

DC METROPLEX BWI COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE WORKING GROUP PUBLIC MEETING

Twenty-eighth meeting of the DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Working Group

Tuesday, January 19th, 2021, 6:30 - 8:58 PM

Meeting held virtually via GoToWebinar

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR PARTICIPANTS

Roundtable Member	District / Organization	Attended	Roundtable Member	District / Organization	Attended
Mary Reese, Chair*	District 30	✓	Marcus Parker, Sr	Alternate for Dan Klosterman, District 32	No
Debra Jung, Vice Chair*	Howard County Council, District 4	✓	Austin Holley*	District 33	✓
Sarah Lacey	Anne Arundel County Council, District 1	No	Nancy Higgs*	District 33	✓
Ellen Moss	Alternate for Sarah Lacey, District 1	No	Brent Girard	Office of Senator Chris Van Hollen	
Debbie Macdonald*	District 9	✓	Adam Spangler	Office of Congressman Anthony G. Brown	✓
Jesse Chancellor*	District 9	✓	Ramond Robinson*	Office of Anne Arundel County Executive Steuart Pittman	✓
Howard Johnson*	District 12		Laila Jones	Office of Anne Arundel County Executive Steuart Pittman	
Paul Verchinski	Alternate for George Lowe District 13	✓	Kimberly Pruum*	Office of Howard County Executive Calvin Ball	✓
George Lowe*	District 13	✓	Samuel Snead*	Office of Baltimore County Executive Johnny Olszewski	
Drew Roth*	District 12	✓	Paul Shank, Chief Engineer	MDOT MAA	No
Evan Reese*	District 30	✓	Darline Terrell-Tyson, Acting Director, Office of Environmental Services	MDOT MAA	✓
Al Donaldson*	District 32	✓	Greg Voos	Mid Atlantic Regional Representative, NBAA	
Richard Campbell	Alternate for Al Donaldson, District 32	No	Kyle Evans	General Aviation Representative, CP Management LLC	✓
Daniel Woomeer*	District 32	✓	David Richardson	Southwest Airlines	No
Dan Klosterman*	District 32	✓	Reginald Davis	Community Engagement Officer ANE Region/ BWI/ DCA Eastern Service Center, Operations Support Group (AJV-E25)	✓

*Voting members

ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS

Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA)
Kevin Clarke, Office of Planning
Bruce Rineer, Manager Noise Section
Karen Harrell, Noise Section

Contractor Support
Royce Bassarab, HNTB

MEETING MATERIALS

Participants received the following materials in advance:

- Meeting Agenda for January 19, 2021

Handouts at the meeting:

- none

Presentations at the meeting:

- BWI Marshall Airport Noise Zone (ANZ) Post-NextGen (Prepared and presented by the Roundtable)
- Airport Noise and Operations Monitoring System (ANOMS) and its use to increase community engagement and transparency regarding the impact of aircraft noise pollution on residents (Prepared and presented by the Roundtable)
- Email communication between MDOT MAA and Roundtable Chair

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Introduction & Member Roll Call

Mr. Bruce Rineer noted that tonight's virtual meeting is operating similarly to an in-person meeting, but with some different procedures, including a request that all attendees mute their microphones, that all members of the public are muted but questions are requested to be input into the chat bar, that the 'raise hand' function should be used for technical issues or questions, and that it is recommended to have only one browser open. Mr. Rineer displayed the agenda.

Ms. Mary Reese (Chair) welcomed everyone and wished attendees a Happy New Year. Prior to roll call, Ms. Reese discussed an issue with registration and posting of this meeting, which was not corrected until last Friday, which is not ideal. Ms. Reese noted that she hoped this was a one-time occurrence, and also noted the agenda link on maacommunityrelations.com did not work, and some documents had been provided to the Roundtable late.

Ms. Reese asked each representative to introduce themselves and to state the district they represent.

Review and Approve Meeting Agenda

Ms. Reese entertained a motion to approve this evening's meeting agenda. Mr. Dan Woomer made a motion to approve the agenda, seconded by Mr. Evan Reese. All voted in favor. Tonight's meeting agenda was approved.

