

DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Working Group Public Meeting

Sixty-First Meeting of the DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Working Group

Tuesday, July 21, 2026, from 7:07 p.m. – 10:01 p.m.

Meeting held in person and virtually via Microsoft Teams

MEETING MINUTES

Regular Participants:

Roundtable Member	District/Organization	Attended	Roundtable Member	District/Organization	Attended
Suzzie Schuyler*	District 1, Anne Arundel County Council	X	Sam Snead*	Office of Anne Arundel County Executive Steuart Pittman	
Debra Jung*	District 4, Howard County Council	X	Clarence Dickenson III*	Office of Howard County Executive Calvin Ball	
Debbie Macdonald*	District 9		Brent Girard	Office of Senator Chris Van Hollen	X
Troy Marty*	District 9	X	Stephen Jones	FAA Regional Deputy Administrator	
Charles Kyler*	District 9	X	Paul Shank, Chief Engineer	MAA	
Howard Johnson, Chair*	District 12	X	Niqui Clark, Deputy Chief Engineer	MAA	X
Drew Roth*	District 12		Darline Terrell-Tyson, Director, Office of Environmental Compliance and Sustainability	MAA	X
Paul Verchinski*	Alternate, District 13	X (Online)	Karen Harrell	MAA	
Mary Reese*	District 30	X	Kevin Clarke	MAA	X
Rob Shepard*	District 31		Tara McDaniels	MAA	X
Ted Sakellariou*	District 31	X	Shannetta Griffin	MAA, CEO	
John Leary*	District 31	X	Royce Bassarab	MAA/HNTB	X
Lori Shook	District 32	X	Greg Voos	Mid-Atlantic Regional Representative, NBAA	
William Pierson*	District 32		Kyle Evans	General Aviation Representative, CP Management LLC	
Daniel Woome, Co-Chair*	District 32		David Richardson	Southwest Airlines	
Michael Huddleston*	District 32		Steve Alterman	President, Air Cargo Association	
David Nibeck	Alternate, District 32		Trey Turner	Commercial Carriers Representative	
Libby Lewandowski*	District 33				
Kimberly Franklin*	District 33				
Christopher Burk*	District 44B				

**Voting Member*

Other Named Attendees:

Brett Healy, ADCI (Meeting Minute Taker)
Marie Kennington-Gardiner, FAA IFP Gateway Representative
Ben Thielen, FAA Community Representative

Introduction and Roll Call:

Introduction:

The meeting commenced at 7:07 p.m. with an introduction and safety briefing delivered by Mr. Bruce Rineer. Mr. Rineer reminded attendees that the meeting is being recorded and said virtual attendees could comment using the chat function. To address technical difficulties, Mr. Rineer suggested that online participants log off and rejoin the meeting. He also recommended that they have only the Teams application open for the meeting's duration. Mr. Rineer reviewed the building's exits and evacuation routes and stated that an Automatic External Defibrillator (AED) and a fire extinguisher were located in the hallway.

Roll Call:

The Roundtable Chair, Mr. Howard Johnson, introduced and welcomed several new delegates to the Roundtable and thanked them for attending. Mr. Johnson then conducted roll call, and quorum was met. Mr. Evan Reese was unable to attend and asked Ms. Mary Reese to participate in his stead. Mr. Johnson asked the Roundtable to approve the substitution. No objections were made.

Review and Approval of February 24, 2026 Meeting Minutes:

Mr. Johnson moved on to the approval of the February 24, 2026 meeting minutes. Mr. Ted Sakellariou made a motion to approve the February meeting minutes. Ms. Suzzie Schuyler seconded. All were in favor, and the motion passed.

Approval of Agenda:

Mr. Johnson asked if there were any amendments to the agenda; there were none. Mr. Sakellariou motioned to approve the meeting agenda, and Mr. John Leary seconded. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.

MAA Update:

Mr. Johnson said the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) would not present any information at the meeting but were attending virtually to answer questions. Given the full agenda, Mr. Johnson asked attendees to hold questions until after each presentation.

Presentation on Runway 10/28 Closure:

Mr. Royce Bassarab and Mr. Rineer presented an update on the closure of Runway 10/28 for pavement rehabilitation. Mr. Rineer stated the closure would begin the night of July 21, 2026, and continue for several months. He explained that Runway 10/28, BWI's longest runway, intersects with the airport's other primary runway, Runway 15R/33L, and repaving the intersection of those runways would require closing both runways. Mr. Rineer said during that period, the only commercial operations at the airport would be those that can use the small runway (Runway 15L/33R).

Mr. Rineer said the need for the rehabilitation stemmed from the airport's Pavement Management Plan (PMP), a continuous assessment of pavement quality. The last major rehabilitation of Runway 10/28 occurred in 2012 under the Runway Safety Area (RSA) Program. He stated Runway 10/28, BWI's primary low-visibility runway, is 10,500 feet long and handles 55 percent of departures and 35 percent of arrivals. The project includes milling and overlays of the existing asphalt pavement, grade correction to bring the runway into compliance with current standards, new LED centerline lighting, new touchdown zone lighting, new runway edge light fixtures, and salvaging or replacement of other in-pavement lights.

Ms. Niqui Clark said the impetus for the project is to maintain safe operating conditions at the airport, noting that MAA's PMP is intended to maintain safety and keep the airport compliant with FAA regulations. Mr. Rineer then presented the construction schedule: Runway 10/28 will be continuously closed from July 22, 2026 to October 8, 2026. He also provided maps showing projected airport operations during the closure. In west flow, aircraft will land and depart on Runway 33L, with some aircraft operating on Runway 15L/33R, BWI's small commercial and GA runway. Mr. Rineer noted that JetBlue Airlines has approval for Airbus A220s to land and depart on this runway. In east flow, aircraft will land and depart on Runway 15R.

