

DC METROPLEX BWI COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE WORKING GROUP PUBLIC MEETING

Tenth meeting of the DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Working Group

Tuesday, December 5, 2017, 7:08 PM – 10:01 PM

MAA Offices, Assembly Rooms A/B

991 Corporate Boulevard

Linthicum, MD 21090

MEETING MINUTES

PARTICIPANTS

Roundtable Member	District / Organization	Attended	Roundtable Member	District /Organization	Attended
Lance Brasher, Chair *	District 33	✓	Paul Shank, Chief Engineer	MAA	✓
Christopher Yates, Vice Chair*	District 9	✓	Louisa Goldstein, Counsel	MAA	✓
Gary Smith*	County Councilman Jon Weinstein	✓	Robin Bowie, Director, Office of Environmental Services	MAA	✓
Erica Wilemon*	District 33	✓	Trey Hanna	MAA	✓
Rusty Toler*	District 13	✓	Karen Harrell	MAA	✓
Ellen Moss*	County Councilman John Grasso	✓	Paul Takemoto, Spokesperson, Office of Communications	FAA	✓
Paul Verchinski*	District 13	✓	Kyle Evans	General Aviation Rep CP Management LLC	✓
Dan Klosterman*	District 32	✓			
David Scheffenacker, Jr.*	District 32	✓			
Howard Johnson*	District 12	✓			
Paul Harrell*	District 32	✓			
Drew Roth*	District 12	✓			
Bryan Sheppard*	Baltimore County Executive Kevin Kamenetz	✓			
David Lee*	Howard County Executive Allan Kittleman	✓			
Pat Daly, Jr. *	Anne Arundel County Executive Steven Schuh	✓			
Mary Reese*	District 30	✓			
Linda Curry	District 33	✓			

DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Working Group

Meeting Minutes for December 5, 2017

**Voting Members*

Contractor Support

Mary Ellen Eagan, HMMH
Rhea Gundry, HMMH
Adam Scholten, HMMH
A.J. Durham, Straughan
Christine Wysocki, Straughan

MEETING MATERIALS

Participants received the following materials in advance:

- Draft Meeting Minutes from November 7, 2017

Handouts at meeting:

- Meeting Agenda for December 5, 2017
- Draft Meeting Minutes from November 7, 2017
- DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable letter to Michael Huerta, FAA Administrator, dated September 8, 2017
- FAA letter to Lance Brasher, DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Chairman, dated November 21, 2017
- DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable letter to Larry Hogan, Governor of Maryland, dated December 4, 2017
- Revised Meeting Minutes from June 20, 2017
- Amended DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Charter dated November 7, 2017

Displayed at meeting:

- MAA presentation titled *Operations Summary 2017, January through September, Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport* dated December 5, 2017
- MAA presentation titled *Runway 33L Jet Arrival Historical Flight Tracks and Final Approach Course Intercepts at Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport* dated December 5, 2017

1. Introductions

Mr. Lance Brasher (Chair) welcomed attendees and began the meeting. He briefly gave background information on the Roundtable for first-time attendees, including a history of the reason for forming the Roundtable, correspondences with FAA, and progress to date. He assessed the most recent letter from FAA as computer generated, containing no substance.

Review and approve agenda for tonight's meeting

Mr. Paul Verchinski moved to approve the meeting agenda. Mr. Drew Roth seconded the motion for approval. All in favor. Tonight's meeting agenda is approved.

Review and approve June 20, 2017 meeting minutes

Ms. Linda Curry added text based on Ms. Ellen Sample's presentation at the June meeting. Ms. Curry moved to approve the updated minutes and Mr. Verchinski seconded. All in favor. The June 20th meeting minutes are approved.

Review and approve November 7, 2017 meeting minutes

Ms. Curry stated she did not want to approve the November meeting minutes because of the limited review time (fewer than 24 hours). Mr. Verchinski moved to table the vote on the November minutes. Mr. Roth seconded. Approval of the November meeting minutes moved to next month's agenda to provide time for review.

