

DC METROPLEX BWI COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE WORKING GROUP PUBLIC MEETING

Thirty-ninth meeting of the DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Working Group

Tuesday, August 16, 2022, 7:00 P.M- 10:04 P.M
Meeting held in-person and virtually via GoToWebinar

MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR PARTICIPANTS

Roundtable Member	District/Organization	Attended	Roundtable Member	District/Organization	Attended
Debra MacDonald*	District 9	X	Marcus Parker, Sr	Alternate for Dan Klosterman, District 32	X
Austin Holley, Vice Chair*	District 33	X-virtual	Debra Jung*	Howard County Council, District 4	X
Ellen Moss*	District 2 Anne Arundel County Council		Brent Girard	Office of Senator Chris Van Hollen	X-virtual
Mary Reese*	District 30	X	Adam Spangler	Office of Congressman Anthony G. Brown	
Jesse Chancellor*	District 9	X	Sam Snead*	Office of Anne Arundel County Executive Stuart Pittman	
Howard Johnson*	District 12	X	Laila Jones	Office of Anne Arundel County Executive Stuart Pittman	
Drew Roth*	District 12	X	Bruce Gartner*	Office of Howard County Executive Calvin Ball	X
			Mandy Rimmell*	Office of Baltimore County Executive Johnny Olszewski	
Scott Phillips*	District 13	X	Paul Shank, Chief Engineer	MDOT MAA	X
Paul Verchinski	Alternate, District 13	x	Darline Terrell-Tyson, Director, Office of Environmental Compliance and Sustainability	MDOT MAA	X
Evan Reese*	District 30	X	Greg Voos	Mid Atlantic Regional Representative, NBAA	X
Al Donaldson*	District 32		Kyle Evans	General Aviation Representative, CP Management LLC	
David Nibeck	Alternate for Al Donaldson, District 32	X	David Richardson	Southwest Airlines	X-virtual
Daniel Woomeer*	District 32	X	Reginald Davis or Veda Simmons	FAA Community Engagement Officer, Eastern Service Center, Operations Support Group	X-Veda Simmons-virtual
Dan Klosterman*	District 32		Steve Alterman	President, Air Cargo Association	

*Voting members

ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS

Maryland Department of Transportation Maryland Aviation Administration (MDOT MAA)

Ricky Smith, Executive Director

Bruce Rineer, Manager, Noise Section

Kevin Clarke, Director of Planning and Environmental Services

Karen Harrell, Noise Section

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)

David S. Johnson, Eastern Performance Based Navigation (PBN) Co-lead

Matt Fisher, Potomac TRACON

Steven Jones, Regional Deputy Administrator

Southwest Airlines (SWA)

Trey Turner

Other

Senator Pam Beidle, District 32

Jim Allerdice, Vianair

Contractor Support

Royce Bassarab, HNTB

Jordan Mueller, Assedo Consulting

Anjelique Wilson, Assedo Consulting

Rhea Hanrahan, HMMH

Jason Stoddard, HMMH

Sarah Yenson, HMMH

MEETING MATERIALS

Participants received the following materials in advance:

- BWI_Roundtable_Agenda_08162022_DRAFTv1.docx

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Introduction and Roll Call of Attendees

Mr. Bruce Rineer began the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. He stated that all virtual attendees would be muted by default. He clarified that the panelists giving presentations were not considered attendees and therefore would be able to speak and give their presentations. Mr. Rineer explained that anyone in the audience who had a comment would be able to do so during the public comment portion of the meeting, while anyone online would need to submit their questions online via the comment box and they would read those at the end of the night. He clarified that online attendees would not be unmuted during the meeting.

Mr. Rineer concluded the introduction and turned the meeting over to the Roundtable Chair, Ms. Debra “Debbie” MacDonald. Ms. MacDonald greeted those in attendance and noted that there was a substantial agenda. Ms. MacDonald proceeded with roll call of voting and non-voting Roundtable Members, as well as alternates. A quorum was reached.

Approve Agenda

Ms. MacDonald moved on to the approval of the meeting agenda. Mr. Dan Woomer made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Evan Reese seconded. None opposed. The motion to approve the agenda passed.

Review and Approve June 21st Meeting Minutes

Ms. MacDonald proceeded to the review and approval of the June 21st Meeting Minutes. Mr. Woomer stated that he did not receive a copy of the June 21st, 2022, minutes. Ms. MacDonald asked if other Roundtable members did not receive the meeting minutes. No one indicated otherwise. Mr. Reese motioned to table the minutes. Mr. Jesse Chancellor seconded. None opposed. The motion passed to table the Meeting Minutes until Mr. Woomer has the chance for review.

2. ROUNDTABLE CHAIR COMMENTS

Ms. MacDonald reiterated that there was an extensive agenda, thus she did not want to take too much time with her comments. She took the opportunity to remind everyone about the purpose of the Roundtable. She followed up by reading aloud an email from a community member describing the ongoing emotional, financial, and mental hardships that community members face due to extreme noise pollution. Ms. MacDonald then indicated that she would give a debrief of the May 2022 Aviation Noise and Emissions Symposium in Davis, California, when there is more time on the agenda. Ms. MacDonald stated that the night's presentation would cover the long-awaited FAA procedure changes, an update on the regional noise monitoring and mapping system from Vianair, and updates from the Legislative Committee. Ms. MacDonald concluded by stating that she was hopeful the procedural changes would bring relief to constituents. Ms. MacDonald then turned the presentation over to the FAA.

3. NORTHEAST CORRIDOR AIR MODERNIZATION PROJECT BALTIMORE (BWI) FLIGHT PROCEDURE BRIEFING

Ms. Veda Simmons, the FAA Eastern Region Community Engagement Officer, introduced herself and the team that developed the procedures, stating that the development of the new proposed procedures was a team effort, including FAA, MDOT MAA, and industry. Ms. Simmons described the goals to disperse operations, keep aircraft higher longer, and relieve populated areas by relocation of tracks. Ms. Simmons then introduced Mr. David S. Johnson, the Eastern Performance Based Navigation (PBN) team co-lead and Mr. Matt Fisher, staff specialist at the Potomac Terminal Radar Approach Control facility (TRACON), who presented the *Federal Aviation Administration Proposed Procedures* presentation.

Mr. Johnson first presented overview slides to orient the audience on the presented material. He then presented an overview map of the *Proposed Departure Procedures of Runway 28 and Proposed Arrival Procedures of Runway 33L*. He then showed the *Close-In View of Proposed Departure Procedures of Runway 28*, showing all the proposed Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs), specifically stating that two procedures, the proposed FOXHL and TERPZ procedures, would be moved slightly south, by approximately three miles. Mr. Johnson then described the proposed DUKPN flight path, a new procedure for departures out to the east and northeast. Under the CONLE and FIXIT procedure, Mr. Johnson noted that STABL waypoint was moved 1.59 miles to meet criteria, while SCABZ has an altitude

restriction where aircraft must be at or below 7,000 ft to satisfy the “climb via” constraint, as well as to create a continuous climb and to meet FAA design criteria.

