

Airport Community Roundtable
Unapproved Summary Minutes: February 21, 2018

Attendees:

Bob Cameron, Chair, Davidson
Brian Cox, Charlotte
Patrece Lanier, 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
Bob Petruska, County 6
Erin Denison, Gaston
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Jill Taylor, York
Stuart Hair, City of Charlotte (ex-officio)
Brent Cagle, City of Charlotte (ex-officio)
Mark Clark, FAA (ex-officio)

Summary Minutes:

- Meeting started at 6:07 PM
- Quorum – 14 in attendance
 - Brian Cox arrived late, 15 total.
- Review and Approve December 20, 2017 Minutes – Minutes approved – 14 approve.
- Unfinished Business:
 - Motion regarding adding Public Appearance to standing Agenda:
 - Cox - The norm at most city and county meetings is to allow public appearances. Having an opportunity for the community to speak would be appropriate.
 - Cameron - think that the members as neighborhood representatives should bring up their neighbors' concerns for them. The meetings are too time-constrained to allow for public comment in them. Fear that it will make the meeting run out of time and not allow the group to get to business.
 - Brown – Everyone is invited to the ACR and they are welcome to come and listen to what the members can do on their behalf.
 - Cox- there are rules and guidelines that the county and city use for public to speak.
 - Cagle- There are two avenues to speak at city council – any citizens can speak on agenda item being voted on. It's an agenda action item. There is also a public forum, where twice a month 10 speakers are allowed to speak on any topic and that is limited to 10 minutes. There is a waiting list to speak. Can you please clarify whether this would be a public forum or the first option?

- Cox - think people would speak on agenda items, or maybe have availability for people to speak.
- Cameron – Would like to stabilize the group first and stabilize the meeting where the group has less agenda items.
- Filicky – It is important to hear the voice of the people, is in support of having people listen to the agenda.
- Nomellini – it's a time management issue.
- Cox – Allow the opportunity for public appearance and comments in accordance with the Charlotte City Council rules(...) – Brian will forward this to
- Cameron – All I favor of motion?
 - 10 in favor, 5 opposed.
- Technical support for ACR – status of project
 - Hair - Working through internal procurement and budget process. It was not originally included in budget for this FY. Is locating funds for this.
 - Cagle – Is the group in support of hiring a technical support company to facilitate technical discussions associated with the group?
 - Hair – a two part proposal, one for technical facilitation, and one for technical analysis. Will the group want to review the RFP before it is released? We don't want to release the RFP if the group does not want the support.
 - Nomellini – Why are proposals not drafted? Really disappointed to hear that the RFP has not been drafted?
 - Hair – The scope of work has been drafted.
 - Nomellini – What is holding up the process?
 - Cagle - The budget. We don't want to spend the money if the group does not want it. We want to know from the group because based on emails it is unclear.
 - Cameron – I want to see the scope of work to see whether they are in favor of it. Put on the agenda for the next meeting to see whether they have recommendations to improve it.
 - Hair – we will include the scope of work with meeting minutes.
 - Nomellini – very disappointed and frustrated at the lack of progress.
- Participant Inquiry Submissions – system to track?
 - Hair – on cltairport.com/noise there is a participant inquiry form. Anyone in the population can submit them. It goes to Dan Gardon who is tracking them.
 - Dan Gardon, CLT Airport -There are traditional noise complaints and inquiries on the website. I go through them every day and let the ACR members know if there are any that may be significant to the members. If anyone is curious about the ideas, I could submit them to everybody. However they want to do it.
 - Filicky - Is there an aggregate of data that are collected from complaints?

- Update on ACR Request/Recommendation 2017 -01
 - Hair – a print out of FAA’s response is included in tonight’s packet.
 - Discussion ensued between Mark Clark and Robert Cameron regarding FAA’s response.
 - Anding – For us it’s 3,300 ft. but they are coming within a few minutes in the hour. They are coming in very low for a residential area, and in increments that get smaller and smaller, every 1-3 minutes. Can you shed some light as to why?
 - The separation standard between aircraft is 1000 ft vertically, 3 miles laterally. The demand at CLT requires us to operate at the minimum amount possible. Within 10 miles of the airport they can reduce from 3 miles to 2.5 miles.
 - Anding – They were told by the FAA that they were planning to do a gentle glide slope, but now they are saying they can’t do it. Can we do this? Can we get the FAA to speak for us until we get technical support? It’s getting worse. Are we saying we can’t do this?
 - Clark – When we talk about CDAs and OPD’s the goal is unimpeded low power descent. When an airplane intercepts the low power descent, and that point they are in an unimpeded descent. The goal is to reduce periods of level flights and we feel we have been successful at that.
 - Cameron – If a plane is at 6,000 ft they are not a problem to them.
 - Brown - If we could move the approach turns further out that wouldn’t affect as much. If we extend the final approach 8 miles that would not affect as much.
 - Doreen – why is it so loud?
 - Ken Grisment, FAA - Based on the designs of airplanes, the reality is that airplanes are quieter and only getting quieter. Europeans use different terminology, but it means the same thing.
 - Discussion ensued with FAA
 - Question from Wright regarding departures.
 - Clark – Wants airplanes to get into the air as soon as we can. Want to get the aircraft to unimpeded flights up to higher altitudes.
 - Grisment – in all airports, all of them have downwinds, final and departure paths. Often that there is not a lot they can do as air traffic control. Airplanes have to come out of airports. I have worked a lot with ACRs, the community had the first opportunity to provide comments to the FAA only after the FAA worked with airlines and airports to come up with flight plans. Now, the ACR can bring input into the FAA before they are done with the process of drawing flight plans. With Nextgen, most aircraft are on OPDs. Aircraft have changed, they are quieter, but they also require different rules.