Review and approve Charter Amendment

The update made was the addition of a voting member for District 30. Mr. Verchinski moved to adopt the updated Charter and Mr. Yates seconded. All in favor. The updated Charter is approved.

2. Updates from PBN Implementation Working Group Regarding Remedial Actions and Issues

Mr. Paul Shank of MAA stated the next 3-day PBN Working Group (Working Group) meeting is scheduled for next week. Mr. Adam Scholten of HMMH confirmed there is also another meeting tentatively scheduled for January. The FAA is expected to continue to build on what they presented at the November 7th Roundtable meeting.

Mr. Brasher mentioned that the FAA was planning a more substantive presentation for February 2018, as compared with the FAA's November 2017 presentation. He believes progress has been made on moving flights, though is unsure on the status of altitude changes. Mr. Shank said there's still pushback from the Working Group on altitude increases due to overflights (i.e., aircraft passing through the airspace to other destinations at a higher altitude than arrival/departures at BWI). With altitude changes, he observed that industry is on same page as the Roundtable. Per MAA's analyses, planes could be at higher altitudes and still meet the 3-degree descent standard for traditional approaches. MAA requested the data in writing from FAA for HMMH to consider; MAA is prepared to do a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, if necessary.

Mr. Paul Harrell asked for reasoning behind the FAA's resistance, and Mr. Shank responded that some aircraft cannot achieve a 7,000' altitude by the time they reach the airport boundary. He mentioned the remaining 2 Working Group sessions, where he expects the FAA to address altitude. Mr. Shank recalled an estimate of 3-4 decibels in reduction per 1,000' altitude increase.

Mr. Brasher noted he had not yet seen anything on the third prong: dispersion. While Mr. Owens of FAA originally said it was easy to create dispersion, it seems he has been told he cannot communicate that to the Roundtable any longer. We have clear records that demonstrate the dispersion that occurred in the past. Mr. Brasher stressed the importance of representation for the Roundtable by MAA, HMMH, and airlines at the Working Group sessions. He considers FAA's current communications with the Roundtable as unhelpful.

Ms. Erica Wilemon inquired about the FAA's pushback, and Mr. Shank confirmed it was on altitude. Mr. Shank said the MAA has radar information from HMMH that shows how pilots are descending to their desirable altitude once cleared. If there was a published procedure from RAVNN to a new waypoint/fix, to GRAFE, the airline could fly the published approach. We need to look at the percentages present pre-NextGen. Mr. Scholten said the data was available and could be provided. Mr. Shank emphasized the focus on returning to historical percentages.

Ms. Mary Reese considers this concept to be on the right track, but still insufficient because of the continued existence of a line of planes that were not historically present. Mr. Shank noted that they need to determine the historical distribution for approaches to establish percentages. They also need to review overflights, as he believes they can fly at a higher altitude. Ms. Reese inquired if this was being

done for the entire airport and not just GRAFE to SPLAT. Mr. Shank confirmed this would be done for the entire airport. Ms. Ellen Moss asked for clarification on whether this impacted departures, and Mr. Shank confirmed that the higher altitudes were related to arrivals.

At the Working Group meeting, Mr. Shank said MAA asked FAA to voluntarily respect the noise abatement procedures, as the public was involved in this decision, along with FAA, airlines, and industry. Metroplex changed flight paths and introduced noise over areas that never experienced noise before. The FAA has since figured out how to replicate noise abatement procedures with NextGen technology.

Mr. Shank explained that the FAA said they could move flights back to what they call the notional area. For departures, industry said they would be happy with vectoring versus flying interstates in the sky. While that might be putting things back the way they were, Mr. Shank also wants the FAA to respect noise abatement procedures.

Ms. Reese inquired as to why industry would want vectoring for departures and not arrivals. Mr. Shank pointed to predictability for arrivals and stabilization for landing, which are essential to safe operations of carriers. Mr. Shank is under the impression that the FAA is listening.