2. DISCUSSION OF NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER MINUTES

Ms. Reese discussed the November and December meeting minutes. She noted she had not received transcript or recording for the November meeting, and that MDOT MAA has requested that the Roundtable submit a Public Information Act request. Ms. Reese sent a letter to Mr. Shank on January 13th requesting clarification, but has not yet received a response. As such, Ms. Reese suggested that the November minutes again be tabled.

Ms. Reese noted that the December meeting minutes have not yet reviewed by the technical committee and entertained a motion to table the approval of both the November and December meeting minutes. Mr. Woomer made a motion to table the minutes, seconded by Mr. George Lowe.

3. ANZ DISCUSSION AND LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Ms. Reese introduced a discussion on the BWI Marshall Airport Noise Zone (ANZ) and presented a number of slides that she had prepared. Ms. Reese briefly turned over the floor to Ms. Deb Jung. Ms. Jung stated that a memorial service for COVID-19 victims was taking place this evening and that she would need to leave the meeting early. She reminded everyone that hope is coming with vaccinations, and that she hoped to meet at MDOT MAA again in the spring and noted the importance of meeting together.

Ms. Reese stated that lot of work has occurred with the MDOT MAA ANZ since March, and highlighted the areas she sees as the most important. Ms. Reese acknowledged that Roundtable members may not be technical experts regarding the ANZ, but are experts regarding noise complaints in the community. Ms. Reese explained the purpose of the presentation was to review the purpose and process of the ANZ update as required by COMAR, to highlight the noise threshold used to determine the ANZ, and to demonstrate with post-NextGen noise complaints and reports that these metrics are problematic.

Ms. Reese presented a slide stating that the current certified ANZ is from 2014, and the process occurs every five years, and the results are incorporated in COMAR. The ANZ process was established by the Maryland Environmental Noise Act of 1974 prior to the Federal government's implementation of the 14 CFR Part 150 program and noted that Maryland is unique and had been forward thinking in implementing this process.

Ms. Reese mentioned the intent of the ANZ is to protect the citizens of Maryland from the impact of transportation related noise, and to control incompatible land development in areas where noise levels are 65 dB DNL or more. Ms. Reese showed the 2020 Base Year DNL contours, and Mr. Rineer clarified that the 2020 base year as shown doesn't represent the composite DNL contour that comprise the composite ANZ. Ms. Reese noted that better images and graphics are forthcoming. Ms. Reese stated that it is important to note planned airport growth, by approximately 6% for the 5-year condition; by 15% for the 10-year condition; and that by 2030 a parallel Runway 10R/28L will be built and a 1,000'

extension of 15R/33L will be complete. Ms. Reese said a new parallel runway might help some things and hurt some things, but that an extension of Runway 15R/33L would allow heavier (and therefore noisier) aircraft to arrive and depart and exacerbate noise concerns. Ms. Reese showed the forecast DNL contours for 2025 and 2030.

Ms. Reese presented the distribution of noise complaints from the first quarter of 2019 (as previously prepared for the Roundtable). Ms. Reese approximated the 2020 contours over the noise complaints. It shows that noise complaints are occurring far beyond the ANZ. Ms. Reese stated that if the purpose of the ANZ is to protect people from aviation noise, it's going to fail.

Ms. Reese introduced the portable noise monitoring program (an MDOT MAA program available upon homeowner request, which results in a detailed technical report upon conclusion). The reports are very detailed and are available on the MDOT MAA website. Ms. Reese noted she was not able to map all of the residential portable noise monitoring reports but that Roundtable may be interested in pursuing this. These reports are important because they are surveying far away from the airport, and the fact that people who take the time and effort to request portable noise monitoring are obviously very bothered by airport noise. Ms. Reese noted, for example, that her property is located over 16 miles from BWI Marshall and she has had a portable noise monitor at her home.

Ms. Reese presented a graph showing portable noise monitoring reports between 2015 and 2020 and provided the results in terms of DNL, as well as the averages. Ms. Reese noted that not a single report shows a DNL of 65 dB. Ms. Reese also highlighted the lowest levels in the 40's, which means those individuals are still bothered by aviation noise even at very low DNL levels. She emphasized that these numbers tell a story and we have a lot of work to do.

