

DC METROPLEX BWI COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE WORKING GROUP PUBLIC MEETING

Forty-first meeting of the DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Working Group

Tuesday, October 11, 2022 7:07 p.m. – 9:12 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	✓	Marcus Parker, Sr	Alternate for Dan Klosterman, District 32	
Austin Holley, Vice Chair*	District 33	✓	Debra Jung*	Howard County Council, District 4	✓
Ellen Moss*	District 2 Anne Arundel County Council		Brent Girard	Office of Senator Chris Van Hollen	online
Mary Reese*	District 30	✓	Adam Spangler	Office of Congressman Anthony G. Brown	
Jesse Chancellor*	District 9	✓	Sam Snead*	Office of Anne Arundel County Executive Steuart Pittman	
Howard Johnson*	District 12	✓	Laila Jones	Office of Anne Arundel County Executive Steuart Pittman	
Drew Roth*	District 12	✓	Bruce Gartner*	Office of Howard County Executive Calvin Ball	✓
Scott Philips*	District 13	✓	Mandy Remmell*	Office of Baltimore County Executive Johnny Olszewski	
Paul Verchinski	Alternate District 13	online	Paul Shank, Chief Engineer	MDOT MAA	
Evan Reese*	District 30	✓	Darline Terrell-Tyson, Director, Office of Environmental Compliance and Sustainability	MDOT MAA	✓
Al Donaldson*	District 32	✓	Greg Voos	Mid Atlantic Regional Representative, NBAA	
David Nibeck	Alternate for District 32		Kyle Evans	General Aviation Representative, CP Management LLC	
Daniel Woomeer*	District 32	✓	David Richardson	Southwest Airlines	online
Dan Klosterman*	District 32	✓	Veda Simmons	FAA Community Engagement Officer, Eastern Service Center, Operations Support Group	✓
			Steve Alterman	President, Air Cargo Association	

\*Voting members

## ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS

Maryland Department of Transportation Maryland Aviation Administration (MDOT MAA)  
Bruce Rineer, Manager, Noise Section

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)  
Veda Simmons (Online) – Community Engagement Officer

Contractor Support  
Royce Bassarab, HNTB  
Jordan Mueller, Assedo Consulting  
Jessica Fugate, Assedo Consulting

## MEETING MATERIALS

None

### **1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

#### *Introduction and Roll Call of Attendees*

Mr. Bruce Rineer began the meeting at 7:07 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. He stated that the meeting was being recorded and directed the in-person public attendees to approach the microphone during the public comment portion of the meeting. Mr. Rineer explained to those attending virtually that there is a question box where all comments and questions can be submitted and reviewed. He went on to state that the Chair would then determine how and when the questions would be read and answered. Mr. Rineer stated that if attendees experienced technical difficulties, they should log off and log back on. Finally, Mr. Rineer addressed the members of the audience, reminding them that if they have something to say then they need to sign-up at sign-in. He also informed them that public comments would be limited to 2 minutes.

Mr. Rineer concluded the introduction and turned the meeting over to the Roundtable Chair, Ms. Debra “Debbie” MacDonald. 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 transitioned to approving the agenda. Mr. Daniel Woomer motioned to approve, and Ms. Debra Jung seconded. All approved. None opposed.

#### *Review and Approve June 21<sup>st</sup> and August 16<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes*

Ms. MacDonald moved on to approve meeting minutes. Ms. MacDonald explained that the June 21<sup>st</sup> minutes were unusually long, and Roundtable members requested to read the minutes before formal approval. Ms. MacDonald asked if anyone had any questions about the June 21<sup>st</sup> minutes. No questions were raised, and Mr. Woomer motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Ms. Jung seconded. All were in favor, none opposed.

Ms. MacDonald then stated that the August meeting minutes approval was postponed in September as a quorum was not reached. Mr. Woomer motioned to approve the minutes. Ms. Jung seconded. All were in favor, none opposed.

## **2. ROUNDTABLE CHAIR COMMENTS**

Ms. MacDonald stated that there was going to be quite a few presenters during the meeting. She stated that there was quite a bit of new information to share from the last month. She then moved on to the MAA update.

