

DC METROPLEX BWI COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE WORKING GROUP PUBLIC MEETING

Thirtieth meeting of the DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Working Group

Tuesday, March 9th, 2021, 6:30 – 9:10 PM

Meeting held virtually via GoToWebinar

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	
Debra Jung, Vice Chair*	Howard County Council, District 4	✓	Austin Holley*	District 33	✓
Sarah Lacey*	Anne Arundel County Council, District 1		Nancy Higgs*	District 33	✓
Ellen Moss	Alternate for Sarah Lacey, District 1		Brent Girard	Office of Senator Chris Van Hollen	
Debra 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	✓
Evan Reese*	District 30	✓	Darline Terrell-Tyson, Acting Director, Office of Environmental Compliance and Sustainability	MDOT MAA	✓
Al Donaldson*	District 32	✓	Greg Voos	Mid Atlantic Regional Representative, NBAA	✓
Richard Campbell	Alternate for Al Donaldson, District 32		Kyle Evans	General Aviation Representative, CP Management LLC	✓
Daniel Woomeer*	District 32	✓	David Richardson	Southwest Airlines	
Dan Klosterman*	District 32	✓	Reginald Davis	FAA 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)

Bruce Rineer, Manager Noise Section
Karen Harrell, Noise Section
Kevin Clarke, Director of Planning

Contractor Support

Royce Bassarab, HNTB
Sarah Yenson, HMMH
Rhea Hanrahan, HMMH
Malcolm Mossman, Assedo
Tim Cooke, Assedo
Alverna Durham, Jr., Straughan Environmental

Special Guest

Adam Scholten, (Former HMMH Project Manager)

MEETING MATERIALS

Participants received the following materials in advance:

- Meeting Agenda for March 9, 2021
- February Meeting Minutes (DRAFT_V3_20210209_Roundtable_Minutes)

Presentations at the meeting:

- Draft FAA Noise Survey Response Document
- Recommended Comments on the FAA's Neighborhood Environmental Survey (created by Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance)
- Aviation Noise and Emissions Symposium 2021 – Summary of Sessions (Part 1)

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Introduction and Roll Call of Attendees

Meeting started at 6:33pm.

Mr. Bruce Rineer began the meeting at 6:33pm by welcoming everyone in attendance. Mr. Rineer then went over the Virtual Meeting Plan and Procedures slide. He let everyone know that the meeting would be recorded and that it would operate as closely to an in-person meeting as possible. He asked Roundtable Members to self-mute unless speaking and asked attendees to use the question/chat box or the "raised hand" feature to ask questions and/or put any questions in the chat box. Participants should notify organizers if experiencing technical issues by using the question box and/or logging off and logging back in. Finally, Mr. Rineer recommended having only one web browser open during the meeting.

Ms. Mary Reese, the Roundtable Chair, introduced herself and the district she represents. She apologized that she would not be able to be on camera during the meeting due to having to use an older tablet with no camera. Ms. Reese started roll call and asked everyone to introduce themselves and state which district they represent or if they were working on behalf of MAA. During roll call, Ms. Nancy Higgs asked consultants to identify the firms for which they work.

Review and Approve Meeting Agenda

Ms. Reese moved on to the review and approval of the meeting agenda. She stated that she would like to add an item to the agenda after the review of the Draft Minutes, an award presentation to Mr. Adam Scholten. She asked Mr. Rineer to add a bullet for the award presentation to the final published agenda. Mr. Reese made a motion to approve the agenda as amended by the chair. Mr. Dan Woomer seconded the motion. None opposed. The meeting agenda was approved.

Draft Minutes February 9th for Approval

Ms. Reese stated she had not received any feedback from Roundtable members on the Draft Minutes for the February 9th meeting. Ms. Higgs stated that she received a comment from Mr. George Lowe. Mr. Jesse Chancellor stated that Ms. Sarah Lacey should be listed as a voting member on the first page of the meeting notes. (Voting members are identified by a * next to their name.). Mr. Woomer made a motion to accept the February Meeting Minutes, as amended. Ms. Higgs seconded the motion. None opposed. The February 9th Meeting Minutes were approved.

Award Presentation to Mr. Adam Scholten

Ms. Reese introduced Mr. Scholten and announced that the Maryland General Assembly, Anne Arundel County Delegation, sent a citation to Mr. Scholten for his work with the Roundtable as a consultant to MAA as an employee of HMMH. Mr. Scholten stated that he had worked with the Roundtable for 4 - 4 ½ years. Ms. Reese requested special recognition of Mr. Scholten for his work with the Roundtable from Senator Beidle of Anne Arundel County. Ms. Reese read the citation aloud for those in attendance. After reading the citation, she thanked Mr. Scholten.