Mr. Johnson then showed the *Close in View Proposed Arrival Procedures Runway 33L and Runway 33R*, which showed four proposed Standard Terminal Arrival Routes (STARs) for aircraft arriving on Runway 33L or 33R (MIDDY, TRISH, ANTHM, RAVNN). Mr. Johnson highlighted some of the waypoints, as well as the Required Navigation Performance (RNP) procedures.

The *Proposed Departure Procedures Runway 15L and Runway 15R and Proposed Arrival Procedures Runway 10* overview slide was displayed, showing the common runway configurations at BWI used for landing on Runway 10 and departing on Runway 15L and 15R. Aircraft use this configuration when winds are from the south and southeast. The *Close-In View Proposed Departure Procedures Runway 15L and Runway 15R* showed all proposed SIDs for aircraft departing from Runway 15L and 15R. Mr. Johnson noted that the WARYN fix was located to support the existing noise abatement procedure. The *Proposed Arrival Procedures Runway 10* displayed all STARs for aircraft arriving on Runway 10. Mr. Johnson noted the relocated RNP procedures, which are used by aircraft when traffic allows.

The *Proposed Departure Procedures Runway 10* board displayed all proposed SIDs for aircraft departing from Runway 10 from a close view. Mr. Johnson highlighted the JWALL waypoint, citing its importance to voluntary noise abatement procedures, which allow aircraft to “climb via” and thereby reduce aircraft level-offs along departure paths. A similar map, *Proposed Departure Procedures Runway 33L and Runway 33R*, was displayed, showing all proposed SIDs for aircraft departing from Runway 33L and 33R with the “climb-via” instruction added to departure procedures to reduce level-offs. Mr. Johnson reiterated that the waypoint STABL was moved to meet procedure design criteria.

The *Proposed Arrival Procedures Runway 15L and Runway 15R* as well as *Proposed Arrival Procedures Runway 28* showing all proposed STARs for aircraft arriving on Runway 15L, Runway 15R, and Runway 28. All flight tracks depicted in the slides are from 2019.

Mr. Johnson displayed the *Proposed RAVNN Arrival Procedure* overview map, stating that Mr. Fisher would go into detail about these planned procedures. The board displayed STARs for three airports (Washington Reagan [DCA], Andrews Air Force Base, and BWI). Mr. Fisher stated that the proposal sent by the Roundtable required modifications to work in concert with Andrews and DCA procedures. Mr. Fisher then discussed the graphic on the *Proposed RAVNN Arrival Procedure- BWI Roundtable Proposal* slide. Mr. Fisher explained that he worked intimately on the routes shown in the proposed RAVNN arrivals and stated that the counterproposal was as close as it could be to what the Roundtable requested, describing why the airspace was difficult to design as the Roundtable requested. He discussed the *Proposed RAVNN Arrival Procedure- FAA Proposal* slide and discussed how the procedure interacts with the existing DEALE STAR by moving RAVNN south of the Roundtable proposal, ensuring procedure design criteria are met and minimum separation is guaranteed. Mr. Fisher then discussed the challenges associated with certain departure and arrival configurations, namely southbound departures from DCA and their need to be deconflicted from inbound BWI traffic.

Mr. Fisher and Mr. Johnson concluded their segment of the presentation. Ms. Simmons then presented the *FAA Environmental Process and Next Steps*. She stated that these procedures are currently in the

Operational, Environmental and Safety Review phase. She then briefly described the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, saying that the next steps would be to start the initial environmental review. She noted that a timetable to publication could not be given at that time because of several considerations that must be accounted for regarding the analysis and review of new flight procedures. She stated that once the environmental review starts, the FAA will share the planned timeline, commenting that initial environmental reviews can take anywhere between six to twelve months to complete.

Mr. Johnson then moved onto discussion and questions. Mr. Jesse Chancellor asked if the procedures presented to the Technical Committee in May were the same as the procedures presented here. Mr. Johnson assured Mr. Chancellor that the content presented tonight is the same as what was presented in May but in a different format, as a professional group redesigned the presentation for more clarity.

Ms. Debra Jung had several questions. She requested that a presenter simplify the explanation of what the procedural changes will be for someone who may not have the same experience or vocabulary used in the presentation. Ms. Jung restated her question by asking what someone on the ground would experience if these procedural changes were to go into effect. Mr. Fisher stated that in Howard County, the design attempted to reduce the impact to Columbia on the departures. He then stated that for Runways 15R and 28, those goals were reached by moving the tracks further south as well as separating those tracks by creating three different departures. He stated that it will not be as it was 10 years ago and that there would still be some traffic concentration on those tracks. He also stated that the “climb via” instruction would be huge benefit as it would reduce the leveling off of aircraft.

Ms. Jung asked for further clarification and simplification. After stating that planes are flying incredibly low over people’s houses, she asked what will happen after the procedural changes go into effect and whether people will experience a difference at their homes. Mr. Fisher stated that he could not definitively make such a statement, as that depends on the location of the impacted person. He indicated that, based on the data and industry standards, the proposed procedures have mitigated some of the traffic and noise volume over Columbia by pushing the flight paths south and splitting the flight paths. Mr. Fisher reiterated that it would not be appropriate to definitively state that individuals would absolutely notice a difference as it depends where they are located.

Ms. Jung asked if these procedural changes would stop the aircraft from flying so low. Ms. Mary Reese asked Mr. Fisher to explain the altitude procedural changes. Mr. Fisher stated that he was hesitant to respond with any absolutes, noting that he represents the FAA at the DCA Roundtable and has received these types of questions in the past. He stated that he did not want to oversell the benefit for any resident as they may not find relief with the change to a departure as they may be experiencing noise from an arrival. He gave the example that if a flight arrives to BWI via Runway 10, it will still arrive via Runway 10 after the procedural changes, but, with the RNP, will hopefully be flying a little higher, which will help mitigate some of the noise. He then stated that departures following implementation of these procedures should no longer level off at 4,000 ft. He noted that if you are currently within five miles of the airport and experience aircraft climbing out at 3,000 ft, that may still be the case in the future depending on the location of the person.

Mr. Scott Phillips inquired how high aircraft would be around Route 29. Mr. Fisher stated that he would expect to see some improvement as it pertains to the Runway 28 departure but was unsure how much altitude could be gained due to the flight path. He stated that the Runway 15R departure would see aircraft flying higher but reiterated that he could not definitively guarantee anything until the procedures are implemented and studied. Mr. Reese stated that the Technical Committee's goal was reversion to pre-NEXTGEN conditions and commented that the presented procedural changes were as close as possible to that request. Mr. Reese estimated that the changes met 95% of the Roundtable's goals with the remaining 5% in alignment with their overall goals and said that this is the best that could be done for this attempt at improvements. Mr. Reese continued to discuss the feasibility of the climb rates and the effects of climbing on noise and noise complaints. He reiterated that the FAA's proposal achieved what the Roundtable was trying to do, which was to put aircraft higher for longer on departures. Mr. Phillips asked about speeds and their effects on noise, noting that he has seen speeds well above 250 knots, and Mr. Reese discussed the use of power settings and speeds and remarked that speeds greater than 250 knots would be a flight violation. He stated that he believes this is the best solution since flights cannot climb straight up like helicopters.