Ms. Reese concluded her presentation and stated Mr. Chancellor's presentation would provide more ideas for a path forward, and opened the floor for discussion. Ms. Nancy Higgs stated she has reviewed the ANZ document, and said that the executive summary describes the increase in the size of the ANZ that includes a shift in day/night distribution of operations, changes in aircraft fleet, etc. but does not mention NextGen. Ms. Higgs pointed out that aircraft altitudes are an issue, and Ms. Higgs had a portable noise monitor at her residence years ago and consistently saw results of 65 dB, 10 miles from BWI Marshall. Ms. Reese noted she was concerned with modeling, which does not reflect how the noise is actually experienced by those living under flight paths. Ms. Reese noted she doesn't know the input parameters used for noise modeling (i.e. constant approach versus step-down approach procedure). Ms. Higgs agreed this was a problem.

Mr. Reese noted that modeling is a necessary evil and estimations have to be made, but he agreed that the Roundtable does not know if the noise model is run to represent an optimistic (least amount of noise), pessimistic (largest amount of noise) or median scenario. Mr. Reese stated he would not be surprised to learn that the model represented the input parameters that model the least amount of noise, at MDOT MAA direction. Mr. Reese noted the input data is most likely reasonable but may not be what we want going into the model. Most importantly, Mr. Reese commented on the 1950's DNL

“pseudo-science”, and stated that we need to drastically update the way we look at noise - if someone is complaining about 45 DNL, the model needs to address that, and this system isn’t set up to do so.

Mr. Drew Roth noted that to address the 65 DNL standard, changes through legislation must be the course as it is coded into regulations. He stated people beyond the 65 DNL contour are impacted by noise. Strategically, to address the standard is a legislature question, not the ANZ, which works within the framework defined by the law. He stated there are other things that could be done within the ANZ—like the assumptions that underly the model (wind direction, temp, humidity) – be clear that the Roundtable expects that the DNL contours are not done under specially selected conditions. Mr. Roth noted that the absolute values are less interesting than how they might change with new flight procedures. Mr. Roth suggested that the Roundtable ask the MDOT MAA and legislature to establish a baseline prior to implementation to see how things change to determine whether the Roundtable’s proposed changes make a difference. If they do not make a difference, the Roundtable has justification to ask for more changes. Mr. Roth suggested some locations where such monitoring might be appropriate.

Mr. Paul Verchinski stated that he agreed with Mr. Roth, and that he would like to see the permanent noise monitors, once the contours are established; those monitors be placed where the contours are to see whether the modeled values are correct. Unless models are validated, they aren’t telling you what is truly going on. Mr. Verchinski had a conversation with an FAA representative about validating models, who stated that “FAA uses the model that we have and there are so many noise monitoring systems that could be put on the ground, we don’t deal with any of those”. Mr. Verchinski stated that regulations for highways and transit tell you what monitors to be used to validate the model. Mr. Verchinski also suggested the 60 and 55 DNL contours be added to the ANZ, if MDOT MAA won’t include those the Roundtable should ask the Legislature.

Ms. Higgs noted that her area is not even shown on the graphics and agreed with Mr. Verchinski’s comments. Her portable noise monitoring report showed results over 65 dB. Ms. Reese noted that MDOT MAA is doing a great job completing the ANZ process as required, but Ms. Reese doesn’t know the parameters that were used. She stated that the noise contours may be drawn correctly, but the use of 65 DNL is the problem.

Mr. Jesse Chancellor noted that a public meeting on the ANZ process is scheduled for January 28th, and that the draft minutes from the last meeting discussed having a unified public position that Mr. Roth described as the best approach, and questioned when that meeting would occur. Mr. Roth stated that a small team could put together a draft position, comprised of the technical and legislative committees. The Roundtable could then endorse the position, which becomes the formal Roundtable feedback that could also be sent to the Legislature. Mr. Roth suggests that the Roundtable identify a working team who agree to attend the public meeting on the 28th and meet afterwards to determine a position and he is willing to put together PowerPoint bullets. That process would determine what to say with bullet points, get Roundtable concurrence, then have a good writer finalize the letter. Mr. Chancellor asked for the final deadline for comments, and Mr. Rineer stated that the final deadline for comments is February 15th. The next Roundtable meeting is scheduled for February 9th.