Mr. Brasher requested the presentation of (existing) slides that show pre- and post-Next Gen dispersion. The Roundtable wants dispersion where it was historically.

Mr. Verchinski asked why all of the airspace was not being used. Mr. Shank said this level of dispersion cannot currently be replicated with NextGen. Mr. Verchinski and Ms. Reese do not believe this to be true. Mr. Verchinski stated that algorithms can be written to increase dispersion. Looking at the slides requested by Mr. Brasher, Mr. Roth pointed out the presence of a runway used for small commercial flights.

Deliverables:

- HMMH to provide data on approaches, specifically historical percentages related to descents of flights (NOTE: this is complete, delivered in the second presentation)
- HMMH/MAA to analyze over flights and the potential for altitude increases

3. MAA Report on BWI Operations for Previous Month and Year-to-Date, covering: dispersion, altitude, number of operations/runway, upcoming developments and plans

Mr. Scholten gave a presentation titled *Operations Summary 2017, January through September, BWI Thurgood Marshall Airport*. This presentation was scheduled for the November meeting and got postponed due to the PBN Working Group presentation. (The complete presentation is available on MAA's website at:

http://www.maacommunityrelations.com/media/client/anznoiseupdate/2017/BWI_2017_ops_through_Q3_v1_20171205.pdf)

The presentation focused on jet operations, as these are the bulk of flights at BWI, and the evolution of runway use over the year. Data provided included a summary of averages for jet operations (arrivals and departures on weekends and weekdays).

Wind is typically the primary driver for runway usage, though other reasons for variations in use exist. Runway usage can change multiple times over the day or remain steady. Mr. Brasher inquired as to why certain runways are used much more than others, and Mr. Scholten responded that it is safer for aircraft to land into the wind.

Ms. Reese asked if winds were known to change over the decades—i.e., if the airport were built today, would the runways be situated in a similar configuration? Mr. Shank explained that another runway (parallel to Runway 28) has been on expansion plans for the last twenty years. Runways at BWI were configured based on historical wind information. BWI runways crisscross because they were built for a particular aircraft that was very sensitive to crosswinds (this aircraft is no longer in use today); commercial aircraft still have sensitivity to crosswinds.

Mr. Brasher asked why runway use is not flipped, making the percentages inverse (e.g., 61% arrivals would change to 61% departures). Mr. Roth said he believes that would create planes flying where they have never flown before.

Mr. Shank said the current use, as shown in the slides, is a more efficient utilization of the runway system and accounts for the winds. Ms. Reese added that planes do not want to cross the taxiway, and asked about the reason behind adding a second Runway 28. Mr. Shank said the additional runway would increase capacity. The airport planning document states that additional capacity would be needed at some point in the future; one way to achieve this is to add runways. When the airport master plan was written in the 1940's, each of the existing runways also had a parallel runway. The thought behind this was to protect airspace for future runways, so buildings and other structures could not be built to interfere. (This master plan is in the public domain at <http://maacommunityrelations.com/content/whatsgoingon/masterplan.php>.)

Mr. Roth asked about the needs of flights, and Mr. Shank responded that takeoffs require longer runways than arrivals. Mr. Scholten added that you can get more departures out of a runway. Mr. Roth asked how arrivals and departures would be balanced, if a second runway were to be added. Only the number of planes that arrive can be loaded and returned to service; there cannot be more departures than arrivals because the planes would not be there to load.

Mr. Scholten noted that adding another Runway 28 would allow one of the 28's to be used for arrivals only and the other to be used for departures only. Mr. Roth questioned how adding another runway would not add to the noise problem. Mr. Shank responded that, by default, adding more runways adds more capacity.

Mr. Shank stated that there is no capacity constraint today, only in the distant future. He also said that adding another Runway 28 would not dramatically increase capacity—it's not a doubling, it is a small percentage increase.