Mr. Phillips also questioned whether one of the tracks was truly moved three miles south, saying its graphic representation appeared to be only one mile south. Mr. Reese noted that splitting the departures was a novel approach and would likely help with dispersion of tracks. He also noted that he wished that air traffic controllers would be allowed to vector traffic and stated that in the absence of vectoring, these procedures are the best the FAA can do. Mr. Reese thanked the FAA for the opportunity to work with them on these procedures. He concluded by stating that this is not a fix for NextGen and only addresses the biggest issues at the time, saying that this process will have to be done again in the future as further studies will show what works and what does not work.

Mr. Roth agreed with Mr. Phillips that the tracks looked like they were about one mile north of the first purple track, but that he does not think the exact difference is significant since the intent is to provide dispersion, which the proposal does. Mr. Phillips clarified, saying that he thought that three miles was a misstatement in the presentation.

Mr. Roth anecdotally stated that he has witnessed low-flying arrivals off Runway 10 and asked for clarification on how changes on arrivals on Runway 10 will impact Columbia. Mr. Fisher stated that certain areas of Columbia will not experience much substantial change from today, stating that the changes address the STARs and the feeds to the RNP. If vectors are required for the downwinds, he would not expect much change from the current situation. He further elaborated on the need for a stabilized approach and the altitudes required for that. Mr. Fisher noted that RNP procedures offer some relief and distribution when traffic volume and conditions allow RNP to be utilized. He stated that some changes to procedures will take time to learn and understand as a system, and some may see some improved conditions the more those paths are taken. Mr. Reese noted that the use of RNP provides benefits to fuel use to the airlines and that the MAA could talk to Southwest and other airlines about the use of RNP over visual approaches. He emphasized that the benefits cannot be quantified until the procedures are implemented, and Mr. Fisher agreed, saying that he could not conclusively quantify the benefits since they would depend on traffic and the controllers, but that FAA has removed as many barriers to its use as possible.

Mr. Roth asked about the proposed RAVNN arrival procedures, wondering if the waypoint SEED (the new RAVNN) was the same as the Roundtable's proposed new location for RAVNN. Mr. Fisher was hesitant at giving a definitive "yes" without looking at the original proposal. Mr. Reese stated that it was within a quarter mile of the Roundtable's proposal and that its altitude is between 5,000 and 6,000 feet. Mr. Roth commented that any changes were before an aircraft got to SEED and that conditions would be the same past SEED. Mr. Reese replied that, past SEED, the proposal is the same as the Roundtable's request, but this was his understanding for runway 28 arrivals. Mr. Fisher stated that changes specific to SEED were specific for arrivals to Runway 33L and was done to satisfy the Roundtable's design goals as well as the FAA's design criteria. Mr. Johnson added that the location of SEED was modified slightly to meet necessary criteria.

Mr. Rineer noted that several online comments had been received regarding the FAA presentation and asked if Ms. MacDonald wanted to entertain them at this point or save them until the comment period. Mr. Rineer read a comment from Mr. Paul Verchinski, who asked what the climb rate was per nautical mile. Mr. Fisher stated that he wanted to defer to industry partners to answer that question, saying that climb rates for obstacle clearance are required during departures, but each operator has its own procedures. He also stated that any departures out of Baltimore have crossing restrictions, specifically at or above 11,000 feet, that must be adhered to due to other traffic. He also noted that altitudes may vary due to time of year and possibly destination, saying that as long as altitude restrictions are met, the FAA does not dictate this.

Ms. Reese thanked the design team for their diligence and attention toward the requests the Roundtable made. She noted that she has enjoyed working with the FAA technical experts during this process. The FAA agreed, saying they have enjoyed working with the Roundtable and the MAA.

Mr. Chancellor read a question from one of his constituents in his district, asking Ms. Simmons if the NEPA process studies the impacts of projects on human (mental or physical) health for infrastructure programs. He went on to say there have been some misunderstandings about what the NEPA process covers. Ms. Simmons stated that she was not aware of the types of studies but requested that the question be forwarded to her so that she can get a subject matter expert to assist in answering the question.

Mr. Roth asked if the focus was on the capital improvements or the aircraft operations. Mr. Chancellor clarified the focus was on infrastructure including procedures, as procedures create infrastructure, but he was speaking broadly regarding any airport infrastructure projects. Mr. Paul Shank stated that the group that presented today was focused on the operable airspace. Again, Mr. Chancellor asked whether NEPA studies the impacts of infrastructure on human health. Mr. Shank stated that the FAA's Washington Airport District Office handles infrastructure projects as that is where the capital improvements NEPA expert is located. Mr. Chancellor stated that the NEPA process is a long process, and many people want to know if the NEPA study will address the impacts on human health and well-being. Mr. Johnson interjected, stating that there are two different NEPA processes, one for the changes done to the airport pertaining to the built environment, for which the Washington Airport District Office has a separate person, and a process that covers air operations and how it will affect communities, which is what this particular NEPA study will cover. Mr. Chancellor reiterated the general question and

concern stating that it is unclear what the NEPA report will and will not cover as it pertains to human health concerns and said that this question has not been answered. Mr. Woomer then added that NEPA covers health impacts, not just environmental impacts, saying that NEPA investigates the economic, environmental, and community impacts of a project. Mr. Chancellor thanked Mr. Woomer and stated that he would send the question out to the FAA and MAA for a definitive answer to his question.

Mr. Rineer then read a request from Mr. Austin Holley, who attended the meeting online. Mr. Holley asked if someone could provide a description of the waypoint and flight paths within five to seven miles of the airport or the 33L arrivals over Anne Arundel County, and whether they differ from the BWI Roundtable's 2019 proposed changes. Mr. Johnson stated that he could not comment on the 2019 changes at that time as he was not sure what the 2019 changes were and would need to go back to verify. Mr. Fisher asked for clarification of Mr. Holley's question, asking if Mr. Holley was asking for the difference between the proposal and the presentation shown that evening. Mr. Holley confirmed. Mr. Fisher requested that topic be tabled so a graphics package could be assembled to not misstate any information, especially given how critical the information is. Ms. Reese stated that if the information has not changed from what was briefed to the Technical Committee, asking for a new overlay could take months and further delay the process. Ms. Reese asserted that she was absolutely opposed to the request.

Mr. Roth then asked Mr. Holley if the FAA's statement that the proposed changes are all upstream from the SEED waypoint is sufficient to address his concerns. Mr. Reese stated that he believes the proposed changes meet the goals of keeping aircraft as high as possible for as long as possible and that this is the only way to achieve any sort of dispersion. Ms. Reese requested a vote for the provision of any additional overlays. Mr. Reese said he is sensitive to Mr. Holley's request and agrees with the need for it, but it would be erroneous to say that the Roundtable asked for flight track overlays within the requested area.