Mr. Verchinski thought the comment period for the ANZ was 60 days. Mr. Rineer noted the comment period for the ANZ is 30 days as required and provided under COMAR. Ms. Reese noted the FAA's Neighborhood Environmental Survey includes a 60-day comment period.

Ms. Reese asked if Mr. Roth would lead this effort, and Mr. Roth suggested he will join the technical committee, make it a technical/legislative committee joint effort, and let the chair of technical committee run it. Mr. Roth suggested Ms. Reese could provide final edits. Mr. Roth suggested a legislative/technical committee review session via Zoom at 2:00 p.m. the afternoon of Sunday, January 31st. Ms. Reese would turn it around quickly (1-2 days) in advance of the February 9th Roundtable meeting.

4. NOISE MONITORING PRESENTATION

Mr. Chancellor began a presentation on the MDOT MAA noise monitoring system. Mr. Chancellor noted that the Roundtable had hoped MDOT MAA would provide a presentation on this topic, but as they indicated they were unable to do so, he prepared a presentation with the intent of determining how the existing system is used and whether other airports are using a similar system in ways the Roundtable might want to pursue.

Mr. Chancellor stated he wanted to find ways to increase transparency around noise in the community using ANOMS. The purpose of the presentation is to summarize the BWI Marshall ANOMS system and its current uses from a layman's point of view, to highlight current European thinking about aircraft noise pollution in densely populated regions, and to demonstrate through an example how one European airport uses its noise monitoring system to increase community engagement and transparency. Mr. Chancellor noted that he did not make formal requests for information to MDOT MAA's consultant (HMMH) in the preparation of this presentation, but that any Roundtable questions should be collected and sent to MDOT MAA and the Roundtable should request a formal written response. Mr. Chancellor noted the source for most information is from the MDOT MAA Quarterly Noise Report and MDOT MAA website.

Mr. Chancellor displayed the mission statement of the MDOT MAA Noise Section and noted that it is not usually discussed. The mission statement reads: "The Noise Section of the Office of Environmental Services is committed to monitoring aircraft operations and airport related noise levels in the communities surrounding BWI Marshall and Martin State Airports, and is dedicated to helping stakeholders understand the facts, science, and regulations associated with airport noise in a transparent, clear and accessible way to those we serve." Mr. Chancellor commended the efforts of the MDOT MAA Office of Environmental Services, and noted the values of the Roundtable and Noise Section are aligned.

Mr. Chancellor provided details about the ANOMS system; it includes 24 permanent noise monitors, a number of portable noise monitors, associated software to analyze flight tracks, noise complaints, and noise levels, and a public interface (WebTrak). MDOT MAA collects, analyzes and reports on aircraft operations and aircraft noise exposure on an ongoing basis. MDOT MAA distributes results from the system via Quarterly Noise Reports, which Mr. Chancellor noted are quite detailed and are very good

reports. Mr. Chancellor presented a graphic showing the 24 permanent noise monitors and noted the permanent noise monitor farthest west is located at the MDOT Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA) station in Columbia off of Broken Land Parkway, and the furthest south is located at Benfield Elementary School. He noted the monitors are not always located in areas where most noise complaints originate from, including areas such as Lake Elkhorn, Howard County General Hospital, and other areas on the Annapolis peninsula.

Mr. Chancellor noted that ANOMS is used to derive flight tracks, and that an earlier presentation noted that the system was integrated with FAA radar, but Mr. Chancellor wasn't sure that this remains true. ANOMS provides input for tables of aircraft and community noise sources, and the results are used to compile and map quarterly noise complaints and complainants per community.