## **3. MDOT MAA UPDATE**

Ms. MacDonald stated that she had hoped to get an MAA update from Mr. Paul Shank, but as he was not in attendance, Ms. MacDonald asked other MAA staff for the update. Ms. Darline Terrell-Tyson stated that the MAA was wrapping up the review and working to get comments to the FAA before the next Roundtable meeting. Ms. Terrell-Tyson clarified that the review is from the August presentation. Ms. Terrell-Tyson indicated that the review should be done before the next Roundtable meeting and will be sent to the FAA following the review from the MAA. Ms. Jung and Ms. MacDonald stated that this was great news.

Mr. Jesse Chancellor requested clarification from either the MAA or the FAA on the exact next steps required for the FAA to begin its full environmental review. Mr. Chancellor stated that additional clarity was needed as he believed that there was an industry component to the approval, and it was still unclear what the specific steps were.

Ms. Jung believed that Mr. Chancellor's question was one for Ms. Veda Simmons. Ms. MacDonald confirmed that Mr. Chancellor's question was sent to Ms. Simmons and believed that Mr. Shank would have given an MAA update on those steps had he been in attendance.

Ms. MacDonald asked Ms. Simmons to clarify whether the comments or approval would be complete by the next Roundtable meeting. Ms. Jung surmised that the approval of the review of the August presentation by the MAA would be completed by the next meeting to then send to the FAA to move forward with their next steps.

Ms. MacDonald then asked if there was a hold regarding the NEPA process as there are other changes that do not impact the progress. Ms. Terrell-Tyson stated that the FAA would need to address that. Mr. Drew Roth asked Ms. Terrell-Tyson if she anticipated approval of the FAA proposal and that there is no action of the Roundtable. Ms. Terrell-Tyson agreed.

Mr. Chancellor reiterated that there was still a frustrating lack of clarity. Mr. Chancellor stated that it was his understanding that the FAA was waiting on the MAA approval of all the flight path changes that were reviewed that the FAA has already approved for the beginning of an environmental review but needed the MAA approval for the process to start. It was Mr. Chancellor's understanding that the FAA was on hold for the MAA to review the flight paths. He stated that Mr. Shank had asked for Industry to approve the flight paths and it was unclear whether it was just Southwest Airlines, all the commercial carriers, or none of the commercial carriers need to approve.

Mr. David Richardson, a representative from Southwest Airlines, addressed Mr. Chancellor. Mr. Richardson stated that he was reluctant to say anything as he was not well-versed in the process. Mr. Richardson stated that the hard part and the good part is that the FAA has come to the table and proposed changes. Mr. Richardson noted that the FAA does not fly aircraft, only regulates the air space, and that Southwest only flies 737s, thus the broader Industry will have an opportunity to look and review. He continued by stating that the Roundtable's recommendations need to fit into a larger context beyond the Roundtable's scope. Mr. Richardson reiterated that while he is not well-versed in the process, he did believe that other carriers would have the opportunity to weigh-in and comment.

Mr. Chancellor thanked Mr. Richardson for the clarity. He then asked Ms. Simmons if Mr. Richardson's comment was congruent with the FAA practices. He apologized for belaboring the point but said they have been waiting for 5 years to get the process underway. Ms. Simmons started by stating the Roundtable gave the FAA a consensus for the proposed flight procedures and that Ms. MacDonald had sent her that consensus roughly 3-4 days after the August 16th presentation. Ms. Simmons went on to say that the FAA is now waiting on the MAA to send a consensus before the NEPA process can start. She stated the MAA has a process just like the Roundtable does with its voting members. The process is now in the hands of the MAA and details of the process will have to come from the MAA.

Mr. Roth asked Ms. Simmons if the FAA has a requirement to hear from Industry. Ms. Simmons stated that the MAA has a process before they approve or deny, and that the FAA is waiting on the MAA for a consensus.

Mr. Dan Klosterman recalled a previous meeting where Mr. Shank indicated the routes would be flown on flight simulators. He then asked if that had been done. Ms. MacDonald stated that the Roundtable was hoping for an update from Mr. Shank at the meeting but he was not present so no update could be provided.