Mr. Holley stated that he takes the FAA at their word that they have not changed the original proposal from 2019, saying he was not trying to have any new analysis within five to seven miles of the airport, but simply wanted to confirm the changes as he has not seen a detailed comparison of the Roundtable's original proposal versus what was presented today. Mr. Johnson stated that Mr. Holley would get that information once it is verified, but what was shown to the Technical Committee in May is the same information that was presented tonight. Mr. Holley stated that what was shown was not very detailed and that he just wants to make sure that it matches, as the original proposal was very detailed. Mr. Fisher reiterated that the information would be sent over and they would be able to get some less refined graphics sent over relatively quickly. Mr. Holley stated that he had no intention of delaying the process and only wants to make sure that the changes that he has been advocating for are congruent with the FAA's proposed changes. Mr. Fisher stated that they have not made any adjustments to the procedural changes since before May, so they need to go back and look at the original proposal to see what, if anything, has changed.

Mr. Roth asked Mr. Shank if he thought the presentation was the same as the Roundtable's proposal. Mr. Shank stated that the FAA took the presentation given to the Technical Committee in May and used a graphical consultant to improve graphic quality and legibility. He said that the presentation outlined

the same procedures as what was presented to the Technical Committee. Mr. Roth restated the question for clarity, asking Mr. Shank if the procedures that were presented to the Technical Committee in May are the same as the procedures in the 2019 proposal, except for the new RAVNN waypoint. Mr. Shank stated his recollection was that there were a few requests that could not be accommodated due to FAA airspace constraints and procedures, but that was communicated to the Technical Committee and received positive responses in May. He noted that the only change since the presentation to the Technical Committee is the graphic representation. Mr. Reese requested that the FAA provide detailed charts comparing the Roundtable's proposals versus what was presented. Mr. Holley seconded Mr. Reese's request. Mr. Johnson stated that was doable.

Ms. MacDonald moved on to other questions. Mr. Bruce Gartner asked Mr. Chancellor to clarify an earlier statement, saying that Mr. Chancellor said the NEPA process would take about 18 months, but he had heard six to 12 months. Mr. Chancellor clarified by stating that he is no expert in the NEPA process but has heard that these processes can take as much as two years, and while six months would be perfect, he knew that Ms. Simmons could not commit to that timetable. Mr. Gartner asked Mr. Johnson and Ms. Simmons what the publication and implementation process was the process for the procedures. Mr. Johnson stated that once there was a better understanding of the environmental review, how long it will take, and what the steps they need to complete the review, they will have a better idea of what publication date would be expected.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON FAA PRESENTATION

Ms. MacDonald then opened the room to questions specifically about the FAA's presentation, noting that the comments need to be quick and there will be a period for more public comments.

Mr. Michael Bahr, who is directly affected by traffic from Runway 15R, asked what was going to be done about the traffic that flies over Hanover. Mr. Fisher asked for clarification to Mr. Bahr's question, asking if Mr. Bahr lived south of Runway 15R. Mr. Bahr stated that he lived southwest of it. Mr. Fisher stated that the goal of the WARYN intersection was so planes could not initiate their turn until they pass that intersection, stating that one should see traffic push further south-southwest towards pre-Metroplex paths. Mr. Chancellor stated these new procedures should help Mr. Bahr find some relief.

Ms. MacDonald then asked if the FAA's presentation would be provided to accompany the audio recording. Mr. Johnson stated it would be and that Ms. Simmons would send it out.

Mr. Jimmy Pleasant asked why the planes are speeding at such high rates and coming in very low. Mr. Chancellor commented that perhaps this is a question for the MAA or the airlines and not the FAA. He also noted that he is not clear what profiles the airport is using.

Ms. Traci Taber then asked if the flight paths were going to be pushed over toward business districts rather than the houses, saying that it seems to start with departures in the morning and switches to arrivals in the evening. Mr. Roth stated that one of the goals is to return operations to pre-NextGen locations. Mr. Chancellor stated that he did not want to oversell the procedural changes, but that depending on where one resides, positive impacts to their daily lives could be experienced.

Audience member Ms. Laura Donovan introduced herself and stated she lives in Woodlawn Heights, northeast of BWI. Ms. Donovan was told several years ago that she would not experience any more flights over her house. However, helicopter paths and airplane paths soon developed over her home. Ms. Donovan stated she lives within five miles of the airport and referenced an earlier comment during the Roundtable meeting where it was mentioned that any homes within five miles of the airport are out of luck when it comes to the noise levels. Ms. Donovan said she does not know who to talk to about this issue, saying that helicopters fly over her home several times a year, shaking her house and breaking windows. Ms. Donovan questioned why the helicopters cannot maintain a “fly friendly” policy and why they are not flying over I-95 or I-295 instead of her home. She indicated that helicopters did not start flying over her home until NextGen was introduced years ago and expressed to the Roundtable that she does not understand why helicopters are never mentioned during these meetings and nothing has been done. Mr. Chancellor asserted that it is terrible for thousands of people in this area since the MAA and the FAA have allowed NextGen to come into the airport. Ms. Donovan asked the Roundtable if she heard correctly that if she lives within five miles of the airport she is out of luck. Mr. Chancellor stated that Mr. Fisher was not saying those within five miles of the airport are out of luck, saying Mr. Fisher was describing a particular procedure change where people within five miles of the runway end would gain less relief compared to those farther away from the airport. He noted that the area the Roundtable meeting is held was very quiet, yet still within five miles of the airport and that the noise level depends on where you are relative to the runway.

Mr. Roth stated there some flight paths within five miles of the airport will improve but that those flight path changes may not help with helicopters. Ms. Donovan asked if I-295 and I-95 were both within five miles of the airport, which Mr. Roth confirmed. Ms. Donovan commented that she is out of luck, to which Mr. Roth agreed. Mr. Reese clarified that the Roundtable is very sensitive to Ms. Donovan’s comments, and they certainly do not mean to make light of her concerns; however, this project does not address helicopters or Runway 33R. Mr. Reese said that many of Ms. Donovan’s helicopter troubles are coming from Runway 33R, and the procedures discussed at the meeting do not address those. Mr. Reese asked Mr. Shank when the last time a Southwest or FedEx jet landed on 33R. Mr. Roth stated that they talk about helicopters all the time and does not want anyone to feel that he is being flippant with Ms. Donovan.

Ms. MacDonald suggested moving on to the Technical and Legislative Committee updates, but Mr. Fisher asked the group if he could clarify a comment made about flight speeds. On the website and phone application for FlightRadar24, Mr. Fisher noted that aircraft speeds above 250 knots can be seen below 10,000 feet. However, the speeds on FlightRadar24 are ground speeds, while the requirement of 250 knots or less below 10,000 feet is based on airspeed, which does not include the effects of winds. Winds at higher altitudes could be as high as 50-100 knots, which can increase the airspeed seen on FlightRadar24 and other applications above 250 knots over the ground. Mr. Fisher clarified that third party applications such as FlightRadar24 may display ground speeds higher than 250 knots. However, ground speeds are a combination of indicated airspeed plus the wind pushing the aircraft.

Ms. MacDonald then asked Mr. Rineer to read the online comments that were received. The first question was from Mr. Dale Radcliffe who asked if track data was from past flight data or future flight data. Mr. Johnson clarified that the track data used on the FAA’s depictions are actual flight tracks from

2019. He stated they wanted to use track data that was pre-Covid because flight volumes have fallen due to Covid and that the FAA wanted to show a scenario with a representative operational volume instead of minimal flights. Mr. Radcliffe stated that a lot of departing traffic has been rerouted over Anne Arundel County and that Anne Arundel County already experiences all the arrival flights. He believes moving traffic from Howard County to Anne Arundel County is not a solution. He then asked how to measure the overall positive and negative impacts for counties and specific locations. Ms. MacDonald responded that was not a question she could answer.