Mr. Chancellor discussed a study published by the European Parliament from July 2020, entitled "Impact of aircraft noise pollution on residents of large cities" (available at [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/650787/IPOL_STU\(2020\)650787_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/650787/IPOL_STU(2020)650787_EN.pdf)). Mr. Chancellor was careful to describe the issue as noise pollution. The report provides a good summary of how Europeans are starting to see jet aircraft noise as a significant health risk in the EU. Mr. Chancellor highlighted the study's findings, including that competent authorities (often local governments) may set voluntary or regulated noise limits, applying to all noise sources under their jurisdiction (similar to the Maryland Environmental Noise Act of 1974); that an airport itself may declare voluntary noise limits as part of its commitment to engagement and transparency with the local community; and that in order to manage the complexities, it is becoming more and more common in Europe for airports to procure and implement noise and track keeping systems (NTK) which provide, at varying levels of sophistication, a way to monitor and manage the noise generated from flights into and out of the airport.

Mr. Chancellor noted that the EU is considering the need to modify the noise standard in use currently. He noted that the study stated that just by having an NTK system it is possible for an airport to claim that it is monitoring noise levels and distribution and thereby is in a position to manage aircraft noise to some degree and to better understand and respond to community concerns; that a NTK system may also be used to provide more specific responses to individual complaints relating to single flight events and allows more general statistical analysis of complaints distribution and the compilation of regular complaints and noise distribution reports; and that with appropriate skills, noise monitoring can be used to verify noise contour modeling results. Mr. Chancellor noted that, with the new ANOMS system, MDOT MAA is better equipped to monitor noise levels and provide more specific responses. He further emphasized that MDOT MAA may be able to use ANOMS to verify noise modeling results.

Mr. Chancellor described the efforts of Zurich Airport, similar in many ways to BWI Marshall. Zurich Airport has 14 fixed monitoring terminal and provide a monthly noise bulletin on overall noise exposure and aircraft noise pollution at all fixed terminals. He highlighted that the report includes daily noise monitoring results, community noise and is easy to find on their website.

Mr. Chancellor outlined their process of noise mapping. The Swiss Noise Abatement Ordinance stipulates that aircraft noise emissions must be determined by calculation which are performed by the independent Swiss Federal Laboratories for Materials Testing and Research. Mr. Chancellor presented an aircraft noise map showing areas where thresholds have been exceeded. He noted that the Zurich Airport runway configuration is very similar to BWI Marshall, but is used differently. He noted that the map isn't developed using only modeling, but rather it is based on monitoring and all operations in airspace, and shows noise levels at lower levels. The map presents a second look at what an airport thought was happening by showing what actually happened.

Similar to what Maryland does with the ANZ, through the Spatial Planning Act of 1979, the Swiss categorize noise levels over land use by using a planning value, an impact threshold, and an alarm value, by levels (I through IV). They translate into actions the airports have to take, but with leeway that takes into account complexity. Mr. Chancellor noted that this shows that policy can drive behavior.

The next slide presented the sensitivity levels (I through IV) and how they apply to different land use zones (i.e. sensitivity level II in zones in which operations that emit noise are not permitted, notably in residential zones and zones for public buildings and installations). Mr. Chancellor highlighted the footnote that stated that parts of land use zones rated as sensitivity levels I or II may be assigned the next higher level if they are already exposed to noise, such as a level 3 zone with noise that can be treated as level IV (industrial) zone. He noted that the noise levels from BWI Marshall operations are similar in residential zones as it is in industrial zones. This may be a way to update COMAR – to acknowledge that areas saturated with noise may require mitigation.

Mr. Chancellor presented his tentative takeaways. MDOT MAA has a state-of-the-art noise monitoring system because of the good work of MDOT MAA, and that with appropriate skills and institutional willingness, ANOMS could be used to increase community engagement, frequency of reporting, and transparency. ANOMS could be used to verify noise contour modeling results. Lastly, there may be a role for COMAR in managing heavy jet airplane noise pollution.

Mr. Roth called attention to the slide with four tiers of noise levels, and noted that the impacts of NextGen could be described using a similar methodology, as NextGen moved flight paths out of industrial areas and into residential areas. Ms. Higgs agreed and noted that communities around the Severn River in many cases predate the Airport. Mr. Verchinski appreciated the presentation, and noted the age of the DNL metric. Air traffic in the 1970's and 1980's was very different and there was no use of hub and spoke system. The change has pulsed the sound into compact time intervals, with compression of noise that takes place within, for example, a 3-hour period. He stated there needs to be some attention to how airlines now operate and resultant noise impacts. Mr. Verchinski agreed with Ms. Higgs that communities are getting noise levels over 65 dB in pronounced peaks and that a 24-hour average metric doesn't help. Mr. Verchinski noted that he didn't have any noise problems until NextGen and was disappointed that the ANZ doesn't reference it.