Ms. Mary Reese stated that the changes from the Roundtable were created and vetted with Southwest. She believed that the processes that MAA is going through is unrelated to the submittals provided by the Roundtable. She continued to say that the FAA has several items that do not impact the Roundtable that they may not be privy to or impact the Roundtable. She stated that she believed that the MAA is completing processes unrelated to the Roundtable's proposal, but integral to MAA guidelines. She stated that while the MAA process may be slowing the process down, it should not impact the Roundtable's proposals. She concluded that her hypothesis would need to be verified by the MAA. Mr. Richardson agreed with Ms. Reese's sentiments.

Ms. MacDonald thanked Ms. Reese and Mr. Richardson and stated that was as much clarity as the Roundtable would receive for now.

Mr. Holley asked why the process is so difficult and nebulous. Ms. Deb Jung stated the reason it is difficult to understand is that the person with the knowledge was not in attendance. Ms. MacDonald then reiterated that the MAA said the process would be complete prior to the next Roundtable meeting, and that Mr. Holley may have missed that announcement.

Ms. Simmons recalled an email that was sent to her and Ms. MacDonald on October 3<sup>rd</sup> from Mr. Ricky Smith about MAA's process. Ms. MacDonald stated that the email was no more detailed than what was already heard.

Ms. MacDonald stated she would follow up with Mr. Shank to gain clarity in the process moving forward. Mr. Scott Philips asked if there was some type of public SOP for the process that airports go through when procedures change. Ms. MacDonald stated she was hoping to have received a more detailed explanation about the process.

#### **4. ROUNDTABLE COMMITTEE UPDATES**

##### Legislative Committee

Ms. MacDonald transitioned into the legislative committee report. Ms. Reese started the conversation by stating that there was a gentleman who sits on the Anne Arundel Transportation Commission who had reached out to Ms. Reese and Mr. Sam Sneed via email. She continued by stating that the gentleman has experience designing airport capacity, designing, and implementing Nextgen, and working for Rand. Ms. Reese stated that he informed both her and Mr. Evan Reese of some new information they were not previously aware of. The gentleman was concerned about the current planned placement of an additional runway at the BWI Airport. Ms. Reese then posed a few questions that she would like the Roundtable to formally ask:

- What is the purpose of the new runway?
- What does the MAA hope to achieve by building the new runway?

Ms. Reese stated that it is unclear when the runway will be built, it is within the 5-year plan. She mentioned that the concerning part about this news is that if the new runway is constructed, all the arrivals and departures will need to be redesigned, rendering years of hard work moot. She continued by stating that when that process begins, there will need to be an entity in place to take community concerns into consideration when the FAA redesigns arrival procedures. She stated that while the timeline and construction is a bit in flux, it is important to be aware of it as it will require an entirely new redesign process.

Ms. Reese then mentioned that she received an email from Senator Beidle on August 4<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Reese then addressed the representatives attending the meeting directly, stating that her schedule was becoming full, but mentioned that the Senator was interested in supporting another health study. Ms. Reese asked the District 32 representatives to inquire with Senator Beidle and ask if she was still interested in supporting a new study, and whether she would like input from the Roundtable regarding what health issues have yet to be studied. Ms. Reese also mentioned that a dollar figure investment of \$200,000-\$250,0000 was mentioned. Ms. Reese concluded by asking if district representatives could have an answer from Senator Beidle regarding her support for a new health study by the November Roundtable meeting. Mr. Woomer indicated that he would follow-up.

Ms. Jung then gave an update regarding the report from Dr. Zafari. She stated that the study was sent to everyone via a word document as well as a password protected pdf. She continued by stating that the noise impacts from Nextgen were estimated to cost \$40 million dollars in health impacts every year to those who live under the Nextgen "highway in the sky". She then clarified that this was just noise

impact, not particulate matter, adding that she had hoped that was a subject that could be studied next. Ms. Jung then thanked Mr. Chancellor, Ms. MacDonald, and Ms. Reese for their aid in helping create a press release to get the word out about Dr. Zafari's study. She then mentioned that the Baltimore Sun had mentioned the study, and asked Mr. Chancellor his thoughts.