Mr. Brasher said it is imperative to win the dispersion battle so the burden of plane traffic and related noise is shared and distributed equitably around the area. Mr. Brasher believes that once the FAA violated the status quo, by saying it is acceptable for a person or area accustomed to the presence of flights to experience an increase of flight traffic, it is no more fair than saying to put flights where they were not present before; if the FAA cannot restore or put flight patterns back the way they were historically, no one has a protected status. Mr. Roth noted that there is an established noise zone near the airport; there is no excuse to violate the noise zones or noise abatement area. Mr. Brasher rebutted that people under the railways (i.e., concentrated planes flying overhead) are going to ask why they are experiencing the biggest burden, if we cannot win the dispersion battle.

Ms. Reese asked why those in attendance are shouldering the burden for the whole State. She then inquired about reaching capacity at BWI and how close they are to this point. Mr. Shank said BWI will not need additional capacity until 2037. An audience member, Mr. Jimmy Pleasant, said that an additional 150,00 flights each year would put the airport at capacity, and BWI is having one of its best years since the early 2000's.

Mr. Scholten moved on to talk about flight corridors, specifically the locations and concentrations of flight paths around BWI and surrounding communities. He presented data for jet flights retrieved from BWI radar. On the slides, color gradations depict density; blue means lower density, red means greater density. This information is based on the relative number of aircraft. Slides show two images: the left-hand image is zoomed in and the right-hand image is zoomed out to give location perspective. Data is presented by quarter (Q1-3 for 2017); data on the final quarter is not yet available.

Departure shifts were shown to slightly change because of weather variations between warm and cold months. It was noted that climb performance improves in colder weather. Profiles for arrivals trend similar throughout the quarters because they are not as susceptible to weather variations.

Mr. Roth requested a different base map be used for future presentations, and suggested highways be emphasized in imagery. Mr. Scholten and Mr. Shank agreed to update base mapping to show transportation throughways.

Next, Mr. Scholten highlighted operations at BWI in quarters 1-3 with the comparison of 4 arrival flows over a 28-day cycle (as published by FAA). Mr. Scholten expressed that the reasoning for this portion of the presentation is to show proof of concept.

On the right side of the slide is the vertical profile relative to the runway in the scenario, and on the left is the lateral profile over the ground. On the left image, blue lines represent procedures as published and red shows actual flights.

Mr. Brasher inquired if Mr. Scholten could share his observation of how flights changed, from the point of the Chesapeake Bay into the airport. It seemed to Mr. Brasher that flights now curve closer to the east faster than they previously had. Mr. Scholten said flights were more dispersed, historically, and fanned out over a greater distance.

Mr. Scholten explained other components of the slides, like the average altitudes of flights, location of noise abatement, and how these data compare to flying a constant 3-degree descent to the runway (continuous descent profile).

Mr. Shank noted that FAA had not yet accepted higher altitudes due to the presence of overflights. Mr. Brasher asked why the overflights are not flying at a higher altitude. Mr. Shank went on to explain how airspace is divvied up, according to the FAA in a previous Working Group meeting. Overflights typically stick to altitudes of 5,000' and higher. According to FAA, there's not enough capacity to increase altitudes for overflights; at the meeting, MAA and industry attendees asked FAA for data to justify this statement.

Mr. Shank said they have the historical radar track data that shows airplane paths, and will produce it for the Roundtable. Ms. Curry requested to see it at the next Roundtable meeting in January. She also inquired about the expediency of the FAA's correction process for Phoenix. She said FAA agreed to make corrections on departures in 5 months, and she is curious why local efforts at BWI are expected to take 18-24 months. Mr. Shank believed the speed up to be due to the involvement of a federal judge, and assured the group that they are following the strategy of Phoenix. (Maryland's Governor is going after the FAA.)

Mr. Roth stated that Phoenix won the lawsuit, and Ms. Curry wondered if BWI needs to go through a suit to receive the expedited response/actions from the FAA. Mr. Shank said he would carry this information to the next Working Group meeting, and that the Governor is taking action because we were not getting a satisfactory response from FAA. Mr. Brasher commented that it appears that the FAA has the ability to accelerate things more than they are admitting.