Mr. Rineer said the MAA created a website for the project, including frequently asked questions, the proposed work plan and timeline, and other updates. Ms. Clark said the website will be updated regularly throughout construction. Mr. Rineer provided contact information for himself and for Ms. Tara McDaniels and Mr. George Robinson of MAA's Legislative Affairs office for questions or concerns.

Ms. Debra Jung asked how the closure would change noise patterns over Howard County. Mr. Rineer referred to the operations maps and said he expected not much would change for west flow. He explained that in west flow, departures would shift from Runway 28 to Runway 33L but would still join the westbound TERPZ and LINSE departure procedures. In east flow, departures would be similar to current operations, with aircraft departing Runway 15R and turning west over the Severn community. Mr. Bassarab noted that regardless of which runway is used, the predominant traffic flow is westbound, and the primary difference is that Runway 10/28 will not be available for arrivals from the west during the closure. He said MAA would track flow usage but could not predict how often each configuration would be used, since flow is dictated by wind, weather, and air traffic control. During a similar closure in May 2025, east and west flow were each used approximately 50 percent of the time. Mr. Bassarab emphasized that air traffic controllers are ultimately responsible for deciding which runways will be used.

Ms. Clark stated that between August 4 and September 8, 2026, the runway intersection will be closed, with no nighttime operations, so communities should experience some relief from noise. Ms. Jung asked if the operational reductions would be for all traffic or only cargo operations. Ms. Clark confirmed that all nighttime traffic, not only cargo traffic, would stop during the intersection closure, except for smaller aircraft using Runway 15L/33R. Mr. Rineer added that during that period, only Runway 15L/33R would be in operation.

Ms. Jung asked whether the closure would affect the airport's revenue and whether commercial carriers were seeking alternative landing space. She also asked if Southwest Airlines (SWA) would be affected. Ms. Clark confirmed the closure would affect revenue, but that the MAA has worked closely with airport stakeholders, including SWA, to minimize the impact. Ms. Mary Reese asked when coordination with stakeholders began and if the MAA had coordinated with the community. Ms. Clark said the MAA began coordinating with stakeholders, including SWA and the Maryland Aviation Commission (MAC), over a year ago. Ms. Clark mentioned the PMP is a master asset management document tracking the condition and

replacement schedule of all airfield pavements and said stakeholders are updated when the MAA updates it every five years.

Mr. Johnson asked whether the schedule included contingency time for weather or other delays. Ms. Clark said some limited leeway is built into the schedule and that the MAA and contractors are coordinating regularly to maintain schedule efficiency. She noted the contractors can work in inclement weather to some extent and stressed that the October 8, 2026 completion date is firm.

Mr. Johnson asked whether the FAA would make any adjustments to airspace management during the closure. Ms. Clark said she would defer to the FAA to answer that question, and Mr. Rineer speculated that existing arrival and departure procedures for the other runways would likely continue to be used. Mr. Sakellariou noted that the Runway 15R departure procedure over the Severn area has generated many complaints, and during the closure, that problematic procedure would be used roughly half the time. Mr. Rineer responded that the actual proportion of time in each flow or changes to flight paths could not be predicted. Mr. Sakellariou asked whether MAA's noise team had considered mitigation for the affected community. Mr. Rineer said publicizing the closure was the primary option available, adding that even without the closure, if sustained east flow occurred through October, a similar level of departure traffic off Runway 15R would result.

Mr. Leary asked whether an increase or decrease in overall flights was anticipated during the closure. Mr. Rineer said the MAA can track single-runway operations but has no projections for overall volume. Mr. Leary observed that consolidating all traffic onto one runway would likely increase noise in the area even without new flights. Mr. Paul Verchinski, participating by Teams chat, asked whether all Runway 10/28 traffic would shift to Runway 15R/33L. Mr. Rineer explained that in a typical west flow, departures use Runway 28 and arrivals use Runway 33L. During construction, arrivals for west flow would remain the same, but departures would shift to Runway 33L. Mr. Leary reiterated that while total flight volume might not increase, the concentration of noise would, since the relief provided by splitting traffic between two runways would be lost. He noted that community members currently experience high-volume traffic and wanted to note that shifting traffic to Runway 33L would significantly increase the volume and noise over those communities.

Ms. Clark asked how many members of the public recalled the roughly month-long Runway 10/28 closure in April 2025, noting conditions should be similar. Several members of the public agreed that period had been difficult. Mr. Andrew Protigal said the noise was severe, explaining that departures off Runway 33L turning west over Howard County fly directly over his home in the Elkridge/Hanover area. Mr. Troy Marty noted that departures are generally louder than arrivals because engines are at full power, and that moving departures from Runway 28 to Runway 33L initially separates the flight paths by a few miles before they converge at higher altitude farther from the airport. He noted those aircraft would fly a different route than they would departing from Runway 28 and commented that flights might be condensed to accommodate the nighttime runway closure in August 2026. Mr. Leary clarified, saying he did not expect an increase in operations but emphasized that noise levels would not be reduced.

Mr. Leary asked whether the closure might expedite the FAA's review of the Runway 15R flight path change, given the anticipated increase in noise south of Runway 33L. Ms. Clark responded that the airport experienced four emergency closures in 2025 due to deteriorating pavement, underscoring the necessity of the rehabilitation. She said full rehabilitation was estimated to take about six months due to the runway length, but after considering stakeholder and community input, the MAA developed a plan to complete the work in 78 days. She said the MAA could not offer permanent noise relief but could offer temporary relief through nighttime closures, and said the MAA is providing community outreach and providing

project information throughout the process. Mr. Leary acknowledged the necessity of the work and repeated that he hoped the runway closure would expedite the FAA review.

Ms. Reese observed that the ability to implement nighttime closures for a single runway indicates that some form of nighttime quiet hours could be feasible without shutting down the airport or significantly affecting stakeholders or cargo operations. Ms. Jung agreed that quiet hours would be a significant benefit to the surrounding communities.