Mr. Radcliffe also noted that individuals in Anne Arundel County have the same concerns about low altitude arrivals and departures as those in Columbia and wanted to know how Anne Arundel residents could find the minimum altitude of aircraft near their homes and communities. He stated that discussions and concerns need to be equally focused on those west and east of BWI and that keeping all traffic away from Columbia is not a solution. Mr. Reese answered that the Technical Committee had equal representation for Howard and Anne Arundel Counties and has given arrivals and departures in Anne Arundel and Howard County equal attention. Ms. Reese agreed that alleviating traffic over Columbia does not impact the problems identified in Anne Arundel County. Mr. Roth stated he lives in Elkridge and represents Howard County and confirmed that Columbia is not the only focus and that every plane that flies over Columbia also flies over Elkridge and Hanover before it arrives at the airport, depending on its route. He agreed that a lot of questions are about Columbia, but the Roundtable did their best to improve arrivals and departures in all areas surrounding the airport.

Mr. Radcliffe asked why departing flights on Runway 28 are routed east into Anne Arundel County when Anne Arundel County is also subject to all arrivals. Ms. MacDonald stated she believed it was determined by east and west flow at the airport. Mr. Reese said he appreciated Mr. Radcliffe's comments, but that question has already been answered.

Mr. Rineer moved on to another online comment from Ms. Mia Coyne. Ms. Coyne asked if the new flight path (shown in purple) crosses over Elkridge instead of Columbia. She stated that she lives in Elkridge and suffers from the noise. Mr. Chancellor answered that when the FAA came to the Roundtable with the proposed changes to the departures off Runway 28, they also presented the area where planes tended to fly pre-Metroplex. The purple lines in the FAA's presentation are the outer boundaries of what the FAA said in 2017 were the traditional pre-Metroplex tracks for departures off Runway 28. With the Metroplex implementation, a right turn close to the runway caused planes to begin to fly over Elkridge. Mr. Chancellor mentioned this change was something Mr. Roth has been working on. Mr. Chancellor hypothesized that the changes will move most of the departures away from Elkridge but reiterated that changes cannot be guaranteed until he sees how things pan out.

Mr. Rineer read an online comment from Ms. Lisa Fenstermacher. Ms. Fenstermacher asked if the Roundtable could review the intended effects of LINSE and TERPZ changes about six miles from the airport. Mr. Reese answered that they would need more time to answer such a technical question. Mr. Chancellor recommended that Ms. Fenstermacher zoom into the map and compare it to the noise map Vianair will show later in the meeting to place the exact location in relation to the noise levels. Mr. Chancellor advised that until the Roundtable gets deeper into analyzing the maps, they will not be able to tell Ms. Fenstermacher what her location will experience.

Given the number of online comments, Ms. MacDonald asked Mr. Rineer if it was possible to send a notification link to the attendees to let them know when the presentation is available online. Mr. Rineer agreed and advised there are more online remarks, but they appear to be public comments rather than related to the FAA presentation. Ms. MacDonald advised holding off on additional online comments and moving onto Vianair or legislative updates. Mr. Gartner suggested discussing the legislative update first given the timing. Mr. Gartner stated he would only need three minutes to discuss the Vianair schedule.

5. ROUNDTABLE COMMITTEE UPDATES

Legislative Committee: 2022 General Assembly Legislative Session Updates

Ms. Reese led the legislative update. She presented information regarding the Maryland Aviation Infrastructure Impacts Commission during the last legislative session and there was significant public comment in favor of the commission. She listed the sponsors and co-sponsors of the bill on her presentation to refresh everyone's memory. Ms. Reese said Senator Clarence Lam and Delegate Terri Hill have been tirelessly fighting for this [noise] issue, stating that both senators are physicians, so they truly care about public health and have been incredibly helpful and supportive of the things that need to be done moving forward. Ms. Reese revealed that the commission was unsuccessful and never made it out of committee; however, they did receive favorable support from several agencies. Three county executives, the Howard County Council, Allan Kittleman, Oakland Mills Community Association, and the Montgomery County Quiet Skies Coalition were among the agencies who were in support. Dr. Fink submitted understandable research on the NGA website, which Ms. Reese suggested would be of interest to everyone. Ms. Reese mentioned Dr. Arline Bronzaft who is nationally known as the RBG (Ruth Bader Ginsberg) of noise. She further highlighted the panel of people from across the country who testified on behalf of this initiative. Ms. Reese turned to the public audience members and expressed that they are not alone, stating people from all over the country are paying attention and care about what the public is going through. She commented that although it may feel like the public is not supported, there are indeed people who understand and are lobbying Congress to make a change, even at the state level.

Ms. Reese then presented unfavorable opposition from agencies. She commented that minutes from the Maryland Aviation Commission revealed that Howard County, Northern Anne Arundel County, and the Central Maryland Chamber of Commerce all lobbied against the bill in a non-transparent way. The agencies submitted letters to the committee members, and Howard County Chamber of Commerce has since provided what they submitted. After receiving those letters, Ms. Reese began working with the Howard County Chamber of Commerce. However, Northern Anne Arundel County and Central Maryland Chamber of Commerce have refused to submit what they provided to the legislature. Ms. Reese indicated that she has reached out to their membership, particularly their membership in education and health. Ms. Reese said that the public school system, Johns Hopkins, and other members of these organizations were disappointed in the lack of transparency. Ms. Reese is hopeful that membership changes will result from this.

Mr. Chancellor stated that BWI Marshall CEO Mr. Ricky Smith asked for context regarding his earlier question about NEPA and suggested that this presentation provides that context. He commented that the commission would study the health effects beyond what NEPA looks at, and that some of the

opposition to this commission stated that NEPA looks at the health and environmental effects of infrastructure projects at the airport. Those comments from the legislative opposition filtered down to the community and are causing confusion. He gave examples of the types of effects that seem to go beyond what NEPA requires, such as what happens in people's lungs and brains or effects that occur when human beings lose sleep. However, the Roundtable could not speak on those effects because they are not NEPA experts and would like clarification on this. Mr. Chancellor asserted that they needed NEPA experts to clarify whether NEPA addresses these areas to better respond to questions from the community. Mr. Roth added that NEPA comes into effect when completing a project with federal money, saying that a federal health study about the impacts of the airport would be valuable if they wanted to lobby for stronger mitigations and mitigation funding or to oppose or support yet-to-be-funded projects at the airport, for instance. Mr. Roth added that the belief that a health study is not needed simply because it only pertains to projects that are federally funded is not accurate or helpful.

Ms. Reese reiterated that transparency is important. She then moved onto the questions she asked the FAA and the responses she received from them. One of the questions sent to the FAA was from Mr. Brent Girard in Senator Van Hollen's office. Ms. Reese said they received a response from the FAA essentially saying that the FAA has done what Congress wanted them to do in implementing NextGen and they have fulfilled their obligations. Ms. Reese commented that this is exactly what they expected the FAA to say.