Mr. Scholten thanked Ms. Reese and said he was truly honored to receive the citation. He stated that he really enjoyed working with the Roundtable and was happy with the progress that the Roundtable and MAA were able to make in working with FAA. He stated that the progress made was a testament to the process that included bringing the Roundtable, MAA, and industry to the table to collaborate. Together, the group was able to get FAA to accept the proposed procedural changes for review. He hopes that the Roundtable will continue to be successful in the future and said that although he was no longer with HMMH, that the Roundtable was in good hands with Ms. Sarah Yenson, Ms. Rhea Hanrahan, and the HMMH team. He thanked everyone else again and was given a round of applause by the Roundtable. Ms. Reese thanked Mr. Scholten and stated that she hoped that they could work together again in the future to which Mr. Scholten agreed. Mr. Scholten stated that he keeps up with the Roundtable and checks the Meeting Minutes.

Mr. Evan Reese, on behalf of the Technical Committee, thanked Mr. Scholten for his professionalism and his expertise, and also stated that he hoped they could work together in the future. Mr. Scholten expressed his hope to work with Mr. Reese and the members of the Technical Committee in the future.

2. FAA NOISE SURVEY DISCUSSION

Ms. Reese moved on to the FAA Neighborhood Environmental Survey on Aircraft Noise (Noise Survey) Response. Mr. Jesse Chancellor announced that he had invited Ms. Anne Hollander from the Montgomery County Quiet Skies Coalition to discuss a draft response to the FAA Noise Survey, including their talking points. Ms. Hollander introduced herself and stated that she is also a member of the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance. She described the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance as a small group of people from different communities across the country that works on legislative issues and assists communities in developing responses to the Noise Survey and stated that this group has developed a draft response to the Noise Survey. Ms. Hollander introduced Ms. Darlene Yaplee, who was one of the authors of the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance's Survey Response to the FAA Noise Survey and a presenter at the Noise Symposium. Ms. Reese stated that she attended Ms. Yaplee's presentation and found it informative and very helpful. Ms. Reese announced that Mr. Paul Verchinski provided input that forms the framework of the Roundtable's Draft Response to the Noise Survey. Ms. Reese went on to say that she would take additional feedback from the Roundtable and incorporate it into the Draft Response and email it to Roundtable members for approval before submitting it to FAA.

Mr. Reese stated that he compiled the Draft Response and sent it to members of the Roundtable and thanked Mr. Verchinski on his work putting the bulk of it together. He announced that he received a few comments about the Draft Response, and he was in favor of incorporating portions of the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance's responses into the Roundtable's Draft Response. He reminded everyone that comments on the survey were due to FAA on March 15th and suggested having them submitted by March 14th.

Mr. Verchinski thanked Mr. Reese for the acknowledgement of the Draft Responses that he authored and noted that he read and responded to a comment from Mr. Roth (in Section A, Subsection c.). Mr. Verchinski noted that FAA uses Day-Night average sound level (DNL) as its one and only metric for noise measurement which he feels is outdated, but that he was open to changing the verbiage in the document. Mr. Roth stated that his comment was to correct a statement that is factually untrue and warned against statements about other agencies. Mr. Reese agreed with Mr. Roth about not talking about other agencies in the response. Mr. Verchinski stated that other agencies do not mandate the use of DNL and that they consider the use of other noise metrics. Mr. Roth countered that HUD mandates the use of DNL to construct public housing. He proposed removing the seventh and eighth sentences of Section A, Subsection c. There were no objections to the suggested change, and Mr. Reese stated that he would make the change in the next draft.

Ms. Higgs asked if there was additional content that needs to be added in place of the two removed sentences. Mr. Roth replied that he assumed that there would be discussion on incorporating portions

of the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance responses, which may provide the additional content. Mr. Reese proposed that the editing of the Draft Response be done in additions (additional text) and subtractions (removal of text), and that the subtraction portion of the editing was now complete. Mr. Chancellor thanked Mr. Reese and Mr. Verchinski for their efforts on getting out the Draft Response to the Noise Survey and stated that some of the content did not align with what is included in the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance responses. In addition to the current discussion, he suggested convening a small group to consider additions and subtractions and to update the document before presenting it to the Roundtable via email as Ms. Reese had suggested. Mr. Reese stated that he agreed with Mr. Chancellor's suggestion. Ms. Reese also agreed, but stated she was uncomfortable drafting documents for the Roundtable when input is asked for, but none is received. She wants to make sure everyone is paying attention, providing input, speaking for their districts, and is on the same page. Mr. Woomer thanked everyone who worked on the Draft Response to the Noise Survey and reinforced Mr. Roth's point to not send anything out that could contain factual errors. Mr. Woomer shared that he is currently the President of the Maryland Coalition for Responsible Transit, which is fighting the proposed SCMAGLEV transit system. The Maryland Coalition for Responsible Transit is producing multiple documents which they have reviewed by experts to make sure there are no factual errors. He concluded that the work that went into producing the Draft Response to the Noise Survey was outstanding and thanked those that worked on it.

Mr. Verchinski suggested that the Roundtable review the responses developed by the Montgomery County Quiet Skies Coalition and by the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance and discuss what should be included into the Roundtable's Draft Response to the Noise Survey. He agreed with Ms. Reese that there should be input from the entire Roundtable in the responses.