- Clark – If the ACR recommends that planes should go higher on the downwind, then we can explore, however, they will need to adjust all other traffic to space out airplane according to regulations.
 - Cox – At a community meeting someone said it is frustrating to hear that if we make changes it is just going to move somewhere else. Winners and losers were created when the flight paths were moved previously.
 - Clark – It will be advantageous to have a community table to come up with solutions going forward. The FAA will evaluate it for safety and efficiency standpoint.
 - Brown – In making the rails, direct planes over industrial areas instead of residential.
 - Grisment – those suggestions are what we are looking for from the roundtable
 - Cagle – In the departures path before Metroplex was that rail, the airport received many noise complaints. Used the crosswind runway for noise abatement reasons. The folks who live in noise abatement don't agree, we get many complaints from them.
 - Filicky – If there is nothing you can do to fix this, there is something you can do to inform us. I would never have made an investment in a property had I known that there was noise there. Inform the public of flight paths. Frustrating to know there is nothing we can do on the short term.
 - Cagle - City Council has asked that same question. The noise contours map, define significant noise impact. Legally, anything outside that line is not significantly impacted. The Airport can't say that people who live out of there would be significantly impacted. Otherwise, property owners and developers would say that we are influencing their property values without a federal definition. Can only let the city know once areas come up for rezoning that the area is under a flight path, but once that is rezoned, the seller is not legally required to disclose this information to the buyer.
 - Cox – Affecting fewer people is better than affecting more.
 - Grisment - Once something changes, they cannot go back to the original due to criteria change and safety requirements.
- Update on ACR Request/Recommendation 2017 -03
- New Business
 - Cox - Motion for ACR to delay RW18 departure turboprop turnouts
 - Ask that it be considered that departures from that runway go a little further before turning. Motion for consideration?
 - Taylor – is it possible to get same data off two other runways?

- Asking FAA to consider feasibility and take a look at it to see if it is something worth considering
 - Cox motion seconded by Jill Taylor.
 - Cameron - is there a motion to discuss?
 - Cox - concerned about jets, not turboprop as referenced on the Agenda. Ask that the FAA consider that planes will gain altitude over industrial areas vs residential areas.
 - 13 in favor, 1 abstain
- Request to redefine quorum as percentage of active members
 - Cameron motioned to change quorum definition to say it will be a majority of active members. Motion seconded by Thomas and Wright
 - Taylor- clarify active? Attendance requirements are to attend at least half of the meetings in 12 months. Some have missed more than half the meetings; they would be taken off the group at that time.
 - Hair – some members were selected but never came up, are looking to replace those three people.
 - 15 in favor. 0 oppose, 0 abstain.
- Elect new vice Chairman
 - Any volunteers or nominations for vice chairman?
 - Give some serious thought between now and next month to vote on a vice chairman.
- Adding complaint data to standing Agenda
 - Be helpful to get a running total of complaint data to compare.
 - Gardon - I can provide on a monthly basis.
 - Cox - don't need to discuss during meeting, but it would be nice to have information.
- Petruska suggestions for meeting improvements
 - Suggest adding time fences. Set a time for the item so that others know when or how long to speak.
 - Clarification to speaking on agenda items and public comment – add a time at the opening of next meeting for public comment. Reluctant to put other times on the agenda for other items. Understood that there would be a period of time for the motion in the beginning.
 - Cox - Usually the practice is to time items that there is a public interest, not every single item.
 - Dennison – believes the airport should have a different forum for the public. Was the motion added to allow public to speak on every agenda item? Or just at the beginning of the meetings?

- Cagle – The Airport can talk about noise with any group at any time.
 - Cox read original motion.
 - Sauber - Could we agree that we will have some form of public speaking and table this until we are ready to have the public come? Why don't we understand what direction this needs to go?
 - Taylor - Move that we reconsider the public comments portion of the agenda. Wright seconded.
 - 11 in favor, 1 opposed.
- Petruska data re Climbing Altitudes (4 panel. ppt)
 - It appears that the mean varies frequently even when the weather and other things don't change.
 - Brown - this data points to pilot technique.
 - Petruska – Increasing glideslope angle may make it better for noise levels.
- Petruska data re Noise Complaints filed by household and year.
 - Discussion ensued.
- Special Presentation: Expectation Setting
 - Moved to the bottom of the list per Cameron
- Meeting ended at 8:36 pm.