Mr. Chancellor said the study was eye-opening. He stated that there was an understanding after talking to residents that lived near and under the flight paths that it was hard to live with. He went on to summarize the study stating that the study concluded that there needs to be a public health intervention regarding air noise pollution. Mr. Chancellor stated that it can no longer be "business as usual" when it comes to flight path operations and how the airport conducts business. He continued by stating that the FAA has revolutionized the air space, but the airport authority has not adjusted. Mr. Chancellor then described an imbalanced relationship between the economic value of the airport against public health. He went on to say that the tendency was to ignore the public health in favor of the economic value, a paradigm that Mr. Chancellor believes cannot continue.

Ms. Jung requested to view the MDOT Consolidated Transportation Plan (CTP) roadshow in Howard County. Ms. Jung pointed out the speakers in the video, naming the third from the left was Secretary Ports, and Administrator Smith as second from the right. She explained that the meeting was held to discuss how funds were being used for various road improvements across Howard County. Mr. Bruce Gartner stated that it was a 6-year capital program. He stated this was a draft program before going to general assembly this winter. Ms. Jung seconded Mr. Gartner's response. Mr. Roth asked if the new BWI runway was mentioned. Ms. Jung confirmed it was.

Mr. Reese addressed Mr. Roth, stating that a 6-year plan was not necessary to build the runway as it can be completely funded from the federal government. Mr. Roth responded stating that he mentioned it because the proposed runway has been used in the airport noise study to obscure the long-term impacts of noise. He went on to say that for the last two cycles of the Airport Noise Zone study done under the noise abatement law, the 10-year out view shows noise contours based on an imaginary runway. He continued stating that there is no information under the current noise abatement law for the noise 10 years out under the current runway configuration. He stated that the hypothetical runway is being used to avoid the question 'what will the noise be 10 years from now'. Mr. Reese agreed with Mr. Roth. Mr. Reese then stated that he wanted to see both. Mr. Reese reiterated that the runway does not need to be in the plan to come to fruition. Ms. Reese then asked Mr. Roth if he saw the comments that she had submitted in the budget language for last session. She stated that they are fighting to get the plans Mr. Roth is commenting on. Mr. Roth then stated he was not fighting the claim that the runway is coming. Ms. Reese stated that Mr. Roth's comments did in fact appear to be fighting the claim. Mr. Reese, Ms. Reese, and Mr. Roth all agreed that they would like to see information relating to the potential runway and its impacts. Mr. Reese and Mr. Roth agreed that they would like to see the noise impacts calculated using the current runway configuration at 10 years as well as the 10-year noise impacts with the additional runway.

Ms. Jung gave context to the video. She stated that during the meeting, she proclaimed that something new needed to be done. She then stated that Administrator Smith and Secretary Ports were both very happy at the increased cargo coming into the area more than National and Dulles combined. Ms. Jung stated that she informed the Administrator and Secretary that those are not metrics that the communities that live on the ground are happy about, as the cargo planes are among the worst in terms of air noise that wakes up the residents every day of their lives. She also informed those at the

Roadshow that Dr. Zafari's report had come out that week that included a press release, and \$40 million in health impacts every year was not helpful to those who are living on the ground, and that it was critical to think about how to help the people living on the ground experiencing the impacts from flight paths. Mr. Bassarab then played the video from the 7:20 mark so attendees at the Roundtable meeting could hear the response from Secretary Ports and Administrator Smith. There was some difficulty with playback. (Skip to the 38:20 mark to hear the playback. Note—the video will not match the audio.) In the video Administrator Smith can be heard saying that they will do everything they can to expedite the NEPA process, but it is in the hands of the MAA and FAA. He goes on to say that the challenge they have is looking at the \$40 million versus the \$9 billion that comes from the economic impact of BWI. Secretary Ports agreed.

Ms. Reese asked the MAA what economic study was being cited regarding the \$9 billion economic impacts, as it was difficult to find. Mr. Reese questioned what the prospectus was for the \$9 billion economic impact, as it would be knowledge that for any publicly traded entity to have to be able to provide to its stockholders.

Ms. Reese reiterated that it was important to have access to the study. She then suggested that the Roundtable formally and officially ask the MAA for the study.

