

DC METROPLEX BWI COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE WORKING GROUP PUBLIC MEETING

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

Tuesday, November 15, 2022 from 7:02 p.m - 9:13 p.m.

Meeting held in-person and virtually via GoToWebinar

MEETING MINUTES

Regular Participants

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

*Voting Member

ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS

Maryland Department of Transportation Maryland Aviation Administration (MDOT MAA)

Bruce Rineer, Manager, Noise Section
Karen Harrell, Noise Program Administrator
Kevin Clarke, Director, Planning and Environmental Services

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)

Veda Simmons (Online) – Community Engagement Officer

Contractor Support

Royce Bassarab, HNTB
Jordan Mueller, Assedo Consulting
Michael Shipman, Assedo Consulting

MEETING MATERIALS

None

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Introduction and Roll Call of Attendees

Mr. Bruce Rineer began the meeting at 7:02 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. He stated that the meeting was being recorded and explained to those attending virtually that there is a question box where all comments and questions can be submitted. He went on to state that online attendees should log off and back on if they experience technical difficulties. He then stated that any in-person attendee who wanted to speak should have signed up prior, and they would be called during the comment period.

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 meeting agenda. Mr. Evan Reese made a motion to move the MDOT MAA update to after the Roundtable committee update. Mr. Jesse Chancellor seconded the motion. All were in favor, none opposed, and the motion was passed.

Review and Approve October 11th Meeting Minutes

Ms. MacDonald moved on to approve the meeting minutes. Ms. MacDonald said she received one edit to the October minutes, and it had already been corrected. Mr. Daniel Woomeer motioned to approve the minutes, and Mr. Drew Roth seconded. All were in favor, and the motion passed.

2. ROUNDTABLE CHAIR COMMENTS

Ms. MacDonald stated the primary subject of the meeting was public health. She then stated that many Roundtable members have worked towards establishing and supporting a commission that supports the

public health study, which aims to better understand the public health effects of aircraft noise. Ms. MacDonald informed the Roundtable members that she would be asking for assistance from the members who were not yet on a committee to aid in the outreach and communication efforts of the commission.

3. SCIENCE TOPICS (PUBLIC HEALTH)

Ms. MacDonald transitioned the conversation to Mr. Chancellor who started the discussion of public health impacts by showing an excerpt of a video from the previous summer that included three speakers who presented on issues related to legal health and community issues of aviation noise pollution.

The video excerpt was from *Panel 1— The Science: Aviation Noise, Pollution and Impacts on Health*. The panel on the video introduced Dr. Neeklakshi Hudda, a Research Assistant Professor at Tufts University who presented *The Impact of Aviation Emissions on Air Quality and Associated Health Effects in Near-Airport Communities*. The study found that adverse health conditions are prevalent at higher incident rates in near-airport communities. Dr. Hudda specifically focused on preterm births and brain cancer. She found that preterm birth rates among mothers exposed to ultrafine particles from jet exhaust had a higher risk of preterm birth compared to those who were exposed at the lowest pollution levels in communities surrounding Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). Similarly, the study found a higher risk of brain cancer for persons residing in near-airport communities, with African Americans showing a 32-percent higher risk of malignant brain cancer.

The next speaker introduced on the video was Dr. Mathias Basner, Associate Professor at the University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine. Dr. Basner presented a study titled *Noise Effects on Sleep and Health*. He stated that undisturbed sleep was important for physical and mental health. His study found that undisturbed, continuous sleep of sufficient duration is necessary for health and well-being, and traffic noise can disturb and impair sleep's recuperative effects. His presentation estimated that 1.6 million healthy life years lost annually in the EU due to environmental noise exposure.

Another speaker on the video, Professor Thomas Munzel, MD from the University Medical Center in Mainz, Germany, discussed noise and cardiovascular disease. His study examined how transportation noise may impact and damage the vasculature and the brain. After showing a synthesis of noise and health studies, the research showed that aircraft noise above a certain threshold may cause cardiovascular and cerebral/psychological damage. His presentation also suggested that nighttime aircraft noise may be more damaging to human health than daytime aircraft noise.