Mr. Rineer posted the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance's Recommended Comments on the FAA's Neighborhood Environmental Survey on Aircraft Noise to the group. Ms. Reese asked Ms. Hollander if she could give highlights of the document. Ms. Hollander stated that her group thought the most important thing to highlight was that the Noise Survey is an excellent, rigorous, scientific study, and the evidence that came out of it should be incorporated into FAA's aircraft noise policies as soon as possible. The Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance does not want FAA to come out with a statement that more research is needed before they can modify their policies, particularly regarding what is defined as a significant impact. FAA currently considers 65 DNL to be the threshold for a significant noise impact. She stated that the Noise Survey establishes that 65 DNL is an inappropriate threshold for significant impact and is probably off by an order of magnitude. She highly recommends that if the Roundtable wants to suggest more research, it should be couched with clear language that states that additional research should not delay policy changes that should be made based on the Noise Survey. Ms. Hollander also warned against refuting the FAA Noise Survey or including language that states it was done before NextGen and PBN implementation across the country. She stated that the Noise Survey still shows that FAA needs to change their noise policies and threshold for significant impact and shows that the Noise Survey underestimates noise impact. She does not want FAA to get a lot of comments asking for more research because they can hide behind that and delay changes that need to be made now. Ms.

Yaplee added that she attended the San Francisco Roundtable where a staff member for Representative Jackie Spears stated that “we don’t need research, we need action.”

Mr. Reese appreciated Ms. Hollander’s comments. He agreed that the study shows higher annoyance and higher impact of noise pollution and noted that additional research would show even greater effects. He is concerned that if FAA acts on the Noise Survey data, which they have not committed to, and they make changes, that if the changes are incorrect or inadequate, it may be 10-20 years before FAA studies this again. Mr. Roth stated that he finds it insightful that the study is of more value if it does not incorporate NextGen because noise impacts due to NextGen are worse for so many more people than the previous situation. If FAA performs additional studies, any changes would be delayed, and it would allow FAA to show improvement against a higher baseline of annoyance. Mr. Roth agreed that the Roundtable should avoid discounting the survey because it does not include NextGen. Mr. Reese stated that the Roundtable could adjust comments to not discredit FAA’s Noise Survey but still prod FAA to action. Ms. Hollander highlighted Recommendation 7, which mentions the use of additional metrics to determine significant impact, noting that the “N-Above” metric, which counts the number of aviation noise events over a certain decibel level at a specific location, is something FAA could use to address the impacts of NextGen. She continued that, although the Noise Survey did not address N-Above directly, it could be incorporated into a response. Mr. Roth agreed and thought it would fit nicely in Section A, Subsection c. Mr. Reese agreed to adding Comment 7 into the section suggested by Mr. Roth.

Ms. Higgs also agreed and asked for some clarification on how the noise events are counted using N-Above. Ms. Hollander replied that her understanding is N-Above counts the total number of aircraft events over a certain decibel level. The DNL metric averages the decibel level over 24 hours. Ms. Higgs asked if the N-Above data was from models or from the planes themselves. Ms. Yaplee stated it could be modeled using computer software or measured by noise monitors, which is what is being done where she lives in Palo Alto, CA. Ms. Higgs stated that she did not think MAA had noise monitors outside of the 65 DNL noise zone. Mr. Reese said there are some permanent monitors between the 60 DNL and 65 DNL noise zones. Mr. Shank stated that Mr. Reese was correct and MAA is open to placing more monitors and is awaiting any new FAA policies. Ms. Higgs let Mr. Shank know that she is a big proponent of having monitors placed in District 33. Mr. Reese stated that when and if the Roundtable’s suggested changes to the PBN were implemented, the Roundtable and MAA need to collaboratively work to appropriately site more fixed noise monitors if the legislature purchases them. He stated that there is a chance that an existing program can be expanded to include additional noise monitors. Mr. Woomeer and Ms. Higgs both volunteered to have a monitor placed on their properties and offered provide electricity to the monitors.

Mr. Chancellor shared that he previously asked Ms. Hollander and Ms. Yaplee to review the Roundtable’s Draft Response to the Noise Survey. They replied that the comments need to clearly state the Roundtable’s requests and to carefully state and clarify the need for additional research. Mr. Chancellor believes the key take-aways from melding the two documents are to not disparage the Noise Survey, to not give FAA an excuse to delay action in favor of more research, to specify that more research should be done after the immediate changes are made, and to enact policy changes independently from the research agenda. Mr. Reese agreed with Mr. Chancellor and noted that

Comment 10 in the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance's response is a research request, and the Roundtable could couch their research request in a similar fashion. Ms. Hollander clarified that the National Academies' request listed in Comment 10 is not for more research but for a consensus report. The National Academies organization produces consensus reports by convening experts to review existing research and determine policy implications of the research. Mr. Reese stated that he imagined it would take at least eight months to two years to complete. Ms. Hollander agreed that it may take that long, but that FAA would not act on the results of such a report without the input of an independent advisor. The request for the consensus report is specifically for health effects of noise, pollution, and ultrafine particles. She included that Comment 9 discussed redefining significant impact for noise.