Ms. Reese then mentioned two newspaper articles, one from the Baltimore Sun and one from the Washington Post. The Baltimore Sun article included a July 27, 2022, press announcement that addressed the \$4 million Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funds. The FAA prohibits homes from receiving mitigations if they fall into contours with DNL levels below 65 dB. In 2016, the MAA requested funds for homes that were inducted into the 65 DNL. Ms. Reese noted that this delayed timeframe gives us an idea of how long it takes for a neighborhood to receive that money. Dividing \$4 million by 220 homes averages to around \$18,000 per home. Ms. Reese stated most homes require well over \$50,000 for noise mitigation.

Ms. Reese stated the funding was also indicative of encroachment. The problem with the article was that it talked about the AIP funds being released to NextGen. She expressed the importance of carefully choosing what is considered relief for post-NextGen airport problems because not all problems associated with BWI are due to NextGen. She stated that the airport is expanding its capacity, a factor not often discussed. Ms. Reese asked Mr. Shank for the current operating capacity for BWI without any infrastructure upgrades. Mr. Shank apologized and said he did not have the figure at that time. Ms. Reese estimated an aircraft operation capacity between 40-70 percent and said the encroachment of the airport and the growth of the airport's capacity is increasing the extent of the 65 DNL contours and this is not induced by NextGen.

Ms. Reese suggested a strategy which involves alleviating the airport's role in capacity decisions and growth that are affecting communities, saying the decision to grow capacity at the airport is not publicly available and there is no way of knowing what their decisions will be for tomorrow. She stated that most of Maryland's state legislators are not aware of the plans either and the lack of transparency and

the decisions to continue developing areas that are under 65 DNL is a problem because as the airport grows, more 65 DNL areas are created.

Ms. Reese pivoted to reference a Washington Post article regarding a community near Dulles Airport and criticized the idea of telling people they should not move close to an airport if they are not prepared to cope with the noise. She asserted that it is impossible to predict the noise exposure even 20 miles away from the airport due to the lack of access to the decisions that are being made to expand airport capacity. Ms. Reese was disappointed with the Washington Post's hateful rhetoric which criticized people for moving close to airports and apologized to the public members who have heard that statement.

Mr. Chancellor believed the Washington Post article caused a disservice to BWI communities because the neighborhood referenced in the article was a case of the neighborhood encroaching on the airport. He clarified the airport was already there and that Loudoun County and its planning board allowed more and more development closer to the airport. He suggested that BWI, like Boston Logan and DCA, are experiencing airports encroaching on communities rather than the other way around. Ms. Reese informed Mr. Chancellor that his argument was incorrect, and the airport indeed encroached on those communities. Ms. Reese clarified that the affected homes were built at a much lower noise contour level and when the airport capacity expanded, they were inducted into the 65 DNL. She suggested this was a classic encroachment issue and she has been working on this issue for many years. She concluded that those residents still had no way of knowing that the airport was making decisions to grow its capacity 10, 20, or 30 percent such that that contour would slide out over them and engulf them. Ms. Reese clarified that this is what is happening around BWI, asserting that the legislature does not even know the number of homes that have been inducted into the 65 DNL. Yet the Board of Public Works and the state legislator are approving and voting to concurrently freeze this type of expansion, which is "lunacy".

Ms. Jung announced she will be going to the NextGen Advisory Committee meeting on August 30th, 2022, in McLean, Virginia. Ms. Jung said she would be submitting remarks as a member, and anyone is welcome to join her. She stated remarks would have to be submitted by Monday, August 22nd and she would gladly send a copy to anyone who wanted to view it beforehand.

Mr. Girard provided an update from Senator Van Hollen regarding current and proposed legislation for aircraft noise and pollution and provided a recap of what the Senator accomplished this year. On May 13th, Senator Van Hollen submitted requests for at least \$8 million to support regular engagement with communities affected by aviation noise, including technical and analytical support. Senator Van Hollen requested \$5 million to study the health impacts of aviation noise, especially for those experiencing highly repetitive noise exposure. Mr. Girard stated the Senator directed the FAA to ensure that the AIP funds Ms. Reese mentioned are made available for communities further from the airport so those funds could be used to hire independent aviation consultants with technical expertise for roundtables and community groups. Additionally, through the FY23 Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development bill (THUD), \$1.3 million and four new positions for community engagement to address aviation noise issues were created. This includes funding for technical and analytical support services for communities that may not have that expertise themselves. Mr. Girard said the House of Representatives will produce their

own appropriations bills and the Senate will work with the House to finalize that text. With that, it is likely that continuing resolution will be passed in September to fund the government for the FY 22 levels until the legislation is able to finalize those bills.

Mr. Girard then went over current legislation items. The S-1715 bill was introduced by Senator Duckworth in May, but no action has been taken yet. The bill would make certain airport projects eligible for funding through the Department of Transportation for airport noise capability planning. Those projects include noise exposure maps and the development of noise capability programs. The S-3125 Aviation Emissions Reduction Opportunity Act would establish a new grant program to support production and adoption of sustainable aviation fuel and other low emission aviation technology. That bill was introduced in 2021 by Senator Warnock and referred to the Senate Commerce Committee. Mr. Girard stated no action has been taken on that bill. S-4558, which Senator Van Hollen co-sponsored, authorizes NASA to accelerate its work in developing cleaner, quieter airplanes. Mr. Girard clarified that S-4558 was included in the CHIPS and Science Act and is effective immediately.

Mr. Girard discussed plans for 2023. He indicated that the best opportunity to introduce legislation that affects airplane noise and pollution is through the FAA reauthorization bill. The current bill expires on September 30, 2023. The Senate Commerce Committee and likely the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee have begun the process of collecting senators' legislative ideas and proposals for the upcoming bill. In Senator Van Hollen's office, Mr. Girard began to develop the proposals. The proposals included information relating to subject matter experts, the changing of metrics for DNL, the regulation of general aviation activities to limit repetitive noise exposure, fanned dispersal, and funding for the EPA to possibly regulate particulate matter from aviation activities. Mr. Girard stated any ideas for legislation from the Maryland Roundtable are welcome.

Lastly, Mr. Girard discussed the challenges his team is facing. Mr. Girard stated that the former chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, Senator Thune, did not have any interest in supporting their more aggressive proposals, which included dispersion, more aggressive particulate matter regulation, DNL, and other recommendations from the Roundtable. Mr. Girard was hopeful that the new chairperson, Ms. Maria Cantwell, would provide more support; however, he noted that the 2022 election could impact next year's committee chair. Mr. Girard expressed he is looking forward to working with the Roundtable to ensure that his team has submitted the strongest possible proposals into the bill. He also thanked Ms. Reese for raising those issues regarding the \$4 million that was appropriated. Mr. Girard clarified that Senator Van Hollen's office does have some control over the AIP funding but it is a grants process over which the MAA has a lot of control. As a result, any questions related to the AIP should be directed to the MAA, but Mr. Girard offered to take questions offline as well. Ms. Reese thanked Mr. Girard and Senator Van Hollen for their continued support.