When the video concluded, Ms. MacDonald announced that Dr. Zafar Zafari's presentation would follow. Mr. Chancellor gave Dr. Zafari a brief introduction, stating that Dr. Zafari recently completed a study titled *Projecting the Health and Economic Burden of Aircraft Noise*. The study looked at the incremental health and economic burden at BWI and the surrounding region after the implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) flight paths.

Mr. Chancellor summarized that the study compared the current exposure level ("status quo") to exposure levels in 2012 (pre-NextGen). He said the flight paths of status quo negatively impact quality-adjusted life years, morbidity, mortality, and the cost of cardiovascular disease, anxiety, and low birthweights found in the study. Mr. Chancellor stated that due to NextGen's implementation, over a

30-year period, it will cost Marylanders between \$670 million and \$1.8 billion dollars, with an average cost of \$1.2 billion in total dollars. He then stated that in today's dollars it would cost \$434 million and \$1.2 billion, with an average of \$800 million.

Mr. Chancellor then quoted Dr. Zafari stating the model informs us that "public health measures to mitigate noise are warranted."¹ Mr. Chancellor then wondered how those mitigation strategies would be reached and recognized that it was a question for another meeting or for part of a later discussion.

Mr. Chancellor then welcomed Dr. Zafari to the podium for a Q&A session. Mr. Chancellor stated that due to the limited time they had with Dr. Zafari, questions would be limited to Roundtable members only, and any non-Roundtable member could submit their questions to the Roundtable, and the questions would be passed along.

Mr. Chancellor began the Q&A session by noting that Dr. Zafari's study was the first study he has seen that quantifies the health burden of aircraft noise, and asked Dr. Zafari if his study was one of the first studies to put a dollar amount to the loss of years, morbidity, the cost of drugs, and other factors found in the study. Dr. Zafari stated that there have been studies that have looked at cost of cardiovascular diseases, with a majority looking at direct medical costs. Dr. Zafari said his study was one of the first that looked at a variety of other health factors and direct and indirect costs.

Ms. Mary Reese asked how Dr. Zafari's research had been received so far. Dr. Zafari stated that he believed that it has attracted a lot of attention from scientists in noise-related areas as the study highlighted dollar values and quantified costs, an endeavor Dr. Zafari believed was one that many scientists have sought to do. He went on to say that the associated dollar values over a 30-year period are interesting as they indicate how much direct and indirect costs could be associated with noise and could be of interest to the scientific community.

Ms. Reese asked if Dr. Zafari had an idea of when his study would be published in a peer-reviewed journal. Dr. Zafari replied that his colleagues were reviewing the study for comments, and he is hoping it would be submitted within the next couple of months.

Mr. Scott Phillips stated that a similar study had been conducted in New York and wondered if Dr. Zafari could comment on how that study had been received by the public and others. Dr. Zafari stated that the studies do share some commonalities, but he believes his study was a bit more in depth as it attempted to accommodate many of the criticisms that had been received over the years. He stated his study was also more conservative when it came to risks of cardiovascular disease by looking at more studies to pool data from a wider range and add more health outcomes such as low birth weight. Dr. Zafari noted that the New York study was well received by a variety of outlets and even contributed to new policy outcomes in New York City. He also stated that though the New York study looked at the TNNIS flight path, he believed that there were some changes made to the flight path as a result of the outcomes of the study. Dr. Zafari mentioned a recent follow-up study published by his colleagues that looked at other outcomes like sleep disturbances on top of cardiovascular diseases due to feedback on the New York study regarding the fact that some of the parameters used in that study were not from US literature.

¹ *Protecting the health and economic burden of aircraft noise*, Zafar Zafari and Jeong-eun Park, page 11.

Ms. MacDonald asked if the dollar figures that are being reported in newspapers and other sources were the incremental costs and not the total dollars. She clarified that the difference, as she believed, was that the incremental costs were the difference with NextGen. She went on to say that it was important to understand what that dollar amount signifies, as there is an underlying cost that was measured. Dr. Zafari stated that the incremental costs look at the counterfactual scenario or the absence of flight paths in Maryland. He went on to say that though the data obtained from HMMH was older, it was still good because it contained pre-COVID data. He continued by stating that post-COVID-19, there were fewer flights and therefore less pollution and air noise. He stated that the incremental costs related to what they saw in 2015 after NextGen was implemented are relative to the counterfactual scenario. It is a projection of the population prior to the implementation of NextGen in 2012.

