.
- Gagnon: One point that came out of Bob's presentation is that complaints are important, but maybe they're a lagging indicator. Frequency is probably a better predictor of how noise is influencing the quality of life in the community. Loren, if you want to email some suggestions on that to Kurt prior to the January meeting, that might be something the ACR wants to take up.

➢ **New Business**

- **Third Parallel Runway Settlements** - CLT staff
  - Cagle: This item was in the media. After the completion of construction of the 3rd parallel runway, there were several lawsuits against the City. The airport decided to settle all the inverse condemnation lawsuits for around $1.5 million for 40 homeowners. Those homeowners generally live north and south of the new runway. Any citizen can file an inverse condemnation lawsuit against the airport if they believe their property values have been adversely affected by action taken by the airport. Inverse condemnation results in monetary payments. The airport gets an easement, and the property owners and future property owners have no right to sue over airport noise. Inverse condemnation never results in procedure changes. Settlement agreement was in 2014 and was settled in 2018.
- **Review Decisioning Flow of FAA-level Recommendations** – Gagnon
  - Gagnon: *Reviewed handout.* Put this together for attendees to see process, particularly for those recommendations sent to the National FAA for review/implementation.
  - Montross: Based on my experience with DC, document from the FAA about procedures in last meeting was great. Thanks to FAA for that. All roundtables want that. There is a point in the process where it comes back to the ACR after doing the noise analysis to hear "yes, proceed." Should this group be in the process before FAA implements?
  - Szymkiewicz: In my experience, if a project moves forward, then select individuals are involved.
  - Montross: I'm wondering how far along in the process you get before this group knows what the FAA is doing. Can we add a step?
  - Clark: I think it would be based on what the situation is where to insert that step.
  - Montross: I feel it needs to be inserted between steps 11 and 16, I think for this group to be able to access what you are studying.
  - Clark: Hard to know where to insert because of different situations. Part of the reason the FAA has ACRs is to increase community involvement. We are given a task, and we are not going to sit on it. We will update as we go along. If we find something problematic, environmental or anything else, we will come back to the ACR and update.
  - Cox: We could put a note in the chart.
  - Gagnon: We will have a footnote that FAA may come back to the ACR to inform on progress and with potential effects on the local population based on what the implementation will look like.
  - Montross: Drop down at the end of 13 and 14, to formalize the conversation with the ACR.
  - Schofield: What does PBN stand for on page 2?
  - Gagnon: Performance-based Navigation.
  - Szymkiewicz: I will take an IOU and ask community involvement people where they insert themselves in this process with other ACRs. They have a full manual which may answer Tracy's question.
  - Montross: Maybe talk to somebody in DC; when they design the procedure, they go back to touch base with the community.

❖ **Adjourn**

➢ Garrett motioned to adjourn. Pecora seconded; all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:42 pm.