Mr. Johnson opened the floor to public questions regarding the closure. Mr. Edward Flood asked to review the flight maps again, noting that during the same period in 2025 (July 22 to October 8), 12,235 flights departed Runway 15R, and asked whether the closure implies roughly 24,000 flights operating off a single runway during the closure period. Mr. Marty said flight volume during the closure cannot be projected because it depends heavily on weather conditions. Mr. Flood said the central question was whether total air traffic volume would change during the closure at all, arguing that without a reduction in total operations, noise and volume in the area would necessarily increase.

Mr. Rineer said the airport handles approximately 250,000 operations per year, or roughly 20,833 per month, and that those operations would be redistributed according to the flow configuration in use. A member of the public asked whether the airport intended to reduce total flights or simply use a single runway for all operations. Mr. Rineer said the airport is designed to handle the existing traffic volume on a single runway during the closure. In response to further questions, Ms. Reese and Mr. Marty explained that closing one runway does not equate to a reduction in overall airport capacity, though Mr. Marty noted that the arrival flow specifically might see a slight reduction even as total aircraft volume remains unchanged.

Mr. Marty further explained that under normal dual-runway operations, with aircraft arriving and departing on separate runways, operations are more efficient. In that case, air traffic control might sequence roughly 10 aircraft operations in a 20-minute period, split between arrivals and departures on separate runways; with a single runway, that figure would likely decrease to around seven aircraft in the same period, since arrivals and departures must be sequenced together on the one runway. He noted that airlines might still attempt to maintain existing schedules to preserve revenue, though that decision rests with the airlines, not the airport. Ms. Clark said the MAA cannot provide an exact operations count during the closure but expected the airlines would adjust operations to accommodate the construction. She and Mr. Rineer said the airport tracks overall operations data, but that flow-specific questions depend on variables, such as weather, that cannot be predicted in advance. Mr. Rineer offered to obtain average projected daily flight figures from MAA's Airline Affairs office, noting that historically the airport operates in east flow approximately 35 percent of the year, though that figure was closer to 50 percent the previous year. He reemphasized that the airport cannot predict the weather nor control the traffic flow direction.

Ms. Reese asked about the next phase of the PMP following completion of the Runway 10/28 project. Ms. Clark said field studies for the PMP are currently underway and expected to be completed in 2028, at which point the airport's master PMP would be available.

A member of the public asked if air traffic controllers could have flexibility during the closure to disperse flights rather than using the current concentrated flight paths. Mr. Charles Kyler responded that doing so would be extremely difficult given how congested the airspace is in the DC metro area, explaining that shifting aircraft off established tracks poses collision risks with traffic operating at other airports, and noted that allowing flexibility at BWI would cause cascading effects in the rest of the airspace. Mr. Kyler

said standardized tracks and procedures reduce the likelihood of such incidents by ensuring all aircraft follow predictable, coordinated paths.

Open Invitation to Submit Nominees to the Aircraft Noise Advisory Committee (ANAC):

Mr. Johnson introduced a discussion on the FAA's open invitation for nominations to a new, nationwide Aircraft Noise Advisory Committee (ANAC), which will draw representatives from community roundtables across the country. He said he would like the Roundtable to submit a slate of nominees and made a motion that evening to endorse and support those nominees. He noted that nominations must be submitted to the FAA by August 10, 2026, and that he intended to collect nominations through the end of the week. Mr. Johnson said the Roundtable would endorse and submit the slate of nominees for FAA consideration for the ANAC.

Ms. Reese asked if Mr. Johnson intended for the Roundtable to determine the slate of nominees at this meeting. Mr. Johnson clarified that, given the compressed timeline, an additional virtual meeting might be needed to finalize the endorsements before the deadline, saying that he wanted to have the slate chosen no later than the end of the week. Ms. Reese clarified that the Roundtable would endorse and submit the slate to the FAA and asked whether a quorum would be required to select nominees. Mr. Johnson said the matter could be handled through the Legislative Committee.

In response to a request from Ms. Jung, Mr. Johnson provided background on the committee, explaining that member responsibilities include evaluating existing research on aircraft noise impacts and annoyance, assessing alternative noise metrics, evaluating noise mitigation strategies, and reviewing community engagement efforts. He emphasized the importance of the FAA's consideration of metrics beyond the Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL), noting that noise levels below the 65 DNL threshold, such as repeated exposure around 55 decibels (dB), can be highly impactful even though they do not currently qualify for mitigation consideration.

Mr. Johnson said committee members would serve a two-year term. In response to questions from Ms. Reese and Ms. Jung, he confirmed that nominations could be submitted for any or all interested Roundtable members and noted that FAA guidance calls for a minimum of nine committee members, with at least one community representative required. Mr. Leary noted that the guidance specifies "at least nine" members, suggesting the total could be higher. Ms. Reese pointed out that "at least one representative" from airport communities was required, which could mean that only one community representative could be selected. She recalled that prior committees related to the NextGen flight path changes included only two community representatives and cautioned that a similarly limited number might be expected here. Mr. Johnson said he could not speak to the FAA's ultimate selection process but expressed optimism about having representatives capable of enacting change.

Ms. Jung asked whether the committee would meet virtually or in person. Mr. Johnson said the committee is expected to meet online at least twice a year. Mr. Sakellariou noted that several District 31 residents at this meeting had already applied and said he would forward their names to Mr. Johnson. Mr. Leary observed that nominees should bring substantive qualifications beyond community concern alone and should be able to articulate the issue in terms the FAA would find credible. He suggested that community members who could represent other stakeholder groups in addition to community concerns could have greater chances of being selected for the committee and observed that the Roundtable should focus on quality of nominees and not just quantity.