Mr. Scholten went back to the presentation material. Mr. Shank reminded the group what it meant to fly a visual approach, as compared to a published approach path. Mr. Scholten said HMMH can provide historical data with 2017 data for a side-by-side comparison. Mr. Shank pointed out that the slide data showed a decrease in altitude much farther (several miles) from the airport, when pilots used a visual approach. This would not be the case, if pilots used published procedures to a fixed waypoint.

Mr. Shank stated that the request is for a 3-degree descent to avoid planes flying at lower altitudes for longer periods of time, prior to meeting prescribed altitudes for waypoints. He also reminded the group that Mr. Brasher requested the addition of fixes. The 3-degree descent was discussed further, and Ms. Reese commented that this change would be significant. Mr. Scholten added that some carriers with older aircraft that are not RNP-capable would still need to fly visual approaches. Ms. Reese asked if the number of flights cleared for visual could be limited. Mr. Shank agreed to add this as an action item to discuss with FAA. He wants to know the percentage, pre-Metroplex, that was actually flying a 3-degree continuous descent.

Mr. Shank said they asked FAA (via the Working Group) to budget for the creation of this approach (additional fixes/waypoints), and believes this could be one possible solution. He plans to revisit this course of action at the next Working Group meeting.

Mr. Brasher reminded the group that no one wants to be under the line of planes, and that the technology should be able to create dispersion. He used the example of 100 additional fixes from GRAFE (a common waypoint) out to the Chesapeake Bay, which would be cycled among aircrafts to create dispersion.

Mr. Shank stressed that the important aspect is getting closure, and MAA is prepared to continue to push through their advisory role to the Roundtable and participation in FAA's Working Group meetings. He stated that MAA and HMMH diligently review FAA's data, as do industry attendees. MAA, HMMH, and industry act as the FAA's peer reviewers. The FAA also reviews ideas shared by MAA and HMMH.

Ms. Reese asked how consistent FAA's data was with the others' data. Mr. Shank responded that they will know more next week (at the upcoming Working Group meeting). He noted that almost sixty days have passed since the last Working Group meeting and that much has happened in the legal realm in that time frame (referring to a recent court decision finding in favor of the city of Phoenix vs. the FAA in a case over whether proper environmental review procedures were followed prior to implementing flight path changes, and subsequent agreement between the city and the FAA on a path forward).

Ms. Curry read an article that stated the FAA had already offered airports in New York dispersion, and she wondered why this has not yet been offered here. Mr. Shank said he thinks they plan to add more fixes, as they are doing at Logan. Mr. Roth asked for clarification on whether these additional fixes were sequential or alternatives, and Mr. Shank responded that the example he saw used additional fixes and procedures.

Ms. Curry added that the PBN Working Group featured in the article is working with 3 airports in New York. She also said the article mentioned FAA had widened their approach to solving noise problems across the country through dispersion. Ms. Mary Ellen Eagan of HMMH requested Ms. Curry forward the article.

Mr. Paul Harrell asked if there was an elevation where noise problems began. Ms. Eagan said she did not believe there was a particular altitude. An audience member estimated the difference in noise between an aircraft at 3,000' and 2,000' to be about half.

Deliverables:

- Mr. Shank to request FAA consider limiting number of flights cleared for visual, and also provide data on percentages of pre-Metroplex flights that flew a 3-degree continuous descent
- Mr. Shank to request FAA consider creating additional fixes/waypoints as a potential way to increase dispersion
- Ms. Curry to forward article about airports in New York to Ms. Eagan and Roundtable

4. MAA Presentation on Runway 33L Jet Arrival Historical Flight Tracks and Final Approach Course Intercepts at Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport

Mr. Scholten was asked to proceed with another presentation with percentage information. This presentation was a detour from the original agenda. Slides can be viewed here:

<http://maacommunityrelations.com//content/annoiseupdate/dcroundtablecalendar.php>

Content showed jet arrivals over time and where they have been intercepting the approach course, including from what direction they've been approaching the runway. The presentation only analyzed arrivals on Runway 33L for jet aircraft, showing the current operation numbers and historical percentages. They looked at the majority of the paths out there to determine percentages. Data covered 2012, 2013, 2015, and 2017 data samples because they correspond to three 28-day FAA publication cycles: 2012 is pre-Metroplex, 2013 is pre-Metroplex with changes from 2012, 2015 is mid-Metroplex, and 2017 is the most recent data available.