Ms. MacDonald said it is described as searching for balance but should be balanced against the total benefits. Mr. Chancellor rephrased Ms. Macdonald's comments, stating that when flights were dispersed at the airport, there was a health burden the community had to quantify that has not been studied, but the model presented in the study was trying to quantify the dollar amount and health burdens over a pre-established, community-accepted baseline. He went on to say that the Roundtable has been advocating to return to the status quo.

Dr. Zafari followed up stating that the study was not a cost-effectiveness report.

Ms. MacDonald then asked about the study parameters and wondered if the study solely looked at the population within the Airport Noise Zone (ANZ) or if the NextGen model changed that. Dr. Zafari gave an example stating that there is a population within 2012 noise contours, and that is then compared to the implementation of NextGen and how many people are exposed and the difference between them.

Ms. MacDonald asked if exposure was determined if populations are within the noise contours, stating that if someone was outside the noise contours, they were not considered, leading to a conservative estimate of noise exposure. Dr. Zafari confirmed her statements and indicated that the noise contours are average day-night noise level contours. Ms. MacDonald said it was important that the noise contours be as accurate as possible. Dr. Zafari agreed. Mr. Chancellor stated that the numbers used were the same numbers the Roundtable used to make their flight path recommendations to the FAA.

Mr. Chancellor asked about the quality-adjusted life years, as it is not intuitive. Dr. Zafari explained that it quantifies longevity and health-related quality of life during life years. He went on to say that some diseases are not fatal but reduce the quality of life, and that is captured in quality-adjusted life years.

Mr. Chancellor gave an example, stating that 60-year-old individuals and older should not look at the study area and assume that because they live in a particular area, they should take away 3 months of their life. Dr. Zafari confirmed. Dr. Zafari went on to say that the quality for one person is between 0 and 1, where 0 is dead or not living, and 1 is survived with perfect quality of life. He stated that when looking at population, the quality-of-life reductions are compared to the absence of risk. Mr. Chancellor stated that according to the study, over a 30-year period, there is a loss of over 14,000 quality-adjusted life years because of the changes at the airport as a discounted number. Dr. Zafari confirmed.

Mr. Bruce Gartner then asked if there was information showing other significant health impacts and public expenditures to defray the impact. He rephrased the question and asked if Dr. Zafari was aware of any studies that compare public health impacts and public health mitigation expenditures. Dr. Zafari stated that Mr. Gartner's question relates to cost-effectiveness analysis. Dr. Zafari gave the example of noise insulation, looking the capital costs compared to the health benefits. Mr. Gartner stated that it would be worth looking into to understand what the United States is willing to spend on public health mitigation measures. Mr. Chancellor summarized it by stating that if the net present value is greater than the cost of investment, then it should be done.

Ms. Reese stated that she often hears comments from researchers and individuals concerning the amount of research that has been done coupled with the lack of political will to make a change. Ms. Reese stated that she agreed with the sentiment of those comments but cannot negate the impact of having the dollar amounts present because it adds to the effectiveness of the argument, as opposed to just stating a statistic. She then commended the quality of the study and its effectiveness to the Roundtable's cause and to other entities in similar work.

Mr. Chancellor stated that Dr. Zafari's study looked at high annoyance. Mr. Chancellor indicated some "noise-apologists" claim that the airport noise is just annoying, and everyone deals with noise. He then asked Dr. Zafari to explain how high annoyance is used in his study. Dr. Zafari stated high annoyance was investigated through two sources of data. The first through the World Health Organization (WHO) who looked at the global burden of annoyance, specifically looking at aircraft noise. The second was through the FAA who quantified various levels of annoyance related to aircraft noise. The comparison of the two sources resulted in similar findings. The annoyance was relevant to sensitivity to noise in terms of physiological responses to aircraft noise. Dr. Zafari stated the study was conservative and only measured anxiety as a function of annoyance. He continued to say that if an individual was not annoyed by a noise; they were not included in the modeling or measurements regarding anxiety costs. Mr. Chancellor stated that there was a conservative correlation between people who are highly annoyed by aircraft noise and health outcomes as a function of anxiety. Dr. Zafari confirmed Mr. Chancellor's comment.