Mr. Bruce Gartner stated that it was his understanding that the study was done by Martin Associates every year and sometimes the report is given to the general assembly.

Ms. Jung stated that the point of showing the video was to highlight the federal, local, and community challenges that community members and the Roundtable are up against every day. Ms. Jung summarized that it was a constant weighing of "how much do we care about the people living on the ground and the health impacts we are forcing on them" versus "how much money are we making from this airport in tax revenue and various other ways that we're making money". She then reiterated Mr. Chancellor's previous sentiments, stating that it is imperative that a balance is found.

Mr. Howard Johnson asked if was possible to forecast the potential blight from the pathways. Ms. MacDonald asked for clarity. Mr. Johnson responded by citing examples like property values, people moving, tax revenues being lost, etc.

Mr. Chancellor then stated that there was no cost-benefit analysis (CBA) done for Nextgen outside of business impacts and airplane logistics. Mr. Chancellor clarified that there was no CBA done for the communities.

Mr. Johnson questioned whether they could petition representatives for studies on property values, tax revenue and other metrics to understand the current impacts of the flight paths on communities.

Ms. Reese stated that there are many metrics that can be studied but it is important to prioritize the studies that will be the most valuable, adding that the suggestions Mr. Johnson made are valuable. She continued by stating that while these are good suggestions, and the studies are ones that the commission may investigate, it is a big task for Roundtable members to keep doing as they are only volunteers and are exhausted from the extensive process. Ms. Reese also added that the most exhausting from a legislative side is the "dogma" of "business-as-usual", and any questioning of the business is a threat to the airport and its longevity and the State. Ms. Reese emphatically stated that is not the truth. She stated that there are innovators, such as her and her husband but that it is exhausting to deal with individuals who get defensive about the airport that they are determined to only allow the

FAA to deal with the problem. She states that there are “novel and wonderful ways” as to how to address the runways that could change the way air noise impacts communities and reduce them. She continues stating that there is a need for more talent and more people to do the work, but there are people in office convinced that the airport needs to be protected at all costs. She stated that this mindset makes it incredibly difficult to acquire funds for activities like a Commission, citing the recent bill that died in committee. Ms. Reese stated that the Roundtable does not have the funds to do the work that needs to be done, and decision-makers are afraid to do and fund the work that needs to be done as it is seen as a challenge to the airport and its endeavors. Ms. Reese stated that she hopes that with a new governor comes new ideas to match the people who want to do the work. Ms. Reese reiterated a sentiment noted a previous meeting that it is rude and disrespectful that representatives from key stakeholders continue to not show up to the meetings in-person.

Mr. Reese spoke on behalf of the Roundtable members and stated that it was understood that when it comes to aviation and airports in the United States that aviation and airports are a zero-sum game that puts safety above all else, and the MAA and FAA hide behind that. He stated that there are many ways to be safe and the airport is not a zero-sum game, stating that anything can be done with a big enough check. He reiterated the need for a CBA. Mr. Reese then stated that he was disappointed that Mr. Shank was not in attendance, while thanking Ms. Terrell-Tyson and other MAA members for attending.

Ms. Reese added that it was frustrating to know the MAA is verbally telling legislators they support the Roundtable’s efforts, but do not show up in-person to do so. She continued by stating the Roundtable members love and support the airport and aviation. Furthermore, people cannot move away from the airport, and not collaborating with the communities to minimize impacts equitably is “mind-blowing”.

Mr. Roth stated that he looked up where the \$9 billion figure came from, stating that it came from a BWI economic impact study from 2017. He went on to say what the figure is referencing, nor does it say over what time it refers to. He recommended that when the MAA responds to Ms. Reese’s requests, to respond with substantive metrics and documents.