Mr. Roth noted that the ANZ only tests on one criteria – whether aircraft noise is so bad that residential land uses won't be permitted. Mr. Roth noted that noise concerns extend beyond that singular criteria

and more gradation exists. Mr. Roth agreed the Zurich example could help inform a better law for Maryland residents. He noted a better law would consider whether a proposed increase in air traffic caused people to live in one sensitivity zone to experience noise impacts in a different zone.

Mr. Chancellor noted that nothing we do captures the experience under the flight paths, and that our focus is looking at noise from one runway at a time. Mr. Chancellor likened it to an effect similar to Doppler radar, flight frequency increases throughout the day such that the day is saturated with doppler noise. Mr. Chancellor noted that noise exists beyond directly underneath the flight corridors. Services like Airnoise.io help better capture noise complaints, and noise modeling needs to follow a similar process. He noted that when comparing 2030 and 2020 flight paths, by 2030 the local community is covered by flight tracks, and that there needs to be a way to question whether that is the intended result of public policy and a cost-benefit analysis.

Ms. Higgs noted that it doesn't help that BWI Marshall is a cash cow for Maryland. Growth of the airport provides revenue to the State of Maryland, and few other airports are owned by a state. Ms. Reese noted that the economic benefits (jobs and revenue) are used frequently by MDOT MAA as a defense. Ms. Reese noted that taxpayers pay for the damages caused by NextGen pollution, and that she has researched and presented on health studies regarding increases in cardiac incidents when she was the previously Roundtable chair, which translated to billions of dollars over a ten-year period. She noted that the ongoing health impact study is just scratching the surface, and that we need to quantify the losses caused by noise impacts. Ms. Higgs noted that individuals' health insurance are paying for the medical costs associated with these issues. Ms. Reese noted that State legislators are paying attention to the Roundtable's concerns, but passing legislation takes considerable time. The Roundtable's efforts are building credibility, but there are challenges to, for example, determining how to quantify shortened lifespans because of particulates and associated air quality concerns.

Mr. Reese noted that in Europe, NextGen (satellite) procedures are already heavily implemented and the results of noise exposure reflects that, pointing to the slide depicting the shape of the Zurich noise contours. He contrasted the rounded contours at BWI Marshall with the focused contours shown at Zurich.

5. CHAIR COMMENTS & DISCUSSION

Ms. Reese introduced and displayed email communication with the MDOT MAA, for which she tracks the dates of submission and responses. She noted that MDOT MAA prefers inquiries come through the Chair and Vice Chair. Ms. Reese highlighted correspondence related to MDOT MAA's role with the Roundtable and that the perception is that MDOT MAA is pulling back from the Roundtable. At the end of November, Ms. Reese followed up with Mr. Paul Shank where he agreed to provide a brief on the ANZ and ANOMS. Before the meeting in December, Ms. Reese stated that Mr. Shank cancelled the briefs. Ms. Reese displayed the dates on which she asked the questions of MDOT MAA, including those submitted by Mr. Verchinski. Ms. Reese stated that the information she was requesting on the ANOMS and ANZ are relevant to the Roundtable's concerns, and she shared these concerns with Executive Director Ricky Smith. Ms. Reese read Mr. Smith's reply, including that MDOT MAA considers requested briefs a

deviation from the Roundtable's scope which is satisfied by the MAA's participating with the FAA PBN process.