Mr. Scott Phillips then stated that the noise at the airport gets louder late at night and early in the morning. He asked if the study looked at other sleep-related factors, and what other factors could or should be investigated. Mr. Woomer added that when the airport does 2a.m. engine rev-ups, it is highly disturbing, and the impacts of ground noise near the airport has a similar effect to the cardiovascular system. Dr. Zafari addressed Mr. Phillips' question first, stating that the study only looked at daytime disturbances to be conservative. Dr. Zafari went on to say there are other models that could model nighttime disturbances and health factors, but these models were not included in his study to be conservative. Mr. Woomer stated that he did not need an answer to his question. Many Roundtable members agreed that adding a nighttime component would add to the dollar cost associated with health impacts, as well as lead to an investigation into other health disparities as the study only looked at cardiovascular impacts.

4. ROUNDTABLE COMMITTEE UPDATES

Technical Committee

Mr. Reese discussed a meeting he had with Mr. Paul Shank. They determined that the issues the MAA and Industry have had with the Performance Based Navigation (PBN) package has nothing to do with the Roundtable's approach package, and no discrepancies were found because the Roundtable developed everything with MAA and Industry. However, the FAA had many items they wanted to fix, and as a result, the FAA skipped some of their own analytical processes; therefore, they now have to revisit those items. Mr. Reese continued stating that the good news was that none of the changes affected the Roundtable's package. Mr. Reese stated that the MAA and Industry did what they were supposed to do per the FAA's proposals. Mr. Reese stated the bad news was that this may set the Roundtable's schedule back by a few months. Mr. Reese also stated that these are all normal PBN processes that can be done in a working day and, while they are minor tweaks, they need to be addressed. Ms. MacDonald stated that these issues are outside of the Roundtable's proposal. Mr. Reese concurred.

Mr. Roth asked if the PBN package changes influence noise in their communities. Mr. Reese said he does not believe so, as these changes were made outside of the areas of which they affected in their proposal. Mr. Roth asked if changes the FAA introduced were not in the areas the Roundtable is concerned with. Mr. Reese concurred; and stated that a lot of the changes are minor, technical tweaks. Mr. Shank was expected to expand more on this topic in the "MAA Update" section of the meeting. Ms. Veda Simmons said that there was no technical consultant available on the meeting call to speak more on the proposal, so she will take back any information to the PBN group. She also told the Roundtable that she will remain online for the meeting until 9:00 p.m. Ms. MacDonald moved for Mr. Chancellor and Mr. Gartner to begin their Monthly Report for the September 2022 presentation.

BWI-Thurgood Marshall Airport Aircraft Operations and Noise Exposure: Monthly Report for September 2022

Mr. Chancellor presented an updated version of the monthly report discussed during the October meeting. The Table of Contents page was introduced first, as this was one of the suggestions brought up at the previous meeting and is likely to be adjusted based on the latest comments and suggestions from Roundtable members. Mr. Chancellor stated that they had tremendous help from Vianair in the last month. Mr. Chancellor stated that Vianair updated the rough presentation from the last meeting, most notably the graphics, to give it a more professional appearance. The "Introduction" page was updated to declare the main objective: to bring a region-wide view to the problem. Mr. Chancellor continued to discuss changes and updates within the report including the "Definitions" page and the "Disclaimer and Information Sources and Disclosures" page. While displaying the "Seeking Balance at BWI-Marshall Airport" slide, Mr. Chancellor stated that they are trying to achieve a balance between the economic benefits of the airport and the health costs to individuals in the surrounding communities. The next few slides showed a visual representation of flight paths into and out of BWI-Marshall Airport and highlighted the fact that on "east flow" days, Howard County experiences a heavy volume of overhead traffic, and while on "west flow" days, Anne Arundel County experiences a heavy volume of overhead traffic. When showing a slide depicting the number of noise events above 55 dBA in Anne Arundel County, Mr. Chancellor discussed the fact that 55 db is a more realistic threshold for noise events, even

though the FAA follows a 65 db threshold. He then showed a similar slide with the number of noise events above 55 dBA in Howard County.