To determine percentages, four 84-day samples were utilized. (In 2013, there were more flights because a summertime sample was used; the reason for using this time frame was the closure of a runway during the normally used period.) The data is organized by general cardinal direction and broken out based on fixed points. Mr. Scholten reviewed the contents of the presentation slides. The summary slide compares 2017 with 2012, 2013, and 2015, showing changes relative to time period.

Ms. Reese asked about changes for GRAFE and SPLAT; NextGen numbers show GRAFE should not really have much of a change. Mr. Scholten explained that the numbers in question were total, and added that looking at arrivals coming from the southwest (RAVNN/RIPKIN) gives a better idea.

In 2012 and 2013, there was a path from RAVNN to SPLAT (pre-Metroplex). A two-pronged change occurred. SPLAT was published for only RNAV(Area Navigation)/RNP(Required Navigation Performance), then added and published on for the RNP approach only, and finally made available for flights not using RNAV/RNP such as those utilizing an ILS (Instrument Landing System). In addition, there was a rule change on clearing for approach procedures that allowed aircraft to be cleared to SPLAT. Ms. Reese noted that these reasons explain why SPLAT had more of an increase than what was lost for GRAFE.

Mr. Brasher asked for more details on the rule change mentioned by Mr. Scholten. Mr. Scholten responded that the changes occurred under FAA Order 7110.65 (the Air Traffic Controller's manual). Updates to the manual included how controllers separate aircraft, radar vector aircraft, phraseology, and more.

Mr. Brasher asked if these updates included a public comment period. Mr. Scholten said the Order is online for review, however, he is unsure whether there was a public review and comment period prior to publishing.

Ms. Reese asked about the impact of RNP. Mr. Shank stated that this data supported the argument that RAVNN to GRAFE should be utilized more. He said this is what industry was asking for, but he does not

believe this is enough; he wants to see a published procedure because that will dictate what the pilot does. Currently, the pilot can decide to fly something other than the continuous descent.

Ms. Reese then asked how RNP will allow conditions to return to pre-NextGen conditions, and what degree of similarity in conditions can be expected. Mr. Shank said they would need to calculate this information with the current fleet mix. He added that the RNP approach would also alleviate some of the traffic flying from JANNs to SPLAT. Mr. Scholten noted that an RNP approach could still be flown visually, since it could be loaded as a backup on the aircraft FMS (Flight Management System).

Mr. Shank explained that with FMS, the plane is flying itself. He noted that flight traffic could be spread within the notional area with more intermediate fixes. In response to a question from an audience member, Mr. Holley, Mr. Shank said commercial jet aircraft cannot fly a certain procedure because of the proximity to the end of the runway. Mr. Scholten added that final approach fixes are normally 5 miles or greater from the end of the runway, with few exceptions. Mr. Shank said they would ask industry what is possible and what FAA can be accommodate procedurally and hopefully industry can agree to adopt this approach.

Mr. David Lee complimented the helpful and enlightening analysis provided in the presentation, then asked if the same analysis can be done for east flow arrivals to Runway 10. Mr. Shank agreed that this additional analysis should be done.

Deliverables:

- MAA/HMMH to use base maps in future presentations and imagery that clearly depict highways and major roads and go out 20+ miles from the airport
- HMMH to circulate presentation to Roundtable
- MAA/HMMH to calculate how RNP will allow a return to pre-NextGen conditions with the current fleet mix
- Mr. Shank to ask industry about intermediate fixes and ability to descend to runway, and ask the FAA what can be accommodated procedurally
- MAA/HMMH to analyze east flow arrivals for Runway 10

5. Committee Reports: Communications, Legislative, Technical

This topic was not discussed, due to the lack of time remaining.