Mr. Reese noted that both the Roundtable and the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance's FAA Survey responses were missing the request that FAA ensures the inclusion of communities as stakeholders in the process. He stated that it would not take away from any of the other comments or recommendations, and the request would be added to the Roundtable's Draft Response to the Noise Survey. He asked that Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance also include it in their response. Ms. Hollander agreed that it is an important point and thanked him for the suggestion. Mr. Woomer stated that when elected officials hear the same specific and similar requests, they tend to take note and respond to them, noting that he had experienced this over a long career in the federal government, the last few years of which were spent on Capitol Hill. He encouraged blending the response documents and thought there could still be some BWI-specific comments within the Roundtable's response. He also suggested that the Final Response to the Noise Survey be sent to the Roundtable members' elected officials.

Mr. Reese thanked Mr. Verchinski again for his work on the Draft Response to the Noise Survey and proposed including the ten comments from the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance's Noise Survey recommendations and the one comment about including the community as stakeholders. Then, a small group would review the changes as Mr. Chancellor suggested. He stated that he appreciated Ms. Hollander's and Ms. Yaplee's feedback on the Roundtable's Draft Response to the Survey.

Mr. Woomer made a motion to integrate the ten comments from the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance and the additional comment to the community as stakeholders into the Roundtable's Draft Response to the Noise Survey and to continue to move forward with the draft. Ms. Higgs seconded the motion and added that an email version should be sent for review by the Roundtable. Ms. Reese and Mr. Reese agreed. Mr. Reese included that the email review would require a response from the Roundtable members. Ms. Reese asked that the motion be restated. Mr. Reese made a motion to move forward with the evolution of the Draft Response for submission to FAA by incorporating the ten comments from the Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance and the additional comment about including the community as stakeholders. The work on the draft will be undertaken by a small group, and the final document will be sent to the members of the Roundtable for acceptance, requiring positive or negative response from a quorum of the voting members. Mr. Woomer seconded the motion. No one opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Reese offered to host a zoom meeting for a small group to work on a draft. Ms. Jung asked how many would be needed for a quorum. Mr. Reese stated that he believed it was 13, but he would have to check. Ms. Reese stated that it seems as though there is no representation from the Anne Arundel County Council, and she has inquired but not heard back. Ms. Sarah Lacey had been the representative, but she has not attended the last couple meetings. Mr. Woomeer stated that he could reach out to Ms. Lacey. Ms. Reese stated that according to the Charter, two consecutive absences without explanation is considered a resignation. Ms. Higgs stated that she tried to contact the County Executive and has not heard back.

Ms. Higgs suggested that the agreed upon subtractions and additions be added to the Draft Response prior to the small group meeting. Mr. Reese stated he will have an updated draft with the changes made in time for the small group meeting. The small group will be made up of Mr. Reese, Ms. Reese, Mr. Chancellor, Mr. Verchinski, and Ms. Debbie MacDonald, and the meeting will be held on 7pm on Friday, March 12th.

Ms. Jung asked if there was a simple document that could be sent to constituents that explains the FAA's Noise Survey, the due date for responses, and how to respond. She is concerned that constituents would not be able to use the documents that both groups are submitting to FAA as a template for their responses. Mr. Reese replied that the Roundtable would not be able to produce that type of document. Ms. Hollander and Ms. Yaplee stated that they had a document like the one Ms. Jung described and they could share it with the Roundtable. Mr. Verchinski stated the Roundtable represents the population of the area and suggested stating the number of people affected by what is going on with BWI into the introduction of the Draft Response to the Noise Survey. Mr. Reese agreed and added the addition to the list of edits to incorporate. Mr. Woomeer added that there should be a source for the number of people represented by the Roundtable. Ms. Reese asked for a response by Sunday, March 14th to the updated Draft Response to the Noise Survey. Mr. Reese asked that Roundtable members check their spam folders if they do not receive the document on Saturday, March 13th.

3. ANE NOISE SYMPOSIUM DISCUSSION

Ms. Reese thanked Ms. Hollander and Ms. Yaplee for attending the Roundtable meeting and stated that she watched Ms. Yaplee's presentation at the Aviation Noise & Emissions (ANE) Noise Symposium, commenting that the presentation and the entire Noise Symposium was excellent. She thanked them both for the work they put into it. Ms. Jung agreed with Ms. Reese and said she was blown away by the amount of information, great suggestions, and the roadmap ahead, and added that she felt very energized after attending the Noise Symposium. She feels grateful that so many people are working on the issue of aircraft noise all over the country. She stated that sometimes it feels as if the Roundtable members are all alone, but attending the conference gave her a sense of camaraderie as there are many people dealing with the same issues and trying hard to work with FAA to make a difference in their communities. Ms. Higgs agreed with Ms. Jung and said that she attended most of the Noise Symposium and was overwhelmed with the energy, the knowledge, and the actions being taken to reduce aircraft noise going on around the world. She intends to attend the Noise Symposium next year.