6. VIANAIR

Mr. Gartner led the Vianair update, saying he intended to go through the presentation from April, but due to time constraints he would give a quick verbal update. Mr. Gartner stated that the report was shared with the MAA and would hopefully be posted the next day. He also requested that a link to the April report be shared with the Roundtable as well. He advised that the May report was scheduled to be posted around August 26th, the June report to be posted around August 29th, and the August report to

be posted in mid-September. He stated that there were a few notable increases and decreases between the April and March runway maps on pages 8 and 9 of the report. Mr. Gartner indicated one caveat on the current April report was that there was some data that was missing for a few days in September, but that missing data should not impact the averages. Mr. Gartner stated that Vianair compared notes with the MAA prior to the meeting and the missing data did not appear on the MAA's maps. He said Vianair would investigate what caused the missing data to avoid the problem reoccurring in the May report. Mr. Gartner pointed out another issue involving the DNL noise contours. He noted that there were some issues on the far south side of the Anne Arundel map which made it difficult to pinpoint the exact geographical area that was being affected by the noise contour. Mr. Gartner advised finding one's noise monitoring number, going to the table, and comparing those numbers from month to month if the numbers on the maps are not visible.

Mr. Gartner stated having virtual noise monitors stationed every two and a half miles would improve transparency and consistency and would provide some insight over time across both counties. Mr. Gartner said the next invoices would be sent out to Anne Arundel County. After that, Mr. Gartner would start approaching the secretary of the Department of Transportation (DOT) for funding so Vianair could start increasing their virtual noise monitors.

Mr. Chancellor thanked Mr. Gartner for giving a quick update due to the time constraints. He said this is a very important project so he would like to see the presentation during the next Roundtable meeting in September to review the detailed data, saying that the data is compelling. Ms. MacDonald asked Mr. Gartner if he planned to provide the reports to the Roundtable. Mr. Gartner confirmed that the March report is on the MAA's website now, and the April report will be there tomorrow. Ms. MacDonald informed Mr. Rineer that they would need to discuss the best place on the website to put the reports. She would like for viewers to be able to toggle back and forth between the reports for more seamless viewing. Ms. MacDonald added that it would be nice to have all the presentations in one spot.

7. FLIGHT PROCEDURE NEXT STEPS

Mr. Roth asked about the path to getting closure on the FAA's proposal. Mr. Chancellor stated he thinks they have reached closure. Mr. Shank said he shares Ms. Reese's concern about the FAA having to look at questions before providing a graphical comparison and response, which would delay the implementation process. Mr. Reese stated that the Roundtable unanimously voted for the changes to move forward. He clarified that Mr. Roth and Mr. Holley unanimously accepted that the Roundtable's criteria were met. Mr. Gartner asked if the Roundtable should vote, to which Mr. Reese and Ms. MacDonald both stated the vote already occurred so there is no further need. Ms. MacDonald confirmed she communicated with the FAA to proceed with the process. Mr. Roth advised that the FAA's proposal includes modest changes that the Roundtable has already approved. He suggested that the Roundtable make a statement that they have looked at the FAA's proposed changes and that those changes are not significant compared to the Roundtable's original proposal. Mr. Reese made a motion to accept the proposed changes from the FAA. Mr. Woomer seconded that motion.

Mr. Holley clarified that his purpose in his prior comments was not to extend FAA review. Rather, Mr. Holley's point in bringing up that area was to simplify the data he wanted to see. Mr. Holley said he did not trust everyone who presented at the meeting, so he would like to see detailed comparisons of what

the Roundtable proposed and what was given to the Roundtable. Mr. Holley expressed his concern about changes slipping under the cracks and never being done. He stated that the blurry purple and blue lines in the presentation are not helpful. Instead, he would like to see waypoint coordinates and the flights paths that were proposed along with what exactly will be implemented.

Ms. Reese asked Mr. Holley what would rebuild trust with the FAA. Mr. Holley clarified he would like to see detailed PowerPoint presentations and a clear discussion about the way the Roundtable's changes will be implemented. Ms. Reese asked if there were things that could not be done but the materials presented still satisfied the Roundtable's criteria, should that negate the Roundtable's support of the entire package? Mr. Holley said he would not negate anything; rather, he would like to see any differences that could not be implemented in a clearer way, not in a blurry PowerPoint. Mr. Roth clarified that he believed the Roundtable was shown the differences. Mr. Phillips said it sounds like an issue of trust as well as things that are not in their control. He wondered if there is a way to indicate everyone agreed to move forward, but also that the Roundtable has not received all desired information in sufficient detail.

Mr. Reese advised he wanted to correct the fallacy everyone was operating under, saying it is incorrect to think that there is a feedback loop to the FAA closed process for procedure development. Mr. Shank stated the FAA had completed their design process in February. Mr. Phillips clarified he is not talking about the feedback loops but about what the FAA tells the public, saying he does not want to tell the public about proposed changes until they are approved. Ms. Reese stated that the Roundtable operates under a charter and has already approved the changes and cannot redo the analysis that they have already completed, saying that repeating the approval process would create a new requirement for the charter. Mr. Roth agreed that the Roundtable has already approved the changes, stating that per today's presentation, the FAA made an explicit change to RAVNN.

Mr. Chancellor asked if they all heard this same information in May. Mr. Roth confirmed that the information was presented in May, saying that is what he is referring to. Mr. Holley agreed that Mr. Roth and Mr. Chancellor share his concern that the information from May was presented again today. Mr. Roth said to Mr. Holley that he doubts any significant changes would have been left out of the presentation. Mr. Holley agreed and said he recalled Mr. Reese saying that the RAVNN change made in May was thinking outside the box. Mr. Reese agreed and said the underlying intent of what the Roundtable requested was met. He said the changes he saw on the Anne Arundel arrivals, specifically with the RAVNN and SEED waypoints, did not affect the Roundtable's goals. He believed that Mr. Chancellor and Mr. Roth drew the same conclusion. Mr. Reese expressed that he wanted to review the requested comparison charts and have Mr. Holley review the charts as well. He asked if a formal mechanism exists for Mr. Shank to ask the FAA to move forward with this. Otherwise, he would expect that there would be no changes for three to five years.

Mr. Holley said he was 99% in agreement with Mr. Reese. He noticed a small change to RAVNN that could equal a big change to waypoints SPLAT, GRAFE, and Zanax (HAXAK), which is even closer to the runway. Mr. Reese stated waypoints SPLAT and GRAFE were not changed. Mr. Holley answered that he knows they are not changing but the Roundtable proposed a procedure that stretches from RAVNN to another waypoint between GRAFE and the runway, which was not a published procedure prior to that.

Mr. Reese said that waypoints GRAFE and SPLAT are on final approaches so these waypoints don't affect any of the final approach waypoints.