Mr. Philips had a question about Dr. Zafari’s study. He questioned who the study was funded by, suggesting one of the funders as MDOT. Ms. Jung and Ms. MacDonald confirmed that it was, but also stated that it was a bit more complicated than that. Ms. Jung stated it was \$100K and pursued by Senator Lam, Hestor, Elfreth and Reilly and many delegates. Mr. Philips was appreciative of those who pursued it but warned that the study was incredibly conservative due to the data used being a best-case scenario. Mr. Roth clarified that the present value of the impact was \$800 million. He went on to say that value was not insignificant, and that was the present value over 30 years. Mr. Philips went on to say that if this was a simulation study, then the simulation is only as good as the data put in, and that the data that was provided was data provided by the MAA, not real-world data. Ms. Jung stated that even with the numbers being provided by the MAA, the number was still eye-opening. Mr. Roth summarized the study funding by stating it was funded by state money and administrated by MDOT. Mr. Reese confirmed that the MAA provided data that the Roundtable has been using since the start of the process. Mr. Philips stated that he brought this up due to the apparent minimization of impact on the communities. Ms. MacDonald stated that more studies are needed. Mr. Philips, who lives in Oakland Mills, mentioned that school performance back in 2014 were the top in the state to the bottom of the state in 2020. He stated that there could be other factors, correlation is not causation, but it is worth investigating. Ms. Reese stated that school performance would be a good study as well. Mr. Philips stated that impacts on children have an out-weighted societal impact as it impacts the future of society.



Mr. Philips then stated that at least 30,000 planes/year impact the schools in Oakland Mills. Mr. Philips discussed that his house is across the road from a school, and the noise study showed 65 db in his area. He continued to express concern over the noise and pollution impact from flights overhead.

Ms. Reese summarized that schools, economic impact study and respirable impact as items to ask Senator Beidle as study topics of interest. Mr. Woomer confirmed he would ask.

Mr. Philips added that when children are impacted by harmful environments, there is a need to educate them to help them understand how and what this does to them and their families psychologically and socially. He went on to say that his community is 70-80% minority students and the lowest income community in Howard County, and a community that can least afford mitigation efforts.

Mr. Chancellor mentioned that he attended a virtual seminar in June with the leading scientists around aviation noise and impact on sleep, health, and productivity. Mr. Chancellor suggested that the seminar video be played for the next meeting with Mr. Zafari present so people could ask him questions about his study. Mr. Chancellor also asked if people who opposed legislation that would help fund studies like Dr. Zafari's, as well as studies that Mr. Johnson and other Roundtable members have discussed. Mr. Chancellor's stated that having the opposition in the room for an open dialogue discussion would aid in a better understanding of how to move forward and address concerns. He proposed that be the part of the November meeting. Ms. Reese stated that an invitation would be extended.

#### Technical/Legislative Joint Committee Vianair Update

Mr. Chancellor presented the *BWI Thurgood Marshall Airport Aircraft Operations & Noise Exposure Monthly Report Summary for April 2022*. Mr. Chancellor indicated the Roundtable needs common data and common information and mutual understanding. Mr. Chancellor presented a summary report that was out to the technical committee and Vianair. He indicated that the goal of the presentation, which was in draft form, was for review and comment both during and after this meeting. They stated that the goal was to try and communicate what was 70 pages of dense technical information to 10-15 pages of public-facing, more user-friendly information in a different format. He wanted to convey to decision makers, both public officials, as well as individuals who have to make decisions about home ownership under these flight paths what their lives will look and what we all experience.

Mr. Chancellor's overview included comments that had been made to date, adding that he hoped additional comments who be provided at the meeting. He stated he wanted the report ready for dissemination by the next meeting in November. He concluded by stating that it was his hope that this summary was the first in a series of monthly reports. Mr. Chancellor continued, reciting language from the Vianair monthly summary document. He stated that "until we have an agreed reality, we can't draft solutions." He continued by stating that the "agreed reality must be greater than the impacted noise zone, since the noise pollution really covers the entire region. "He concluded by stating that there needs to be a better handle on noise pollution.

Mr. Chancellor continued his presentation, indicating that he listed the comments received from the technical committee, highlighting a few comments such as:

- Adding sources/references

- Removing redundant maps
- Adding a summary of takeaways
- Separating out east/west flow.