Mr. Cartigal nominated Mr. Drew Roth, who was not present, for the committee; Mr. Johnson said he would contact Mr. Roth to gauge his interest. Ms. Jung asked whether Roundtable members could nominate themselves, which Mr. Johnson confirmed. Ms. Jung then stated she was interested.

Ms. Reese said the Roundtable should not extend its endorsement without thoroughly vetting each candidate's background and qualifications in an open public meeting, cautioning that the Roundtable's credibility would be at risk if it endorsed a large slate of nominees that do not all have strong, relevant qualifications. She suggested that individuals could apply independently while the Roundtable limits its formal endorsement to candidates they review and deem qualified. Ms. Jung asked whether a resume is required for application. Mr. Johnson observed it would be difficult for the Roundtable to endorse members of the public without having access to documentation of their qualifications.

Mr. Johnson, Ms. Reese, and Mr. Leary discussed whether an additional meeting would be needed to review candidates before endorsing them. Given the timeline, Mr. Leary suggested that materials could be solicited by flyer, with the Roundtable reviewing the materials and providing recommendations without convening a separate meeting, noting that the community should have confidence the Roundtable is representing their interests. Ms. Reese responded that the Roundtable previously met monthly, a cadence reduced by the MAA rather than the Roundtable's own preference. She stressed that with MAA leadership reportedly considering changes to the Roundtable's composition, maintaining an open and transparent endorsement process is especially important.

Mr. Rineer clarified that the FAA, not the Roundtable or MAA, will make the final selections for the ANAC membership. He said this discussion is regarding Roundtable endorsement of applicants to the ANAC, and that the online application is open to any interested individual regardless of Roundtable endorsement. Ms. Reese said that, historically, the Roundtable's endorsement has carried significant weight with elected officials and could meaningfully affect a candidate's chances. Mr. Leary said if the endorsement matters, other methods to expedite endorsement other than a full meeting are available, stressing the importance of moving quickly.

A member of the public observed that the same individuals tend to attend Roundtable meetings regularly and are therefore likely to be the ones nominated, agreeing the process should not be delayed by procedural formality. Ms. Reese maintained that the Roundtable retains the right to deliberate on its endorsements and that the public has the right to be aware of such deliberations. She emphasized the importance of this transparency and stated that public meetings are by design a slow process. Mr. Johnson said he would solicit resumes from any interested community members to be submitted to the Roundtable by Friday, July 31, 2026, and proposed holding a virtual meeting on August 4, 2026 to review submissions and select nominees.

Mr. Sakellariou made a motion to hold a virtual meeting on August 4, 2026 to discuss the Roundtable's endorsements for ANAC nominees. Ms. Jung seconded. All were in favor, and the motion passed. The meeting will begin at 7:00 p.m. and will be fully virtual. Mr. Sakellariou encouraged anyone interested in being considered to send a resume and application materials to their district representative ahead of the meeting.

At Mr. Johnson's request, MAA confirmed they would collect applications and resumes, which can be sent to Ms. Karen Harrell. Ms. Reese asked that it be made clear the application is solely for the Roundtable's endorsement and not for a paid position or direct application for the ANAC. Ms. Jung asked where the FAA's application could be found; Mr. Johnson noted it had been included in his pre-meeting email. Ms.

Reese asked if the MAA would post a link to the ANAC information on the Roundtable's website page to increase visibility.

In response to questions from Ms. Jung about the number of roundtables nationwide and how representation would be allocated, Mr. Johnson said he did not know and would follow up with the FAA. Ms. Reese suggested that, given the likelihood that only a small number of nominees nationwide will ultimately be selected, the Roundtable should concentrate its endorsement on one or two well-qualified candidates rather than spreading its support broadly. She also mentioned that people could email the Roundtable with questions or comments ahead of the August 4 meeting.

Ms. Tara McDaniels noted that Ms. Marie Kennington-Gardiner of the FAA, who was participating online, could answer procedural questions directly. Via chat, Ms. Kennington-Gardiner confirmed that committee solicitations are published in the Federal Register, as required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Ms. McDaniels said answers to many of the questions posed during this meeting have been answered in the chat. In response to a question from Ms. Jung about geographic representation, Ms. Kennington-Gardiner said the FAA cannot guarantee that every community will be represented and is instead seeking diversity by geography and airport type and size. Selections will be made by the FAA Administrator on behalf of the Secretary of Transportation. Ms. Kennington-Gardiner directed interested parties to the Federal Register notice for committee members' roles and responsibilities. She said the FAA has not finalized a maximum committee size, noting the Federal Register specifies a minimum of nine members, but that she personally anticipated approximately 25 members, and cautioned that this estimate should not be taken as official.

Ms. Reese asked for an official vote to hold the August 4 virtual selection meeting. All were in favor. Mr. Johnson asked that nominations be sent to him or Ms. Harrell by Monday, July 27, 2026.

Mr. Johnson said the Federal Register listing did not specify additional criteria beyond name, title, contact information, a letter of support from a relevant organization, a short biography, and relevant academic credentials. In response to questions from Ms. Reese and Mr. Marty about whether Roundtable endorsement would qualify as a letter of support, Ms. Kennington-Gardiner confirmed that a Roundtable endorsement would satisfy that requirement. She explained that the FAA will mainly assess a nominee's qualifications, including that they understand and can credibly represent the full range of community interests and speak knowledgeably to the issues already under discussion, but stated endorsements are not the most important criterion.

Mr. Johnson reiterated that materials for the Roundtable's endorsement are due to him or Ms. Harrell by July 27, 2026. He noted that the Roundtable would review nominees and finalize its Letter of Endorsement on August 4, and submissions to the FAA are due by August 10, 2026. Mr. Leary said he would ensure District 31 and District 32 representatives had the relevant information to distribute to their constituents.