During the presentation on the “Noise Exposure – DNL Contours: Howard County” slide, Mr. Roth stated he would love to see a graphic for both east and west flows. Mr. Chancellor asked Mr. Roth to elaborate. Mr. Roth stated that he would like to see a presentation with just the graphic on the “Howard County DNL Contours” slide, and he would like to see total noise exposure with both east and west flow. Mr. Roth went on to say that for most of that area, those contours are averaging times when there is traffic with quiet times, when it is in the other flow; therefore, he suspected that those numbers are artificially low (diluted). He continued by stating that when residents complain of the aircraft noise, they are experiencing those noises as they exist under one flow, so it is unknown what the DNL is that they are experiencing. Mr. Roth went on to say that the only data we have is a graphic where the experience people have on the ground is diluted or averaged out with quiet times when it is in a different flow. He concluded, stating that people do not tell us what they are feeling when it is in a flow that is not flying over them, and the Roundtable does not have a measurement to support that sentiment.

Mr. James Allerdice stated that Mr. Roth’s request is what Vianair is attempting to do using LaMAX and number of events above. Mr. Roth stated that the Roundtable has data from MAA that is in DNL, and the Roundtable has the models that go with their proposals that are in DNL; Mr. Roth stated he wants it to be comparable to MAA’s reporting in DNL. Mr. Allerdice responded by saying they were not tasked to validate or invalidate what the MAA does. Instead, they were tasked to establish a baseline to understand the difference when the new procedures are implemented. Mr. Allerdice continued by saying when east and west flow is compared with number above, it sets the baseline so that when the new procedures are implemented, the change can be seen. Mr. Roth stated that based on the graphic in the slideshow, they were clearly able to produce data with DNL contours. Mr. Roth continued by saying the eligibility for mitigation is expressed in DNL. Understanding what the DNL measurement is during a period of east/west flow is helpful in terms of advocating for mitigation, which Mr. Roth believes was put in the scope of work from the beginning. Mr. Allerdice stated that the scope of work has changed many times. They are happy to create a map of Howard County with both east and west flow, but it will be time and cost-consuming; Mr. Allerdice will accommodate whatever Mr. Gartner and Mr. Sam Snead approve. Mr. Roth then expressed his pleasure with Mr. Allerdice’s team and the good work they have done establishing the baseline comparisons against the “happy days” of when the FAA proposals are implemented. However, Mr. Roth stated that he has continuously asked questions regarding east and west flow and if the answers to those questions are expressed as number of events above, they are less useful than if they were to be expressed in DNL. Mr. Allerdice reiterated that this is time and cost-consuming. He went on to state that going back and doing it as an east flow versus west flow more than doubles the workload of getting this done, because it requires ascertaining what operation they are on and pick those days out. Mr. Gartner stated the reason they tried to stick to one set of variables that were agreed upon was for consistency. Over time, the budget is limited to what Anne Arundel and Howard County put in, and Mr. Gartner stated that he can get an estimate from Anne Arundel and Howard County to do this east/west flow map one time.

Mr. Woomer suggested a one-time east/west flow analysis report. Mr. Roth concurred, stating that a one-time report would be ideal as opposed to a monthly process. Mr. Gartner stated that when they did

the previous maps, they picked one day with primarily that flow. Mr. Woomer asked to do it as a one-time analysis and that it does not need to be perfect; the data set will continue to expand, and the analysis will become more granular. Mr. Woomer expressed his desire to come out with a delta between east and west flow. Mr. Gartner stated they will have to revisit this issue.

Mr. Allerdice said that DNL is generally performed annually. He continued, stating that DNL had been broken down into monthly for the report because DNL in and of itself is an average. Mr. Allerdice continued by saying that being able to bring it down to a day or two in east versus west flow is a snapshot of that day and not necessarily representative of what the individual would be experiencing year-round. Mr. Allerdice stated they are able to do it, but he is unsure it will provide the user what they are looking for as a representative sample. Over a year's time, a good picture will be created, but depending on when DNL is done, two completely different results may appear based on time of year/weather. That is why DNL has performed annually. Mr. Allerdice and his team used LaMAX and the number of events above to provide a snapshot of what is going on in the communities on a given day or month. If the user is looking for a comparison of impacts of east flow versus west flow, Mr. Allerdice's team has already provided the metric to do that.

Mr. Roth stated that Mr. Allerdice had not given him what he is looking for: a measurement using the data that had been used for years from the MAA. Mr. Roth stated it is not to compare east flow to west flow; it is to compare a flow with the total. Ms. MacDonald and Mr. Chancellor voted to put this issue to rest and revisit at a later time. Mr. Chancellor then returned to the slide show.