6. Upcoming PTC TRACON Visit by Roundtable

This topic was not discussed, due to the lack of time remaining.

7. Public Comment

Mr. Jimmy Pleasant of Ellicott City said there were over 400 departures each day during Thanksgiving week. He observed 224 flights over his house in one day, which he considers outrageous. He said flight traffic peaked in 2001 and is now climbing rapidly again; BWI is having their 2nd best year in history in aircraft operations. He stated that there were almost 20,000 operations for the airport in the 2nd quarter of 2017. During the second and third quarter, he claimed a noise sensor in Columbia was hitting between 70-75 decibels (then taken offline). He called this an obstruction of justice and wanted to know why the sound system was suddenly shut down.

Mr. Shank explained that the sound system MAA has been using is quite aged and they are in the process of replacing it. Installation is underway. The issue for not replacing the equipment sooner was cost. Ms. Robin Bowie, MAA Director of Environmental Services, was introduced. She is stepping in after Ms. Ellen Sample's retirement. She said they anticipate the new equipment to be up and running by summer of 2018. Mr. Shank suggested possibly placing one of the sensors near Mr. Pleasant's house.

Ms. Nancy Figgins of Arden on the Severn thanked the Roundtable and community representatives, MAA, and residents for their work. She has been impressed by the material presented at the meeting. While there is no HOA in her community, there is the Arden Civic Association. Ms. Figgins and Mr. Eric Best, who was present at last month's Roundtable meeting, went to the ACA board meeting and requested they appoint someone to represent Arden; Ms. Figgins and Mr. Best will be sharing this responsibility. She noted that she lives directly under Runway 33L, in a house on Valentine Creek purchased in 2003. Her home is a modernized cinder block beach house with 11" walls and double-pane windows. While in her yard, she cannot have a conversation while a plane flies overhead. She said she can see the eyeballs of the Southwest pilots, due to how low the planes fly. Some days, they fly overhead all day. Her house does not rattle, though things in her driveway like the trash do. At night, she pulls down the shades and wears ear plugs to cope with the noise; she has also resorted to sleeping pills. There is typically a break from the noise from midnight until 4 in the morning, but that seems to be it. She wishes she had gotten involved earlier in the Roundtable. She is retired now, and had a background in senior level management in the technology field, where she managed teams of over a hundred people. She offered her help to the Roundtable because this is the first time she's asked herself if a move from her dream beach cottage will be necessary, as a result of the noise. Mr. Brasher is her Roundtable representative.

The next public comment came from **Mr. Keith Fischbach**, who lives in Severna Park (about 7 miles from the final approach for Runway 33L). He is a pilot, and learned to fly at BWI. He said operations at BWI are like a finely-tuned clock. He stated that runway usage is not always determined by wind, weather, or safety; the general aviation Runway 33R is one of the main reasons. He observed that air traffic controllers obsess over lining planes up perfectly, and they run general aviation aircraft on Runway 33R and land on Runway 33L all day long. They also take off on Runway 28. He stated this is safe, efficient, and works really well. He complained about planes, such as FedEx, hanging over Runway 33L at 4 in the morning; there are many houses under Runway 33L. Why not send aircraft over Patapsco State Park, as there are practically no homes in that area. He does not understand why this option has not been considered. While he deals with air traffic and loves the airport, he considers these early morning flights to be ridiculous. He believes the overall operations at the airport need to be reviewed. He stated that there is no general aviation traffic after midnight. Regardless of winds that favor Runway 28, planes are landing on Runway 33L. When general aviation is not a factor, he finds it unacceptable to still fly these patterns.

Mr. Shank asked for clarification, and Mr. Fischbach responded that operational efficiency and sequencing are not a factor after 8 at night. Mr. Shank restated that Mr. Fischbach was suggesting landing planes on Runway 28 (non-general aviation after 8-9 pm), and this will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Fischbach continued by stating the 30-60 day closures experienced at each runway, then asked if that meant the planes were departing/arriving under unsafe conditions. He answered this question himself, saying that the differences between the wind on Runway 28 and Runway 33 are negligible, unless the winds are severe.