Discussion on Presentation to the Anne Arundel County Council:

Mr. Johnson introduced a discussion of the Roundtable's recent presentation to the Anne Arundel County Council, arranged by Ms. Schuyler. The presentation team included Mr. Johnson, Mr. Dan Woomer, Ms. McDaniels, Mr. Paul Shank, and Mr. Bassarab. The 15-minute presentation covered the pre- and post-2024 flight path changes, and the team provided Council members with copies of the presentation and supplemental materials for further review. Ms. Schuyler said the meeting went well and that Council members were engaged and asked substantive questions, including what specifically the Roundtable would like the Council to do. The team asked the Council to support Senator Chris Van Hollen's letter to the FAA.

Ms. Schuyler noted that in April, she and several others met with Mr. Pete Smith of the Anne Arundel County Council to discuss if, once the MAA completes its Part 150 Study, the Anne Arundel County Council would have the option to establish noise overlays restricting residential zoning in affected areas, which would help prevent the compounding of noise-related land use conflicts.

Ms. Jung, a member of the Howard County Council, recalled that a similar presentation by Ms. Reese and former member Mr. Jesse Chancellor had likewise discussed noise overlays to restrict residential development, citing the Gateway Area development near I-95 along the Runway 15L flight path as an example of a location without current residential development. Ms. Schuyler confirmed the overlay concept was discussed with Anne Arundel County as well, but noted that action must wait until the Part 150 Study is complete.

Ms. Reese raised concerns that the Part 150 Study is being developed using data from the Airport Master Plan, which she characterized as outdated, saying it has not been updated since 2005. Mr. Rineer disagreed, stating that the Part 150 Study relies on current data with a five-year projection and is not based on the Master Plan. Ms. Reese noted that the Airport Noise Zone (ANZ) includes a ten-year projection. Mr. Rineer clarified that the ANZ and the Part 150 Study are separate programs administered at the state and federal levels, respectively.

Ms. Reese maintained that the County Councils should be aware of the Airport Master Plan and the 2025 ANZ ten-year forecast, which she believes inaccurately represent future noise levels, saying neither of those documents use accurate airport forecasts and repeated that the Master Plan is long expired. Ms. Clark reiterated that the Part 150 Study and the Master Plan are distinct documents that should not be used interchangeably. Ms. Reese said the Airport Master Plan and ANZ are needed for accurate land use planning, but the data in them is out of date, and stated that is why she asked Ms. Clark about an updated PMP. She repeated that the counties rely on the Master Plan and the ANZ to update their zoning and said uncertainty around whether runways would be built or lengthened leads to inaccurate zoning updates.

Mr. Johnson asked whether the updated Part 150 Study would include the airport's planned but unbuilt parallel runway. Mr. Rineer said it would not, though he confirmed the ANZ's ten-year forecast contour does include the projected parallel runway, consistent with its inclusion in the Airport Layout Plan. Ms. Reese noted there is no guarantee the parallel runway will ultimately be constructed, and Mr. Rineer agreed, while maintaining that different planning documents serve different, non-interchangeable purposes. Ms. Reese said she believed the inclusion of an element that is not guaranteed to be constructed skews the data, which should reflect the current environment for something as critical as land use planning. She noted she could compile information on the Master Plan data and share it with the county councils.

Ms. Clark cautioned that the various documents should not be used interchangeably when discussing land use decisions, as the Master Plan, the Part 150 study, and the ANZ are different documents. She noted that the Part 150 study will be completed in about 18 months and will then be the most up-to-date information. Ms. Clark and others confirmed that the proposed parallel runway would not be included in the Part 150 study.

Mr. Leary said he found it odd that the counties were expected to rely on maps and metrics provided by the MAA when making land use decisions. Mr. Rineer stated that ANZ-related noise mitigations are only available to properties within the 75 DNL contour, which is generally confined to the airfield itself. He said the MAA provides the contours to the counties, but the counties may choose to apply a lower threshold

at their own discretion. He noted that currently, tax relief is only available to properties within the 75 DNL contour.

Mr. Marty Krizan, a member of the public, questioned why the MAA would proceed with land use decisions based on DNL while the FAA is simultaneously forming a committee to evaluate alternative metrics. He referenced a website he created, truenoise.org, which he said demonstrates that aircraft noise is an event-based phenomenon poorly represented by an average metric such as DNL, and noted that noise has measurable physiological, not merely subjective, health effects. He said the current 75 DNL contour, confined to airport property, effectively provides no meaningful relief to the surrounding community because DNL is the wrong metric for making mitigation decisions. He suggested that metrics for the number of noise events above a given threshold and average intervals between events would better capture actual impact. He noted that during the upcoming Runway 10/28 closure, reduced spacing between overflights could produce a stress response in residents. He stated that research has found that an interval of roughly 30 minutes is typically needed to recover from the stress. Mr. Krizan emphasized that the metric must be changed before committing to future land use decisions and stated he did not think DNL should be used any longer to make noise decisions.

Mr. Sakellariou noted that while the FAA's new committee will examine alternative metrics, the Part 150 Study is a process that must follow existing FAA guidelines, which include the use of DNL as the primary metric. Mr. Rineer clarified that the Part 150 Study is voluntary, but the MAA has elected to undertake the study because it makes the airport eligible for federal mitigation and monitoring funding, and that until the FAA formally adopts a new metric, the study must use DNL. Mr. Krizan questioned why MAA would not wait for the new committee's findings if the study is voluntary; Mr. Rineer responded that delaying would prevent residents who currently qualify for noise mitigation from accessing it. Ms. Reese noted that mitigation funding is limited and has a long waiting list; Mr. Rineer disagreed, stating that MAA recently completed soundproofing for 130 homes at a cost of several million dollars, noting that Ms. Reese may be thinking of a different program.