Ms. Reese had comments and suggestions. On page 11, she requested that the graphic be zoomed out south a little more to show the impact occurring in the Annapolis Peninsula. The FAA had the same suggestion when this project first began. Ms. Reese's next comment related to dBc. She stated that in the future, if they are able to get a few more dollars, dBc would be a nice model to have. She asked Mr. Allerdice if he and his team had the capability of presenting this model. He responded that as of now, his team does not. Mr. Allerdice stated they should have it at some point in the future, but he would need to coordinate with developers first. Mr. Phillips stated that DOT commissioned a study that talks about the impacts of low-frequency noise and the psychological impacts. Mr. Phillips told Ms. Reese that she could use that because it is published by DOT themselves. Mr. Chancellor then moved to end his presentation due to time constraints.

Legislative Committee

Ms. Reese stated that during the last meeting, the Roundtable continued to discuss ways to address identified issues such as economic and impacts on children, along with Senator Beidle's potential interest in pursuing other studies. Mr. Woomer said that he met with Senator Beidle, and she is willing to meet with the other senators, including a Howard County senator who is working on budget taxation. Mr. Woomer and Senator Beidle will see if they can put \$200,000–\$250,000 into the Department of Health budget. Mr. Woomer indicated the Roundtable needs to put a priority list together. Ms. Reese stated that Ms. Debra Jung was not in attendance for this meeting, but she is expected to attend December's meeting. She also said that a special Chamber of Commerce presenter will be in attendance for December's meeting. She thanked Mr. McCarthy for attending the meeting. Ms. Reese continued by announcing that next month's guest speaker worked for Rand for several years and conducts research

with George Mason University for the FAA and other projects. He wants to discuss proposed runway design problems as well as untapped potential at BWI.

Mr. Woomer asked if the Chamber of Commerce is a member of the BWI Partnership and advised having BWI Partnership representatives attend next month's meeting, as well.

Mr. Chancellor stated that a member of the Howard County Chamber of Commerce is attending the meeting virtually. They opposed the Roundtable's legislation in the last session about creating a commission to study health impacts. Ms. Reese has been working to understand their concerns. They are here to listen in the spirit of cooperation. Mr. Chancellor's hope is to have open dialogue between the Roundtable and Chamber of Commerce to create compromise. Ms. Reese then said the legislative agenda is still in the works and Senator Beidle's support will be a factor in finalizing the agenda. There was a question as to whether the legislative committee is working with transition teams for the new governor, and they are, though not so much the transition teams, but throughout the elections, the Lieutenant Governor has been spoken to about this issue and has expressed genuine interest and concern.

Mr. Chancellor then took a moment to thank Mr. Al Donaldson for his support to the Roundtable. The Roundtable has been trying to create email lists broader than typical contact lists to prepare the monthly report, which Mr. Donaldson volunteered to work on.

4.MDOT MAA UPDATE

Mr. Shank first thanked Mr. Reese for briefing on the proposal. He said that the technical committee will be briefed on comments first, as has always been done. Mr. Shank continued by saying the most crucial factor is that the email to the FAA states that the MAA's review of the FAA proposal does not dramatically impact what they proposed three years ago. The MAA's comments were improvements that the FAA is planning to do that go beyond what MAA asked for. Mr. Shank then stated that the MAA is duty bound to analyze everything, not just what the Roundtable asks for. The Roundtable received more of an executive summary from the FAA, but MAA drilled into the detail, which took considerable effort. The proposal is satisfactory for the MAA, and they will report that back.

Mr. Shank then asked Mr. Reese if he would like a briefing or if he would like to review the proposal beforehand. Mr. Reese did not feel the need for a briefing unless anybody else on technical committee would like one. Mr. Roth stated he would like to review the materials that Mr. Reese received from Mr. Shank. Mr. Shank continued by saying if MAA is invited to PBN Working Group, they recommend one more meeting to address comments that were made. If anything from that meeting does affect what was proposed, it will be reported back to the Roundtable.