Mr. Roth reminded the group of the Roundtable's request to revert back to pre-NextGen conditions. Mr. Fischbach said he is not proposing to move the problem to where it has not been, rather to move it where it affects fewer people who have houses that are fixed to deal with the noise.

Mr. Michael Bahr of Hanover (a mile southeast of Arundel Mills Mall) observed planes flying a new pattern over the past 3 months. He handed out a graphic. The first page showed typical departures for Runway 28. The next page shows flights over the past 3 months. As soon as they take off from Runway 28 and clear Aviation Boulevard, they make a sharp left turn and fly over Mr. Bahr's home. He also experiences noise from Runway 15R flights headed to New England/New York.

Mr. Shank noted his familiarity with these patterns, as they are published departure procedures. Mr. Scholten and Mr. Shank said they will double check the procedures again to determine if there was a change. Mr. Bahr said he has been documenting the change and called it unreal, with changes beginning on August 12, 2017.

Mr. Shank posed the question of what happens when a change occurs in procedure and what the public information process is. Mr. Bahr stated that at the August Roundtable meeting there was mention of public notification, though he has not seen anything yet that can be publicly shared. Mr. Shank reminded Mr. Bahr and the audience of the website with materials from the Roundtable (on MAA's community webpage). Mr. Shank also said that, historically, he and Ms. Ellen Sample of MAA would go to community associations to discuss noise.

Mr. Bahr remembered the existence of a quarterly newsletter on noise levels in the past. He said the newsletters contained information and updates, and he recalled them being stuffed in his mailbox flag. Mr. Shank noted that MAA does mailings, and they currently have 2 campaigns for direct mail.

An audience member said that the website did not have sufficient information, and Mr. Shank said they would work on accessibility of the site and its information. Ms. Curry stated that there are ways to optimize a website so certain pages will show up on search results more than others. Ms. Karen Harrell of MAA said the bulletin board on the main page is visible and accessible.

Ms. Reese suggested that it is time for MAA to do a press release for The Capital with a link to the website and a statement that the FAA is expected to return in February. Another audience member said they had difficulty finding details on tonight's Roundtable meeting from the website.

Deliverables:

- MAA to consider landing planes on Runway 28 (outside of general aviation peak times)
- MAA will check the changes in procedures for Runway 28 and 15 departures (Mr. Bahr's comment)
- MAA to improve information accessibility of Roundtable information on website

8. Work Session on Status of Action Items, Tier 1 Items

This topic was not discussed, due to the lack of time remaining.

9. Review Action Items and Adjourn

The next Roundtable meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, January 16th, 2018. Mr. Brasher expressed appreciation to the Roundtable for their confidence in his and Mr. Yates' leadership over the

last ten meetings. He mentioned he believes it may be time for another Chair and Co-Chair to be elected in February.

Mr. Patrick Daly, Jr. asked if there were any updates on whether Maryland's Attorney General had secured outside counsel. Ms. Goldstein stated that attorneys had been hired and sent information on all of the Roundtable meetings and the Metroplex Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). They are looking at impacts from Metroplex at BWI and for Montgomery and Prince George's Counties. The Governor's direction was to look at the entire state. The hired lawyers represented Phoenix.

There's also another case about National Airport and flights over Georgetown, which will be argued in the U.S. Court of Appeals for D.C. on January 11th, 2017. This case may have more impact for this area because issues for National are about a flight path from Virginia over D.C. Looking at Appendix A to the Phoenix Order, there are many complicated actions that need to be taken, some of which could take 12-18 months. The exact target for filing the lawsuit is unknown. Ms. Curry said she has spoken with someone in the Attorney General's Office in D.C. Consultants for D.C. Airport area said the District is considering joining Georgetown in the lawsuit.

The Roundtable meeting adjourned at 10:01 pm.