Ms. Higgs began her presentation on the ANE Noise Symposium, stating it was Part 1 since so much information was provided at the conference. She noted that the presentation touched on some key points and suggested the Roundtable might want to discuss what additional information from the Noise Symposium members wanted to hear about. She also offered to send the list of conference presentations and share them with Roundtable members as attendees had access to them until July. Ms. Higgs discussed the following:

Aircraft Noise and Overflight Dispersion: Opportunities and Challenges

Case Study 1 – Equivalent Lateral Spacing (ELSO) at San Diego International Airport (SAN)

She pointed out that this case study showed the importance of consensus as a Roundtable. This case highlighted a proposal to reduce the number of housing units exposed to 65 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), which is a metric equivalent to DNL that is used in California. The proposal did not pass because it did not receive the required unanimous consent. Mr. Woomer asked why they did not have a unanimous vote. Ms. Higgs stated that it was her understanding that those who would be newly impacted voted against the proposal even though it would have dispersed the current flight paths. She said it was similar to conversations that the Roundtable has had before, where aircraft noise cannot be relocated to areas where it did not previously exist, but she has not seen any regulations or policies to that effect. Mr. Roth explained that the Roundtable initially took the position to revert the flight paths to pre-NextGen locations and have maintained that position. Ms. Higgs said she understands the position of reversion, but in retrospect, it has not worked because FAA will not do it. Mr. Roth stated that in a different sense it has worked; the Roundtable has not pitted one community against another and even if reversion to prior flight paths is not accomplished, we have kept our focus and unity.

Case Study 2 – Terminal Arrival Area (TAA) at Washington National Airport (DCA)

FAA is implementing the TAA concept to bypass the FERGI waypoint to introduce track variability for arrivals into DCA. The proposal is currently being finalized for submission to FAA through the Community Work Group (Roundtable) in Arlington County, VA and Montgomery County, MD. Ms. Higgs asked if Ms. Hollander had an update or anything to add. Ms. Hollander said she did and introduced Ms. Janelle Wright who was directly involved in the procedure. Mr. Woomer wondered if the security of the Nation's Capital was involved in the decision to introduce the track variability. Mr. Reese replied that it may have, but when everyone uses the same flight path, it is easier to identify aircraft that are acting erratically and not conforming to the expected flight paths.

Ms. Wright introduced herself and stated that she was a member of the Working Group at Reagan National (DCA). Ms. Wright stated that there is restricted airspace at the airport but that security issues were not a part of the TAA proposal. She stated that this procedure is the first segment of an approach to the airport, and it is unique in that it is for approaches as opposed to departures, as in the first case study at San Diego. She explained that the proposal is trying to create track variability so that the same communities are not burdened repeatedly on every approach. The lead air traffic controller at Potomac TRACON has been heavily involved, and FAA began a 180-day test of the proposal starting on March 1, 2021. The test will monitor if the air traffic controllers can safely space and sequence flights and will

gather information from the communities affected to determine the impacts of the procedure. She stated that following the test, there will be analysis to determine how much variability occurred. If everyone agrees it was a successful test, the Working Group hopes it will lead to a published procedure.

Ms. Hollander added that during this presentation at the ANE Symposium, the presenter was asked if this proposal could be used at other airports. He responded that this was possible at DCA because they primarily use only one runway for arrivals. Mr. Reese stated that it has been a year since he has flown this particular arrival but explained this proposal is for the arrival feeder route and not the final instrument approach to the airport. He added that the proposal submitted by the Roundtable Technical Committee to the FAA PBN Working Group included a similar procedure, which added multiple waypoints and a RNP approach requested by Southwest Airlines. He is encouraged by seeing this being tested by DCA and believes when coupled with newer technologies and NextGen starts to fulfil its potential, this could be replicated at BWI Thurgood Marshall Airport. This procedure is applicable to BWI since 70% of arrivals use the same runway (Runway 33L), which is similar to DCA. Mr. Woomer stated that many companies save money by flying into and out of BWI instead of DCA. Mr. Reese stated that it is the choice between flying Southwest Airlines (BWI) or American Airlines (DCA). Ms. Higgs thanked Mr. Reese for explaining that and making the correlation to BWI.

Case Study 3 – City of Charlotte Douglas International Airport (CLT)

The implementation of the Charlotte Metroplex allowed FAA to design dispersed departure procedures at CLT, but FAA has not been able to disperse arrival procedures. She noted she did not know why this was the case, and neither did Mr. Reese. Mr. Reginald Davis of the FAA stated that he is working on the project at CLT airport and shared that the CLT Community Roundtable has submitted a proposal that included six recommendations to the FAA PBN Working Group. He explained that they are at a similar stage in the process to the DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable, and the FAA PBN Working Group will start with reviewing the changes to the arrivals.

Case Study 4 – Central FL Metroplex

Ms. Higgs mentioned there was discussion about a Central Florida Community Group, but she was not aware of what airport it pertained to. Mr. Davis could not offer specific details but stated that a Metroplex project was underway in Central and South Florida. Mr. Davis provided a link to the project: <https://www.faa.gov/air-traffic/community-involvement/florida/>. Ms. Higgs stated that she would do some research and explained that her property in Florida is near the Regional Southwest Airport, at which aircraft noise has progressively gotten worse due to cargo planes. Mr. Davis stated that there are multiple Roundtable working groups in Florida.