Mr. Johnson recapped the meeting with the Anne Arundel County Council and said the County now had the information to allow them to decide how to proceed regarding zoning changes and encouraged members of the public to raise their concerns directly with their County Council representatives. He stated that the Roundtable only presented the information and did not endorse any particular action regarding zoning or other changes. Ms. Jung agreed, noting that while land use protections may not benefit residents already within a noise zone, they remain important for advocating for future protection in areas that do not yet have residential development.

Review of Follow-Up Questions to the FAA:

Regarding the Runway 15R east flow departures and the impact on residents in Severn, Senator Van Hollen offered to contact the FAA on behalf of the Roundtable and residents of Severn. The Senator's office shared the FAA response with the Roundtable, and on June 28, 2026, the Roundtable submitted several follow-up questions to the FAA via Senator Van Hollen. These questions included how long each stage of FAA Order 8260.43C is expected to take; how to process the current Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) Gateway request as quickly as possible; when the request will be published on the IFP Gateway website; and what other waypoints other than WARYN may be candidates for adjustment and why. Mr. Johnson shared the FAA's responses to the follow-up questions, which were received on July 17, 2026.

Regarding the first question, the FAA provided a chart outlining the full IFP implementation process and timeline. Mr. Johnson said the request, submitted February 18, 2026, remains in the initial feasibility review phase; this phase typically lasts three to five months. Subsequent phases include final review by

the FAA flight procedures team, an environmental review, and procedure development. Mr. Johnson said the FAA estimated this process could take approximately 40 months. He noted the environmental review is the longest phase, at approximately 12 months, and said the FAA also has a 12-month monitoring and review period following procedure implementation.

Regarding the second question about prioritization, Mr. Johnson explained that FAA guidance places National Airspace System safety projects first, followed by projects with mandatory publication deadlines, such as navigational aid infrastructure changes. National airspace initiatives, including congressional responses and Part 150 noise procedures, fall lower in the priority order, with the Roundtable's request currently near the lower end. He commented that the Roundtable was informed that the timeline might be expedited if their request was paired with a more critical request. Mr. Johnson also noted that he hoped the review of their request would include new noise metrics.

Regarding the third question, the FAA indicated that a procedure's status becomes visible on the IFP Gateway once it is within two years of its proposed publication date, which Mr. Johnson estimated would place publication of the Roundtable's request around 2028. In response to a question from Mr. Leary about whether the Roundtable's request could be incorporated into the upcoming Part 150 Study, Mr. Rineer said MAA is in the scoping phase and has not yet begun that study.

Ms. Kennington-Gardiner explained that the IFP Gateway's highest priority is addressing safety, and that the IFP Gateway queue is a dynamic pipeline; newly identified safety issues can move ahead of existing noise abatement requests at any time. She said that absent any other higher priority actions, a request like the Roundtable's could be completed within months, but the current queue makes that unlikely in the near term. Ms. Kennington-Gardiner assured the Roundtable she would brief them once the FAA completes the initial validation phase but said that was still underway, noting that quarterly or regular updates from the FAA would likely not provide substantive information. She said the Roundtable should not expect updates from the FAA until the validation process has been completed and reiterated that noise abatement requests will never be prioritized ahead of safety procedures, since noise abatement is only addressed once a procedure is confirmed to be safe.

Ms. Kennington-Gardiner noted that the FAA had already implemented one noise abatement procedure for BWI based on the Roundtable's input. Mr. Leary asked about the status and results of the 12-month review of that change. Mr. Rineer said the review had been completed, with no safety concerns identified as part of the review. He said the community raised concerns regarding noise increases over Severn, which have been addressed through the IFP Gateway submission. Ms. Kennington-Gardiner concurred. Mr. Rineer emphasized that the current issues over Severn are noise issues, not safety issues.

Ms. Reese asked to correct the record, saying she disagreed that the Roundtable had reviewed or endorsed the 2024 WARYN waypoint change, stating that it was not part of the changes the Roundtable reviewed in 2019 and asked MAA to corroborate that characterization. Mr. Rineer maintained that the change involving the WARYN waypoint was briefed to and approved by the Roundtable. Ms. Reese disagreed, saying the WARYN changes had nothing to do with the Roundtable's 2019 analysis. She requested that the MAA provide documentation that the Roundtable reviewed and approved these changes.

Mr. Bassarab interjected, saying that BWI's noise abatement procedures have existed for over 30 years; these procedures historically instructed pilots to begin turns no sooner than a defined distance from the runway end, rather than at a fixed waypoint. For Runway 15R, departures could initiate turns at 1 or 2 DME from the runway end, depending on the departure direction. He said the 2024 changes attempted

to mimic the distance-based noise abatement departure by placing the WARYN waypoint at the 1 DME mark. As a result, prior to the 2024 changes, turns could be initiated at varying distances from the runway end, but now all turns for Runway 15R westbound departures occur at the WARYN waypoint. Mr. Bassarab said the MAA did not anticipate the high concentration of flights over WARYN. He said that the procedures currently in place, not only for Runway 15R but for Runway 10/28 as well, mimic the airport's long-standing noise abatement procedures.

Mr. Rineer stated that this change had been briefed to the Roundtable and said the MAA's analysis included in that briefing showed an expected increase of 2 to 3 dB over the Severn area. Mr. Bassarab agreed. Ms. Reese strongly disputed that this briefing occurred and maintained that the Roundtable never approved a plan involving an increase in noise over Severn or analyzed changes relating to the WARYN waypoint. Mr. Johnson said the Roundtable's Technical Committee reviewed the FAA materials and subsequently informed the Roundtable that the FAA planned to make changes relating to WARYN. He also stated that the FAA did point out the potential for noise increase over Severn during east flow operations. Ms. Reese asserted that at a previous meeting, she and Mr. Chancellor stated that the Roundtable had not been briefed on WARYN nor informed about noise increases, but Mr. Johnson did not speak up then. Ms. Reese emphatically declared that the WARYN change occurred outside of what the Roundtable recommended and analyzed. Mr. Johnson conceded it was possible that WARYN had not been analyzed but stated that the FAA did inform the Roundtable about the WARYN turn.