Ms. Reese responded to Mr. Smith reiterating MAA support of the PBN process, but that the Roundtable's charter allows for the understanding of the noise monitoring system relative to what's been provided to the Roundtable. Many folks have shared concerns about the MDOT MAA's participation, and Ms. Reese does not receive a response to many inquiries. Ms. Reese reiterated that this is a real challenge and she is sorry that this is happening. She noted this differs from her experience when she was the chair previously. Ms. Higgs noted she was unclear of MDOT MAA roles and responsibilities, and that an organization chart would be helpful. Ms. Reese noted that MDOT MAA participation has changed and summarized MDOT MAA's administrative support to the Roundtable. Ms. Reese suggests maybe MDOT MAA is out of practice due to the time between the planned March 2020 meeting and the November 2020 meeting. Ms. Reese reiterated that she doesn't want the issue to look like it's on the Roundtable's end. The Roundtable includes a lot of talented and committed individuals who are working to make the airport better and fit into the community.

Mr. Reese addressed the November meeting minutes, and pointed out that in November, Mr. Shank stated that the current PBN proposals addressed everything at the airport. Mr. Reese, in November, stated that the Roundtable has always agreed to participate in an iterative process to change procedures at BWI. He stated that he appreciates MDOT MAA and HMMH support, and that the Roundtable cannot influence change without industry, MDOT MAA and HMMH. Mr. Reese is very worried that MDOT MAA is pulling back and his phrasing was intentional, and may be related to the apparent MDOT MAA drawback. The Roundtable does not feel that these potential procedures will solve everything.

Ms. Reese noted that FAA Regional Administrator Jennifer Solomon confirmed that there is a process to continue to submit requests related to air traffic procedures to FAA, via the IFP Gateway, and that FAA is more likely to accept changes when they include operator and Roundtable concurrence. Mr. Reese noted that the number of procedure suggestions in a Metroplex is directly related to the FAA's scheduling of resources to convene a PBN working group.

Mr. Verchinski stated that FAA has indicated that they are constantly in the process of making minor changes to procedures at different airports. Mr. Reese agreed and noted that FAA often tweaks procedures, but the Roundtable's proposed procedures represent a major change and require a PBN Working Group. He reiterated that this does not mean the Roundtable believes all issues were addressed, but that tweaks to the procedures could be made quickly. Additional major changes are warranted to ensure a good quality of life for the most people around the airport.

Ms. Reese noted the importance of thanking those that have provide support, including Senator Lam, Senator Reilly, and Delegate Hill. She noted Senator Lam and Senator Reilly deserve special thanks as they attended Roundtable meetings and pledged their support, and have delivered. She noted the health study bill passed last session but was vetoed by Governor Hogan, however funding has been

provided and the study is moving forward and actively underway. Ms. Reese will provide an update at the February meeting.

Ms. Reese has asked MDOT MAA to give special recognition to Adam Scholten, formerly of HMMH, for his excellent work and diligence. She asked if anyone has an idea of any awards that might be appropriate, please let her know. Ms. Reese noted that everyone on the Roundtable deserves thanks; and the members are doing an incredible job. This Roundtable has not been divided and the Airport's namesake, Thurgood Marshall, would be proud of the work the Roundtable is undertaking.

Ms. Jung and Ms. Reese will be meeting with Senator Van Hollen's office, perhaps in the next week, to discuss efforts at the Federal level. An update will be provided at the February meeting.

6. COMMITTEE UPDATES

Ms. Reese provided an update on the Roundtable Technical and Communication committees.

The Technical Committee had lost member Paul Harrell, but as of this evening gained Mr. Roth's participation. Membership includes Mr. Chancellor, Mr. Reese and Mr. Austin Holley, but new members are always welcome. Mr. Reese stated that there is plenty of work to go around.

Mr. Holley asked Ms. Reese about an email he sent requesting the coordinates of some of the waypoints associated with the Roundtable's proposed procedures, in the event that FAA proposes any changes or rejects any Roundtable proposal. Mr. Reese suggested that the information is readily available and can be obtained from HMMH, through MDOT MAA.

For the Communications Committee, Ms. Reese stated that Ms. Barbara Deckert is no longer a member of the Roundtable or the Communications Committee. Moving forward, Ms. Higgs volunteered to serve on the committee but was not sure she wanted to serve as Chair, and that she had volunteered to assist in the past. Ms. Reese suggested that Ms. Higgs be the point person to compile comments on meeting minutes, and that Ms. Reese could draft press releases and support Ms. Higgs. Ms. Higgs noted she would like to see more activity from the Communication Committee and noted that many in the community do not know the Roundtable exists. She noted it can be difficult to get articles published in newspapers. One issue is that we aren't clear with what is being done with the data that MDOT MAA collects (i.e. noise reports). Ms. Kim Pruim also volunteered to assist with efforts of the Communications Committee.