Aircraft Noise Emissions Legislation Introduced or Potentially Reintroduced in the 117th Congress

Ms. Higgs presented bills that did not pass in the 116th Congress that have been or may be reintroduced in the 117th Congress.

- Safe and Quiet Skies Act (H.R. 389)

- Air Traffic Noise and Pollution Expert Consensus Act (H.R. 712)
- Aviation Impacted Communities Act

Ms. Jung asked Ms. Higgs what the presenters recommended that people do to get these bills passed. Ms. Higgs asked Ms. Yaplee, who was the presenter for this subject, if she could give an overview of the presentation. Ms. Yaplee stated that she reached out to citizens nationwide to discuss aircraft noise and determined that the overarching problem is that the systems used by the FAA to assess, report, and address noise and health impacts do not reflect the 21st century. Legislative changes are long overdue, and residents want relief. Ms. Yaplee shared her six simple phrases that summarize the problem:

1. FAA's Narrow Mission Provides Limited Protection for People on the Ground – FAA is focused on safety and efficiency and not on people.
2. The Significant Impact Definition is Inadequate
3. One Size Does Not Fit All – Criteria used to assess noise at locations near the airport and away from the airport (noise measurements, noise thresholds, ambient noise) differ, and NextGen has created noise problems farther from the airport. Soundproofing and mitigations are usually completed closer to the airport.
4. Environmental Review Process Is Flawed – AEDT, as an example, only uses a 24-hour average and does not incorporate the noise people actually experience, which depends on the airplane's configuration.
5. Strategies to Reduce Noise are Underused
6. Aviation Emissions Need Attention

Ms. Yaplee gave an example that pertained to One Size Does Not Fit All, and explained that the policies, regulations, and significant impacts are based on the people located close to the airport, and NextGen has created a completely different problem. She shared that her home in Palo Alto is 16 miles from the airport in San Francisco. She had a noise monitor, provided by the airport, placed on her property that recorded 244 events, at 52dB CNEL. She explained that to achieve the FAA definition of significant impact, there would need to be 5,000 airplanes per day over her home, or a plane every 17.7 seconds for 24 hours. This shows that it is virtually impossible for a property away from an airport to reach the FAA-defined significant impact of 65 dB DNL. She continued that her presentation included additional examples from around the country, quotes on each of the six problem area phrases, and mitigation efforts that could be implemented but are not currently being done. Ms. Higgs thanked Ms. Yaplee for her overview. Ms. Yaplee provided a link to her presentation in the chat box (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gF9M570mpe6M2CHrco25NoO4FMNa2LKB/view?ts=6046cf7c>).

Ms. Higgs briefly touched on additional ANE Symposium presentation topics including Climate Change and Aviation. The role of Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF) was discussed, with Mr. Woomeer explaining current research and development on the use of algae to develop bio-jet fuel and cooking oils. Ms. Higgs ended her presentation highlighting additional topics from the ANE Symposium for potential subject matter at future Roundtable meetings including:

- Aviation Emissions: Reduction Efforts and Current Research
- Civil Society Expectations for a Green Recovery
- *A Guide to U.S. Aircraft Noise Regulatory Policy* by Sanford Fidell and Vincent Mestre

Ms. Higgs highly recommends *A Guide to U.S. Aircraft Noise Regulatory Policy* by Sanford Fidell and Vincent Mestre and suggested starting a book club to discuss. Ms. Reese thanked Ms. Higgs for her presentation.

4. DISCUSSION

Chair comments

Ms. Reese shared that she and Ms. Jung gave testimony virtually to the Subcommittees on Transportation for the Maryland General Assembly. Ms. Jung thought that it went well, and stated that both Subcommittee Chairs, Delegate Marc Korman and Senator Cory McCray, reached out to her to express interest in the three things she asked of them during her testimony which included:

- Continuing to fund the Roundtable, including providing resources so it can continue to meet and ensuring continuing support from MAA.
- Asking that MAA provide a report to the transportation committees of the State Senate and the House of Delegates so delegates and senators can ask MAA about the progress being made on the Roundtable's behalf.
- Carefully monitor the cargo expansion at BWI, as cargo planes are the worst aspect of the aircraft noise for many people in the communities represented by the Roundtable.

Ms. Jung let Ms. Hollander know that Delegate Korman was very complimentary of the work she was doing in Montgomery County. Ms. Jung believes the Roundtable has good friends at the State legislature. Ms. Reese thanked Ms. Jung for her summary.

Ms. Reese moved to discuss the upcoming April meeting and the election of new Roundtable leadership. She believes that the Roundtable should have new leadership and asked members of the Roundtable to seriously consider running for Chair or Vice Chair. She offered to talk with any member who had questions about the role and duties of the Chair and Vice Chair. Ms. Reese stated that she and Ms. Jung have a desire to stay involved in a Legislative Committee and explained that the time commitment required would make it difficult to continue as Chair and Vice Chair. She and Ms. Jung intend to run for Co-Chairs of the Legislative Committee. Ms. Reese suggested that meetings could be held every other month or quarterly based on what the new Chair decides. Ms. Higgs stated that having a Legislative Committee is a great idea based on the information she heard at the ANE Symposium.