He then stated that the purpose of the virtual noise monitoring system was three-fold:

- 1) To communicate with the public
- 2) To get information before the flight paths were implemented to do a pre and post analysis
- 3) to develop a mutual understanding and start crafting better solutions for the community and the airport

Mr. Chancellor then showed two tables. One table depicting *the Economic Impact of BWI-Marshall*, and the other *Commercial Aviation and Health*. Mr. Chancellor indicated that the depicted tables are the metrics that need to be balanced. Mr. Chancellor stated that there are many components surrounding the economic impact of BWI that require balancing (jobs, income, visitors, etc.). Mr. Chancellor then stated that the study Mr. Zafari completed should be front and center. He went on to say that public complaints were growing, but those complaints were being minimized because of the small sample size. He continued stating that the small number can still be statistically significant, and that minimization should be avoided.

Mr. Chancellor discussed the next two panels and the airport noise in Europe, stating that the WHO recommends reducing noise levels to below 45dB during the day and 40 dB at night. Mr. Chancellor noted that the U.S. is not at European standards yet, as we are operating at a permissive 65 DNL. Ms. MacDonald asked about the statement, “FAA has adopted a 65 dBA DNL as the threshold of significant noise exposure, below which residential land uses are compatible” wondering whether they (FAA) stated in writing where the last part of the statement came from. Mr. Chancellor believes it was copied from an FAA document on their website. A brief Roundtable discussion ensued surrounding the arbitrariness of the 65 dBA DNL standard in the U.S. Mr. Chancellor continued with his presentation, showing the *Monthly Airport Operations- Anne Arundel and Howard Counties Combined*. Mr. Chancellor stated he wanted to depict dominant east/west flight paths coming from both counties. He then stated that better descriptions were needed for the public to better explain what is being shown. Mr. Chancellor then described the operation statistics, stating that the year-to-date figure is only March and April as that was the only available data. Mr. Chancellor then described the *cargo operations daytime vs. nighttime* graph, highlighting Ms. MacDonald’s request to see more cargo-related data.

The next slide presented was the *Anne Arundel County Noise Exposure: DNL (Daily Average) Landmark Virtual Noise Monitors*. He described the charts as the chosen landmarks used a special tracking technique to do the pre and post analysis and to see the impacts of where people live. He clarified that the chart shown was for April only, as the data is only available one month at a time. Mr. Chancellor explained that the charts are the DNL readings coming from the virtual system in Anne Arundel County. Mr. Chancellor gave an example, stating that for a 42 DNL, the 24-hour period is tracked and averaged. Mr. Chancellor showed the *Anne Arundel County Noise Exposure: Number-of-Events-Above 55 dBA*. He went on to say that the work Vianair does is incredibly detailed to do pre and post analysis of the flight paths. He then pointed out the number of events above 55 dBA over a location, indicating that these are

daily events. He stated that negative health impacts start to become apparent at 55dBA. He then presented the Howard County noise exposure and number of events. He went on to say that much of Howard County is within a 55DNL or higher but indicated that could be due to flight departures. Ms. Reese indicated that there could be a placement error of a noise monitor in Howard County. Mr. Chancellor stated that noise monitors may need to be replaced and readjusted.

Ms. Reese asked if seasonal shifts impact departures. She also asked for people to give suggestions on where other noise monitors could be placed. Mr. Philips added that the discrepancies may be perception of noise versus dBA. He found that there are differences between dBA and dBC. He went on to say the dBC is not necessarily a linear correlation always between them in Anne Arundel may be experiencing lower frequencies and a lower dBA, the impacts are still be felt as the wavelengths travel through buildings, thus experiencing negative psychological impacts.

Mr. Roth stated that the MAA provided a study about 1.5 years ago detailing the environmental impacts in terms of weather and wind in terms of noise perception as perceived on the ground. He went on to say that one would expect the noise in the winter to be perceived louder due to the lack of foliage, moisture content in the air, and temperature. His second observation, this data has 65/35 split between east flow and west flow approximately (speaking on the April Vianair data) on the departure data. 60% of the departures, which are louder, are over Howard County. They average in quiet times when flow is in the other direction. We do not know how loud it is as we have yet to assemble and present any data that does not average in quiet times.

When discussing the Howard County number-of-events, he pointed out that there were over 10,000 events above 55dBA above Oakland Mills High School in April.