Mr. Roth suggested that since SEED does not move, that means nothing downstream changes. Mr. Reese said the only thing he sees changing from those waypoints is the opportunity for more dispersion. However, waypoints on the extended centerline have not changed. Mr. Roth added that even though the FAA moved RAVNN, all the waypoints after RAVNN did not move. Mr. Holley agreed and said their intent with the 33L approaches and arrivals was to get more aircraft over I-97. He expressed that he wanted to make sure the FAA's proposed adjustments shift those flights over I-97. Mr. Chancellor said they asked that same question in May and they were told the movement would be in line with I-97. Mr. Chancellor told Mr. Holley that he agrees with his concern in wanting to see the FAA's technical work. He said that the FAA representatives who presented today have been great and transparent, to which Mr. Holley agreed. Mr. Chancellor said he thinks everything has been completed, he would just like to see the final technical assessment. Mr. Roth stated he believes the FAA has given the Roundtable enough information and they should let the FAA move forward. Mr. Holley said he agreed with Mr. Roth, Mr. Reese, and Mr. Chancellor and he did not mean to throw up a roadblock. Mr. Holley said he believed the FAA's presentation was great and he supports the Technical Committee's approach.

Mr. Reese made a motion that the Roundtable endorse the FAA's changes as in keeping with the intent of the already passed, proposed changes. Mr. Woome seconded the motion. Ms. MacDonald asked Mr. Chancellor for his opinion. Mr. Chancellor said he believed the Roundtable has met their charter responsibilities already, so another vote is unnecessary. Mr. Chancellor said the one RAVNN change that Mr. Roth mentioned is consistent and not significant and he is not comfortable with the wording of this motion. Mr. Roth clarified that the motion states the Roundtable will simply say the modifications that the FAA proposed are within the scope and margin of error of the Roundtable's proposal. Ms. Reese suggested they make a motion to say the Roundtable has completed their work per its charter for the PBN process and expect the FAA to move forward, as soon as possible, with implementing these changes. She formally made the motion and Mr. Reese seconded. Ms. MacDonald asked if everyone was in favor and all agreed.

Mr. Shank stated that the FAA would not proceed with making changes until the Roundtable endorsed the changes. He confirmed that the Roundtable endorsed those changes today; the group just needs to formally agree so that the meeting minutes will reflect that the Roundtable agreed with the FAA's changes. He stated that he needed to get a similar comment from industry and the MAA so they can communicate with the FAA that the stakeholders agree with the FAA proposal. Mr. Shank asked Mr. Reese and the Technical Committee if they are happy with the information the FAA presented to the Technical Committee. Mr. Reese said he stands by everything he has already said. Mr. Shank reiterated that he owes the courtesy of talking to the industry directly to get their viewpoint. Ms. Reese said the ball is essentially in Mr. Shank's court now. Mr. Shank agreed. Mr. Holley said that although he was not satisfied with the graphics, he supports the FAA's statement that they only made changes where they indicated they made changes.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. MacDonald opened the floor for another public comment period.

Mr. Jim Barnes said he hasn't been to Roundtable meeting for months due to the Roundtable's meeting management. The last time he attended a meeting, the Roundtable voted on an agenda, and he sat for 45 minutes but had to leave before public comments were allowed. Mr. Barnes feels the Roundtable does not follow their agendas and is demonstrating what this body cannot accomplish. He expressed that BWI is decades behind most airports in the U.S when it comes to noise management, saying he was frustrated because the meeting he witnessed today was not helping the community as quickly as it should. Mr. Barnes suggested that the FAA and the MAA do not support noise control, saying that real things that could be done quickly were not being addressed. Mr. Barnes mentioned Continuous Descent Approaches (CDAs) and traditional approaches, remarking that aircraft are noisy when they are dirty and slow, not when they are traveling quickly. Mr. Barnes lives in Anne Arundel where the aircraft level off at 2,000 feet with gear and flaps down all the time. He expressed that CDAs should be implemented and that many other airports have done so.

Mr. Reese told Mr. Barnes that the Roundtable has been working on that issue for two years, but it must go through the FAA. Mr. Barnes suggested that the FAA can tell aircraft they are X number of miles away from touchdown to increase aircraft level-offs. Mr. Barnes also suggested that the FAA give aircraft a visual approach to stay over the Severn River, not over communities. Ms. Reese stated air traffic controllers currently clear flights for visual approaches from RAVNN that fly directly over the densest population. Mr. Barnes said the FAA can clear pilots on a visual approach over the Severn River. Ms. Reese suggested that type of communication with pilots does not happen anywhere. Mr. Reese told Mr. Barnes he hears his frustration and that these concerns have been raised previously.

Mr. Barnes reiterated that the MAA and the FAA do not support noise reduction at BWI. Mr. Reese said he did not disagree with that point. However, Ms. Reese said she believes the MAA would love to fix the noise issue. Mr. Barnes asserted that all that needs to be done is to not issue clearances to allow flights to descend below the glideslope.

Mr. Reese suggested that Mr. Barnes read the Office of Personnel and Management (OPM) report on the implementation of NextGen. Mr. Barnes replied that the BWI has barely implemented NextGen so that is not the issue. He suggested that traffic flows heightened the noise levels and that he would like to see the creation of approaches that follow natural land features to keep aircraft away from the public. Ms. Reese noted that the FAA has no mandate to do that. Ms. Reese said she visited the facility and that the personnel had been given no direction to consider communities under it. Ms. Reese clarified that they have been expressing concern for that issue from the start.

Mr. Chancellor let Mr. Barnes know his technical proposals and his knowledge would be welcomed by the Technical Committee, saying he previously was unable to suggest that because Mr. Barnes left the prior meeting early due to his frustration. Mr. Chancellor suggested that Mr. Barnes send his documents to the Roundtable members for review. Mr. Reese stated that the Roundtable members do this on a volunteer basis and he cannot dedicate 40 hours a week to the Roundtable, but suggested that Mr. Barnes' ideas could be presented to the MAA. Mr. Chancellor said he would take the responsibility in ensuring that Mr. Barnes' documents are sent to the Roundtable members and the MAA. Ms. Reese thanked Mr. Barnes for staying tonight.

Audience member Mr. Mark Peterson stated if you take Vianair's PDFs and blow them up to 400%, you cannot see his street or any state roads and asked what could be used as a reference to find his street. He suggested the only way to find that information is by knowing the geometric center of your zip code and the distance from that center to your house. Mr. Gartner said that has been a constant challenge for Vianair. Mr. Chancellor agreed that has been a concern. Mr. Peterson said the FAA included roads and reference points. Mr. Gartner said Vianair is working on improving the geographical information available. Mr. Peterson further commented that Mr. Smith has not attended any Roundtable meetings for the past four years.

Mr. Pleasant commented that aircraft speeds are too high over his neighborhood and that leads to increased noise.

Mr. Phillips stated that in the past, nighttime flights were quieter and did not wake people up, despite being older aircraft. However, the nighttime flights now are waking people up. He asked what had changed since then.

Mr. Chancellor suggested that anyone with a further wish to discuss could do so with the Roundtable members following the meeting.

9. NEXT MEETING

Ms. MacDonald proposed that the group choose a date for the next meeting. Mr. Chancellor wanted to ensure that the chosen date would work for Vianair to present. Vianair representatives stated that September 13th would work for them. Ms. MacDonald confirmed that September 13th would work for everyone. All agreed.

10. ADJOURN

Mr. Reese made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Woomer seconded. The meeting adjourned at 10:04 p.m.