Ms. Higgs asked for an update on how the PBN Process was going and how would it continue with the Technical Committee. Ms. Reese replied that the PBN Process would continue, and the Technical Committee is staying intact. She described tasks of the Chair to include setting the agenda, taking input on the agenda, scheduling the meetings, and working with MAA and FAA to schedule monthly calls. The

position requires organizational leadership and management skills. Ms. Reese believes the Roundtable contains talented people and offered to speak offline with anyone interested in the position. She suggested members interested in the position contact their fellow members and possibly run together.

Mr. Dan Woomer suggested Tuesday, April 13th, 2021 for the next meeting date. There was no objection to Tuesday, April 13th for the next meeting, with a start time of 6:30 pm. Ms. Higgs inquired about the PBN process and if there had been any response from FAA. Mr. Reese replied that the Roundtable was still waiting for FAA to reply and explained that once the PBN process begins, Mr. Shank and MAA would be representing the Roundtable during the PBN Working Group meetings and would be able to update the Roundtable on the progress. He stated that the Technical Committee is waiting for the PBN Working Group's feedback on their submitted proposed changes. Mr. Shank stated that he spoke with Mr. Bill Wise of the PBN Working Group two days prior to this meeting and revealed there had been quite a few organizational changes with FAA. Jennifer Solomon, the Regional Administrator for the Eastern Region, has been promoted, and her replacement has yet to be named; and Matt Cathcart, who was leading the PBN process, has also been promoted. Mr. Shank reminded Mr. Wise that there was to be a meeting in March and asked if the meeting was still on schedule. Mr. Wise replied FAA is meeting to set an internal meeting to get the PBN Baltimore schedule structured. He apologized that FAA did not have a firm date and stated he would let the Roundtable know when heard back from them.

Mr. Shank confirmed that MAA would continue to support the Technical Committee and reiterated Mr. Reese's prior point that FAA promised that if they considered making changes to the proposal submitted by the Technical Committee, they would inform MAA and the Technical Committee of the changes. This would allow MAA and the Technical Committee to review the acceptability of the changes and report their findings to the Roundtable. Mr. Reese thanked Mr. Shank, restating that the Technical Committee was in a holding pattern waiting for a reply from FAA, and that Roundtable Members would need to be available to meet very quickly if there was any feedback from FAA. He requested that Mr. Shank inform the Chair and himself of a response from FAA within one business day so that they could have time to convene a meeting to review any changes if necessary. Mr. Reese predicted that a meeting could occur in June, according to Mr. Shank's discussion with Mr. Wise. Mr. Shank stated that he would let Mr. Reese and the Chair know the day he hears back from FAA. Mr. Reese thanked Mr. Shank and said he appreciated the work the MAA staff puts into running the meetings. Mr. Shank replied that he was excited to have the Technical Committee work with Ms. Yenson from HMMH who is replacing Mr. Scholten.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Reese begin the Public Comment period and asked that Mr. Jimmy Pleasant be permitted to speak first. Due to some technical difficulty, Mr. Pleasant was unable to unmute right away.

Mr. Rineer read the comment of Ms. Tracy Tabor who first thanked the Roundtable members and second asked that the members of the Technical Committee hold FAA to their promises. Ms. Tabor posted an article in the BWI Quiet Facebook page that discussed the FAA's continued implementation of

NextGen at other airports. She asked, with all the pushback in the form of complaints, lawsuits, roundtables, and evidence from their own studies, why would FAA continue to implement NextGen. Ms. Tabor stated that it makes her think that FAA is not concerned with everyone on the ground, and they are just going to do what they have planned.

Ms. Jung asked Mr. Davis to respond to the comment. Mr. Shank asked if Mr. Davis was still on the call, and if not, offered to share the response he has gotten from the FAA on why it is still being implemented. Mr. Shank explained that FAA, under congressional mandate, continues to implement NextGen at airports, but they are now including the Community Roundtables as part of the process. In contrast, the community was not involved when NextGen was implemented at BWI and many other airports. Ms. Jung asked what happens at these new airports if the Roundtable thinks NextGen is a bad idea. Would FAA still move ahead with implementing it? Mr. Shank replied that based on his experience working with FAA, FAA receives public input through the environmental process while they implement NextGen and are being more sensitive in considering the impacts to the community than they were four years ago. Mr. Shank recalled Ms. Solomon saying its “kinda hard to put the genie back in the bottle” during testimony in 2019, and he thinks everyone has learned from the past mistakes. He believes that FAA is making a more concerted effort than what was done at other airports and they are trying to be better here in Baltimore.