Ms. Jung asked Ms. Kennington-Gardiner why the health of people on the ground is not included as part of the FAA's safety mission. She referenced a health study led by Dr. Zafar Zafari, an associate professor at the University of Maryland School of Pharmacy and a member of the MAC, that quantified the 10-year health and economic cost of aircraft noise exposure. Ms. Kennington-Gardiner said she understands and appreciates the concern but reiterated that the FAA's mission is centered on the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, while broader public health impacts fall under the purview of agencies such as Health and Human Services. She noted the cited study has not undergone peer review or broader validation and said peer-reviewed or otherwise validated studies such as this would be considered as part of the FAA's noise policy review or by the ANAC. Ms. Kennington-Gardiner added that other sources, including surface transportation, also contribute to community noise and emissions. She emphasized that the human health aspect is not what the FAA as an agency is authorized to do, saying the FAA flight procedure implementation process focuses specifically on the safety of the aircraft tracks themselves, with noise abatement pursued wherever possible without compromising safety.

Mr. Brent Girard, representing Senator Van Hollen's office, said the Senator's office's main responsibility is ensuring that the FAA is responsive to the Roundtable's requests and credited the FAA's timely engagement so far, though he noted his office is still awaiting a response regarding the environmental and health impacts of the concentrated flight path. He agreed with Ms. Jung that it is a safety issue and cited concerns about cardiovascular disease and particulate matter exposure. He said his office has asked the FAA to substantiate its earlier claim that the aviation emissions impact is no worse than automobile exhaust, noting that, unlike car traffic, aircraft fly directly over residential areas. He also speculated that the FAA would not recognize the negative health impacts of aviation. Mr. Girard reaffirmed the Senator's continued commitment to the issue and concluded by saying that if no progress has been made on the IFP Gateway request, the Senator's office would consider using the 2028 FAA Reauthorization as leverage. Mr. Johnson and Ms. Jung thanked Mr. Girard and Senator Van Hollen's office for their continued support.

Planning For Next Meeting:

Mr. Johnson said the Roundtable would return to a monthly meeting schedule going forward, and the next meeting was scheduled for August 25, 2026.

Public Comment:

Mr. Johnson opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Andrew Protigal:

Mr. Protigal, a resident of Hanover, thanked Ms. Jung for her advocacy on the noise issue and disputed the noise characterizations discussed earlier regarding departures off Runway 33L, saying that based on his experience during previous Runway 10/28 maintenance periods, the noise impact has been severe. He said that without living through the experience directly, it is difficult to appreciate the impact regardless of the metrics or predictive models used. He said he supports a compromise that accounts for the health effects on surrounding communities while recognizing the airport's importance to the region.

Mr. Jimmy Pleasant:

Mr. Jimmy Pleasant referenced results from portable noise studies conducted the previous year, claiming that during that time, only one Howard County location was tested. This location was 10 miles from the airport and still experienced 80 dB departures and 75 dB arrivals. He argued that relocating flight paths would not meaningfully reduce noise levels given how far sound travels. He cited FAA hourly capacity data that stated BWI can accommodate up to 60 departures per hour, saying he has seen up to 40 departures per hour on Runway 28, which was already excessive. Mr. Pleasant said that the noise issue cannot be fixed as the operational pace is too high. He additionally claimed that at the last MAC meeting, the MAA's directors wanted to bring additional airline service to BWI and argued that noise and health issues should be resolved before pursuing additional flight volume.

Mr. Pleasant reiterated the view that DNL is an inappropriate metric for measuring aircraft noise impact and cited the FAA's recent Neighborhood Environmental Study, saying that study showed that all respondents were aggravated by aircraft noise. Mr. Pleasant stated that flight operations have been reduced due to fuel costs, but that reduction should not be mistaken for a resolved noise problem. He concluded by saying he understands the airport is an economic benefit to the state but asserted this benefit is not significant enough to counteract the negative noise effects on the communities.

Mr. Edward Flood:

Mr. Edward Flood asked that the Roundtable formally document in writing the impact of the Runway 15R westbound turn on the Severn area and referenced a conversation he and Mr. Johnson had had recently. He also raised the issue of funding the Roundtable and its activities, recalling that earlier flight path modeling had been funded through the counties or MAA and ultimately incorporated into FAA-accepted recommendations, and asked whether similar funding exists to support modeling associated with the current IFP Gateway submission. He asked when the FAA-recommended flight path for the current submission and the underlying data would be made available for public review so that the public can study the proposed and alternative flight paths. He expressed the need for the public to be able to provide input on these flight paths. Mr. Flood said he does not see an existing process for that to occur and commented that the current process has been grossly unfair to the roughly 12 homeowners' associations and 1,500 households affected.

Mr. Flood also raised concerns about aircraft noise over local schools, including Quarterfield Elementary School and Old Mill North Middle School, stating that operations on Runway 15R pass directly over these sites at altitudes below 2,000 feet. He said that despite significant investment in these schools, the impact of overhead flight noise on the learning environment has not been meaningfully addressed and observed that, based on the IFP Gateway timeline, these impacts would not be addressed until 2028.

Mr. Flood asked about the availability of previous meeting minutes. Mr. Rineer explained the previous meeting's minutes had not yet been published to the MAA website because they were approved earlier in that evening's meeting.

Ms. Jung asked about the original source of funding for the Roundtable's 2019 noise modeling study. Ms. Reese and Mr. Johnson said the work was completed under MAA's contract with HMMH, MAA's noise consultant. Ms. Jung asked how to budget for a similar effort for the WARYN analysis. Ms. Clark said the MAA would need to request funds from the State for that task and noted that funding for any new modeling would require approval. Mr. Rineer noted that the earlier procedure change had been submitted through the FAA's now-defunct Performance-Based Navigation implementation process, colloquially known as the "dot 41 process," whereas the current request is being handled through the IFP Gateway, and said he was uncertain how comparable funding could be secured under the newer process.