He then presented noise contours across Howard and Anne Arundel Counties. He pointed out the 55 contour line as inside the deep-red color. Ms. MacDonald and Mr. Chancellor pointed out that the 55 DNL encompassed the most populated parts of Howard County. Mr. Roth and Ms. Jung stated that Columbia, Savage, and Elkridge contain more than half the population of Howard County. He then zoomed in on the counties individually, describing the contour maps. He stated that having the Vianair system allowed for a greater understanding of noise pollution and was a steppingstone to craft better solutions.

Mr. Chancellor showed a slide of what DNL is. He went on to say his next steps were to gather comments and update the presentation. He did have a request for the Roundtable, stating that he did not have a complete list of people who should receive the presentation. He requested an ad hoc committee to craft a recipient list for those who should receive this presentation. Mr. Alfred Donaldson volunteered.

Mr. Roth asked for the presentation to return to the Howard County DNL slide. He pointed out how bad the noise over Oakland Mills and Long Reach High School, adding one-third of the enrollment of Oakland Mills High comes from Elkridge and the Route 1 corridor where the noise is much worse than that. One half of the enrollment of Long Reach High School comes from the Route 1 corridor where kids experience much louder noise than that.

Mr. Chancellor concluded his presentation and turned it back over to Ms. MacDonald to give her presentation.

### Technical Committee

Ms. MacDonald stated that when she saw the data Mr. Chancellor presented, she was concerned about accessibility. She indicated that she wanted to see the data in a format that made sense and was accessible. She explained that she stripped the data from the tables and plotted it into Google Maps. She stated she created different layers for the landmarks and the grid. She noticed differences from month to month. She then overlaid the landmark layers. She stated that mapping it helped her understand the data and compare the landmarks versus the grid.

Mr. Chancellor stated that it would be helpful to have east/west flow. Ms. Reese asked what the distance was between grid points. Multiple Roundtable members answered 2.5 miles. Ms. MacDonald stated that this map was created to help her measure how far a point was from the airport to see high noise levels far from the airport.

Mr. Roth then discusses Maryland noise abatement law in Oxford Square. He stated that it is within the 65 DNL, but not under the noise abatement law. Ms. Jung asked if Ms. MacDonald was going to share the map. Ms. MacDonald was hesitant to share as it was only an exercise in understanding the data.

Mr. Roth suggested plotting MAA's noise monitoring points into the map as that may be helpful. He stated that the points chosen by Vianair were chosen with the understanding that the MAA's points would help fill in the gaps in data collection.

There was then a discussion about virtual monitoring with some over-talking.

## **6. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting was planned for November 15<sup>th</sup> with an effort to get Dr. Zafari to attend.

## **5. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ms. MacDonald moved the meeting to the public comment portion.

Mr. Jimmy Pleasant stated that in the April report, page 64, a single event noise levels where they made Contour maps (Vianair) shown runway 28 coming over Howard County. He stated that he lives 6 miles from the airport and brought up a report from BWI and HMMH in 2017 where he noted a discrepancy in decibel levels causing him to call into question the accuracy of the Vianair models.

Ms. MacDonald responded stating that we do not monitor single events.

Mr. Chancellor interjected stating they do not capture for reporting purposes, single events, in the Vianair system. They capture it to create the full data but do not report it out.

Mr. Pleasant continued, stating modeling does not work. Mr. Chancellor again asks him to send him an email.

Michael Bahr notes he read Mr. Zafari's study about environmental and health costs. He stated he was fearful about his insurance increasing because he lives under a flight path. He brought up the study's impacts on birth defects and likened the conversation to Love Canal. Ms. Jung agreed and had similar sentiments.

Ms. Laura Donovan asked about landmark monitors. Mr. Chancellor stated that the goal was to obtain enough monitors for a balance of data. He noted they tried to select good locations, some under current and future flight paths that may or may not be accepted by the FAA. He believed the map from Ms. MacDonald will help the public understand noise pollution. Laura asked what the difference was between 2 decibels. Mr. Chancellor stated that the if one looks online at the report, one can extrapolate their dBA.

## **7. ADJOURN**

Mr. Wormer motioned to adjourn the meeting Mr. Chancellor seconded. The meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.