Mr. Shank continued that the process is taking a very long time at BWI, as it has been over a year since the Roundtable submitted its proposal of procedure changes. He stated that he has reminded FAA of how long it is taking but understands that COVID has had a big effect on the agency. Mr. Woomer commented that FAA is moving forward with NextGen implementation and waiting for the ripples to hit, but he believes the ripples happen far later than the implementation, and FAA responds with “what do you want us to do now?” He appreciates how Mr. Shank has worked with the Roundtable to try to make an improvement to the situation, but FAA, whose goal is to go forward with further implementation of NextGen, is not necessarily using the operating guidelines. He hopes that word gets out to other airports that there are challenges with NextGen, and they are aware of what is going on and can organize themselves more quickly to intercede before they find themselves in the situation like the citizens of Howard, Anne Arundel, Montgomery, and Prince George’s County, MD now find themselves in.

Ms. Higgs asked how FAA receives input from community roundtables if roundtables are not formed until after implementation of NextGen at an airport. Mr. Shank responded Roundtables are now being formed prior to implementation of NextGen. Mr. Reese stated that from a technical perspective, there is a need for NextGen. He explained that phasing out of ground-based VORTACs and ground-based radio navigation stations must happen. NextGen is a needed solution to the future of aviation in our county, but we, as the Roundtable, have focused on how FAA has horrendously bungled the implementation and use of the technology. He is encouraged to hear that FAA is proactively forming roundtables now, but he will not take their word for it that they have learned their lesson on how to appropriately implement NextGen. Mr. Reese circled back to Ms. Tabor’s comment and reiterated that NextGen is mandated by Congress and is technologically necessary for the advancement of our airspace. He again noted his skepticism as to whether the FAA will implement NextGen in a way that would avoid some of the problems that it has created for this Roundtable and surrounding community. Mr. Reese stated that

all the Roundtable could do is continue to publicize the problems and hopefully the FAA will learn eventually. Ms. Jung thanked Ms. Tabor for her question and appreciated how it gave the Roundtable an opportunity to discuss the ongoing implementation of NextGen.

Mr. Jimmy Pleasant from Ellicott City provided the next comment. He stated that he had sent a few members of the Roundtable an email requesting additional information from Mr. Rineer related to a noise study he had done in 2020. Mr. Pleasant requested a complete list of every aircraft departure from Runway 28 and what city they went to for the day of the noise study. Mr. Pleasant believes that the aircraft may have been rerouted away from his monitor. Mr. Rineer replied that he had provided Mr. Pleasant with the data from the month-long noise study. Mr. Pleasant responded that the information he was seeking was missing from the data, specifically list of destination cities. He stated that departures to TERPZ7 go over his home and would be able to tell if any flights were missing or rerouted on days where flights were heavy, but the monitor recorded low counts. Mr. Pleasant explained that he thought noise was lower the month of his noise study due to COVID-19, but he later found out there were still a high number of flights that month. He shared that his neighbors remarked that aircraft were being rerouted while his noise study was in progress and stated that in the 1980s, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) noted that aircraft had been rerouted during noise studies. Ms. Reese asked if the information request could be resolved after the meeting with Mr. Shank. Mr. Pleasant agreed.

He went on to say that departures are not flying over the two permanent noise monitors in Howard County, and they were not picking up the highest levels of aircraft noise in the county. He explained that the monitor on his property, as part of his noise study, had recorded noise 8-10 dB higher than the permanent monitors. Mr. Pleasant stated that he currently only gets departures over his home but wondered if arrivals would begin because it seems as though MAA is harassing him. Mr. Pleasant stated that before the COVID-19 pandemic he would get up to 243 departures a day fly over his home. He also noted that WebTrak does not accurately show aircraft flightpaths and other states have issued a disclaimer. Mr. Pleasant stated he experiences aircraft noise starting at 5am until 11pm. He believes that the FAA should have never implemented NextGen and before it, he lived in a quiet neighborhood. He asked how 243 planes a day over his home is not considered a significant health hazard. Mr. Pleasant stated that EPA proposed lowering the significance level to 45 DNL and after some compromise, was changed to 55 DNL, but the change was not implemented due to defunding of EPA during the Reagan administration in the 1980s. He said that an existing law should be enacted and funded that would allow EPA to regulate aircraft noise and take it out of FAA's hands.

Ms. Jung asked where Mr. Pleasant lived and noted that he was in District 1. Mr. Pleasant stated that FAA told him they were ordered to make flight changes and stated they did it without an environmental review. Ms. Jung agreed and replied it was the basis of the failed lawsuit against FAA. Mr. Pleasant did note that the judge criticized Congress's 60-day statute of limitations. He stated there are too many flights over people's homes and that operations are increasing, from one airline in particular. He noted that NextGen was implemented in Cleveland, but flight paths did not change, and five runways are used for departures. Ms. Jung asked Mr. Pleasant to reach out to her any time, as she represents all of Howard County, would continue to help move things along, and could be a listening ear. Mr. Pleasant closed by stating that once he began pushing back against FAA, planes began flying lower and slower

over his home. Ms. Reese thanked Mr. Pleasant for his comment and encouraged him to continue emailing her. She apologized that he was unable to get his comments in at last month's meeting and stated that his comments were always appreciated.

8. ADJOURN

Ms. Jung moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Woomer seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:10.