Ms. Reese asked Ms. Simmons about the timeline and scope of work for PBN Working Group. Ms. Simmons said that MAA contacted Eastern Regional Administration with a list of concerns in response to the FAA proposed procedures, including specific points made by air carriers, and requires the FAA to take additional steps. Ms. Simmons indicated that it would trigger a collaborative work group process. The FAA PBN Team will initiate a "Dot 41 Process" and arrange for a full working group meeting. Ms. Simmons stated that the team is looking at availability of all parties and based on scheduling, the meeting could happen in early 2023. She said if all the hurdles raised can be addressed in the working

group, the FAA will proceed with environmental review and NEPA process. Ms. Simmons indicated that this project cannot move forward until all concerns raised by MAA and other industries are addressed via this collaborative process.

Mr. Roth asked about the schedule impact of the PBN collaborative process compared with the baseline established previously. Ms. Simmons responded that they would not know until the meeting. More information will be available after the "Dot 41 Process." Mr. Roth stated that the current schedule baseline did not contemplate this meeting. Ms. Simmons concurred. The PBN team is looking to have the meeting during the second week of January.

Mr. Roth informed Mr. Shank that he had a mistaken belief that the Roundtable only cared about the changes in flight paths. Mr. Roth stated that the Roundtable had been waiting a long time, and any action by MAA that results in a schedule delay is important. He continued that the Roundtable should have been notified by Mr. Shank as soon as he knew it would happen. Mr. Roth expressed disappointment about hearing this from the FAA instead of Mr. Shank. Mr. Shank apologized for the miscommunication. As he explained two Roundtable meetings ago, the MAA offered to provide a briefing to the technical committee. Mr. Shank also noted that MAA did not believe the impacts were on the proposal. Based on the feedback received, Mr. Shank declared that if an issue does not concern what the MAA has asked for, they will not meet and discuss it. Mr. Roth clarified that an important part of this process is scheduling. Mr. Chancellor stated that this was a logical "argument"; if there is something problematic, the MAA will coordinate with the Roundtable, and if nothing is problematic, the Roundtable should not be involved. Mr. Shank claimed that he did not know if this would impact the schedule. Mr. Roth stated he was not criticizing the content of the review; he was criticizing the lack of candor and communication. Mr. Reese stated that this delay occurred since the last meeting in the interim; therefore, this is the first time Mr. Shank could tell us in person. During the last meeting, Mr. Roth spoke with Ms. Terrell-Tyson of the MAA, who said that the letter was going to go out to the FAA and Mr. Roth asked whether there were going to be any issues in that letter; she did not believe that was the case. Mr. Roth stated that he felt blindsided when the Roundtable got communication back from the FAA that implied a schedule delay. Mr. Shank responded that he has done everything on his end, and he communicated with the FAA, who controls the schedule.

Ms. Reese then stated that this issue was at an impasse and motioned to move forward in the meeting. At the last meeting, the Roundtable was not given a sufficient status with the MAA. She suggested that Mr. Shank's presence at this meeting is critical, and that if he is unable to attend, the entire Roundtable meeting should be canceled by the MAA. Mr. Shank acknowledged Ms. Reese's comments and concerns. Ms. MacDonald stated that Mr. Shank used to join the monthly coordination meeting via telephone and requested that he continue to join that meeting.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Laura Donovan said that the Roundtable was doing a great job, and she was appreciative of the work being done.

Mr. Jimmy Pleasant presented an issue he has regarding modeling. He pointed out discrepancies within the model and stated the model was not producing accurate contours. He continued stating that unless the model is 100-percent accurate, then the model should not be used.

Mr. Scott Phillips asked if there are any overlaps between BWI noise monitors and the model where we could verify. Mr. Gartner stated no.

Mr. Michael Bahr lives in Anne Arundel County and had questions regarding inconsistencies with aircraft altitudes. He stated that typically aircrafts fly over home is at 2,200 to 2,600 feet. He went on to say that within the last month, the planes sounded different and that flight altitudes were suddenly varying.

The Roundtable moved on to online questions, many of which were related to the health study. These questions were collected and passed along to the Roundtable Chair to be responded to after the meeting.

Ms. Elizabeth Cowles asked if there have been any flight pattern changes yet. The Roundtable replied no.

7. NEXT MEETING

Ms. MacDonald moved for the December meeting to be held on December 13th, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. All voted in favor; none opposed.

8. ADJOURN

Ms. MacDonald moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Reese motioned; Mr. Woomer seconded. All voted in favor; none opposed. Meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.