Ms. Reese said that the changes proposed by the Roundtable in 2019 were in response to a broader set of procedure changes put forth by the FAA, recalling that the Roundtable was only able to address a subset of those changes. She said the Roundtable included a disclaimer noting that they were unable to fully and comprehensively assess the impacts of the FAA's changes due to limited time and resources available.

Ms. Clark added that the original procedure review and development included a defined scope and charter, with the teams supporting that activity developed according to the defined scope. She stated that a similar action for the current IFP Gateway request would need to follow a similar process to define the scope of what the MAA would provide and what the funding needs would be, and that the scope and funding would require approval from the MAA's Executive Office.

In response to Mr. Flood's earlier question, Mr. Bassarab clarified that the current submission to the IFP Gateway requested that the FAA consider an altitude-based turn rather than a fixed waypoint but did not specify a particular altitude, leaving that determination to the FAA's flight safety criteria and review process. He said the FAA's environmental review process of that change will look for specific changes in DNL levels, noting that in 2019 MAA had independently funded a more detailed grid-point modeling study beyond what the FAA's own process requires. He said all parties first need the FAA to confirm that a proposed change is technically and operationally viable before MAA would move to fund a more detailed community-level noise evaluation. Mr. Bassarab said the request for more detailed modeling is appropriate but premature until a proposed procedure is available.

Ms. Kennington-Gardiner added that such a procedure is not yet available since the FAA has not determined an altitude that satisfies safety criteria. She said FAA review of a proposed procedure change considers, in order, technical feasibility, operational viability, and environmental impact, and that a change proceeds to publication only after all three are satisfied. Ms. Kennington-Gardiner said additionally, once those three factors are considered, the Roundtable and MAA will be asked to review and endorse the resulting flight path, and following that, the procedure will move forward to publication in the IFP Gateway. Mr. Flood asked if the Roundtable and MAA could provide a cost estimate for conducting studies similar to the earlier HMMH analysis. Ms. Jung asked what the earlier study cost; Mr. Bassarab estimated on the order of \$100,000.

Ms. Reese asked whether the Roundtable would have an opportunity to review any additional changes the FAA determines are necessary as a result of adjusting WARYN. Mr. Johnson said the requested modification may lead to changes to other waypoints and that he expects that the FAA will brief the Roundtable on the changes. Mr. Bassarab said WARYN is the first waypoint following departure from Runway 15R, and that the FAA has indicated other runways' initial waypoints may also require adjustment. Ms. Kennington-Gardiner added that procedure criteria evolve over time, and that a change deemed infeasible in the past may become viable as criteria and aircraft capabilities change. She cautioned, though, that any proposed change could still ultimately be found nonviable, whether for operational or environmental reasons, including opposition from other affected communities. She noted that noise abatement procedures are developed to leverage existing environmental and other conditions, while the FAA's development of primary flight procedures focuses on aircraft stability on final approach and other safety concerns. She stated that noise abatement procedures are alternatives to primary procedures when air traffic control conditions allow.

Mr. Michael Nemo asked why the procedures could not revert to those used before the 2024 changes, noting those NextGen-era paths did not generate the same level of complaint over the Severn area and had been flown safely for years. Ms. Jung noted that the Roundtable's charter stated that the group's purpose was reversion to pre-NextGen conditions and dispersion. Several Roundtable members unequivocally stated that reversion is impossible. Mr. Marty cited insufficient controller staffing and the loss of manual vectoring capability at the necessary scale, adding that congestion and complexity of the surrounding airspace further complicate any changes. Ms. Reese acknowledged the desire to return to earlier, more dispersed flight paths but agreed the issue is not straightforward. She noted that the U.S. Navy implemented similar precise guidance for carrier landings, which eventually was updated to incorporate variation in the precise touchdown point. Ms. Reese said this proves the FAA could design dispersion into the flight procedures but said it would require full, holistic airspace redesign. She said several community groups are advocating for this. She also stated that increases in efficiency could be gained through a full airspace redesign. However, she made the point that such a redesign would require significant funding and dedicated champions to advocate for it. Mr. Marty said the FAA would not revert to pre-NextGen procedures but stated that the procedures can be modified slightly. He also reminded the group that the DC Metroplex airspace is complex so reversion would affect the whole metroplex, not just BWI airspace. Mr. Nemo maintained that the earlier arrangement had worked previously and emphasized that dispersing noise more broadly would be a fairer outcome.

Unidentified Commenter:

An unidentified commenter said the daily extent of noise exposure has not been adequately addressed, stating that on the day of the meeting, overflight noise in his neighborhood began around 5:06 a.m. and continued until 10:00 a.m. He mentioned that the previous weekend, overflights began at 4 a.m. and continued for two days, with the longest gap between flights lasting only about five minutes. He said the noise makes outdoor activity impractical and is audible indoors as well, and that he can reliably step outside during a noise event and see the underside of the aircraft overhead.

Ms. Laura Donovan:

Ms. Laura Donovan noted that Runway 10/28 is 10,500 feet long and asked if, during the closure, operations would occur on a runway of different length. Mr. Rineer said the runway would be the same length. She then asked if the MAA could show go-around routes, saying that flights over her house do not appear to follow any defined paths, and registered concern about further variability while the runway is closed.

Ms. Donovan then mentioned a recent study from Norway or Sweden that indicated a link between high noise exposure and Parkinson's disease.

Meeting Closeout:

Mr. Johnson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Schuyler seconded. All were in favor, and the motion passed. The meeting was adjourned at 10:01 p.m.