In the comments, Mr. Ramond Robinson had offered assistance to the Roundtable to in reaching out to Secretary Slater to improve MDOT MAA responsiveness.

Mr. Holley noted that he serves as the Airport Noise Chair of the Greater Severna Park Council and relays information to that group, and will continue to do so over the next few years. Ms. Higgs commended Mr. Holley's efforts, and noted that Crownsville does not have a homeowner's association (and therefore is not included in the Greater Severna Park Council) but does have a bimonthly publication. Ms. Reese stated that a newsletter would be great if it could be done and that the Roundtable has emails of communities and community associations.

Ms. Reese noted that the Roundtable has a number of new members, and that she recognizes it is hard for new members to capture all of the organizational knowledge possessed by others on the Roundtable. As such, Ms. Reese suggested a quarterly or twice a year informal session to answer questions for new members, and that she would reach out to new members and veterans.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Rineer noted that any of the six attendees could raise their hand to speak. Ms. Reese noted that she hoped the lack of participation wasn't because the Roundtable meeting wasn't advertised for a sufficient amount of time.

Mr. Kenneth Phillips, River Meadows Drive in Oakland Mills, noted that he appreciates the Roundtable's efforts and he believes the Roundtable is on the right track. Mr. Phillips noted that he had consulted the Airport Noise Zone prior to purchasing his home but has experienced excessive noise since he moved in. He is a regulatory research scientist working for a government regulatory agency and collected aircraft noise recordings (pre-Covid). He compared aircraft noise recordings to noise from Route 29 and concluded aircraft noise represents three times the noise of nearby Route 29.

Mr. Phillips suggested there needs to be a legislative change to illustrate to congressional representatives that while planning and construction of highways like Route 29 takes decades, FAA was able to implement changes for flight procedures overnight, without actual noise measurements and no public involvement. He further stated that a problem with 65 DNL is that it is comparing noise to an unrealistic source. Comparing aircraft noise to highway noise, which is real and tangible, would be more beneficial.

Mr. Phillips stated that another issue with the use of DNL is that it uses A-weighting, which accounts for the range of human hearing, and removes the impact of lower frequency noises which penetrate homes. Mr. Phillips noted low frequencies are harder to block with white noise machines. He noted that USDOT has done a study on aircraft noise, which he concluded that low frequency noise causes the feeling of oppression. He noted that highway noise is not an issue and can be soothing like white noise. Mr. Phillips agreed with Mr. Verchinski's earlier comment that concentrating aircraft in small time periods can cause DNL of 65 dB for short periods of time, and that working from home means he is constantly hearing this noise.

Ms. Reese requested Mr. Phillips' email as she would like to reach out to him, and that she appreciated his comments. Mr. Holley agreed and noted his desire for further involvement of Mr. Phillips on the Roundtable.

Mr. Roth stated that the NextGen program went through the same NEPA process as a highway project, and that it was important for the Roundtable to ensure they are being truthful about the situation. Ms. Reese asked whether NextGen was implemented via a Categorical Exclusion, and Mr. Roth noted that all of FAA's proposal (i.e NEPA documents) are publicly available. He noted the issue was that after FAA public meetings, the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) that FAA issued allowed FAA to implement something different than what was presented. Ms. Higgs noted that those outcomes are the same.

Mr. Chancellor noted that Mr. Phillips was correct about the perception and Mr. Roth was correct on the process. Mr. Reese noted that FAA didn't anticipate the unintended process and didn't view the people under the flight paths as stakeholders in the process. Ms. Reese said she appreciated the comments about the use of the A-weighted metric.

8. ADJOURN

Ms. Reese reminded the group that the next meeting is scheduled for February 9th at 6:30 p.m. Ms. Higgs moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Chancellor seconded. The meeting adjourned at 8:58 pm.