

DC METROPLEX BWI COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE WORKING GROUP PUBLIC MEETING

Forty-Seventh Meeting of the DC Metroplex BWI Community Roundtable Working Group

Tuesday, January 9, 2024, from 7:03 p.m. – 8:41 p.m.
Meeting held virtually via GoToWebinar

MEETING MINUTES

Regular Participants:

Roundtable Member	District/Organization	Attended	Roundtable Member	District/Organization	Attended
Pete Smith*	District 1, Anne Arundel County Council		Sam Snead*	Office of Anne Arundel County Executive Stuart Pittman	
Debra Jung*	District 4, Howard County Council	X	Bruce Gartner*	Office of Howard County Executive Calvin Ball	X
Debbie Macdonald Chair*	District 9	X	Mandy Rimmell*	Office of Baltimore County Executive Johnny Olszewski	
Jesse Chancellor*	District 9	X	Brent Girard	Office of Senator Chris Van Hollen	
Howard Johnson*	District 12	X	Veda Simmons	FAA Community Engagement Officer	X
Drew Roth*	District 12	X	Diana Leon Brown	MAA Chief of Staff	X
Scott Phillips*	District 13		George R. Robinson III	MAA, Asst to Chief of Staff	X
Paul Verchinski*	Alternate District 13		Paul Shank, Chief Engineer	MAA	
Evan Reese*	District 30	X	Darline Terrell-Tyson, Director, Office of Environmental Compliance and Sustainability	MAA	X
Will Pierson*	District 32	X	Bruce Rineer	MAA	X
Daniel Woomeer*	District 32		Karen Harrell	MAA	X
Dan Klosterman*	District 32	X	Royce Bassarab	MAA (HNTB)	X
David Nibeck	Alternate – District 32		Greg Voos	Mid Atlantic Regional Representative, NBAA	
Marcus Parker, Sr	Alternate – District 32		Kyle Evans	General Aviation Representative, CP Management LLC	
Kimberly Franklin Co-Chair*	District 33	X	David Richardson	Southwest Airlines	
Libby Lewandowski*	District 33	X	Steve Alterman	President, Air Cargo Association	
			Trey Turner	Commercial Carriers Rep.	

*Voting Member

Other Named Attendees:

Brett Healy, ADCI (Meeting Minute Taker)

Curby Fowler, FAA

1. Introduction and Roll Call

Introduction

Due to weather and safety concerns, the meeting was held online only via GoToWebinar, and there was no in-person component of this Roundtable meeting.

The meeting commenced at 7:03 p.m. with an introductory briefing delivered by Mr. Bruce Rineer. Mr. Rineer explained that this meeting would be entirely online. He stated that the meeting was being recorded and that participants with questions should type them into the chat box. Virtual attendees experiencing sign-in issues were advised to log out and log in again. Mr. Royce Bassarab was online as a moderator to assist anyone that had questions or issues.

The Roundtable Chair, Ms. Debbie MacDonald, conducted roll call to establish a quorum. Roll call was taken, and the required quorum was met.

Approve Agenda

Ms. MacDonald asked for a motion to approve the meeting agenda. Mr. Will Pierson motioned to approve the meeting agenda; Ms. Debra Jung seconded. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

Review and Approve November 14 Meeting Minutes

Ms. MacDonald asked for a motion to approve the November 2023 meeting minutes. Mr. Jesse Chancellor motioned to approve the meeting minutes; Mr. Evan Reese seconded. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

2. MAA Update

Ms. MacDonald asked Mr. Rineer if there was an MAA update for this meeting. Mr. Rineer replied that there was not.

3. MAA Response to FAA Noise Policy Review

Ms. MacDonald then moved to the MAA response to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Noise Policy Review. She said that Mr. Chancellor and Mr. Drew Roth would present on this topic and a discussion would follow. Ms. MacDonald directed members of the Roundtable to ask questions via the chat function to facilitate an orderly discussion. She further noted that she did not have control of the mute function and requested that the members be cognizant of that.

Mr. Chancellor stated that he attended his first Maryland Aviation Commission (MAC) meeting, saying that it was a very informative meeting and that they accomplished a lot. He said that he learned that the MAA submitted a separate response to the FAA Noise Policy Review, saying this should have been assumed since all major airports and constituents were involved in the Noise Policy Review. Mr. Chancellor said that this came up as part of Mr. Paul Shank's orientation presentation to the new

commissioners. Mr. Chancellor requested, received, and reviewed a copy of Mr. Shank's presentation, and then met with Mr. Roth to discuss what was said.

Mr. Chancellor and Mr. Roth suggested that the Roundtable should review and understand the MAA's response. Mr. Chancellor stated that it was clear that the MAA's and the Roundtable's responses were developed in parallel as there are many similarities between the two. He commented that it would be useful to understand the differences between the two documents, and maybe eventually reconcile the views of the Roundtable and the MAA.

Mr. Chancellor stated that he had asked Mr. Shank if he would give the MAC orientation presentation to the Roundtable, but he was unable to do so at today's meeting. Mr. Chancellor said that the Roundtable should therefore refrain from a detailed discussion on tonight's presentation, but they should think about the material presented in preparation for future discussions, saying that perhaps Mr. Shank would give the MAC orientation to the Roundtable at the next meeting. Mr. Chancellor reiterated that he and Mr. Roth wanted only to introduce the topic to the Roundtable and that it would not be fully addressed during the meeting. Mr. Chancellor noted that the presentation is a recording of Mr. Shank's presentation to the MAC, and the chair and co-chair have already distributed the official MAC orientation presentation to the members of the Roundtable.

Mr. Chancellor said that he and Mr. Roth would then lead a discussion with the Roundtable regarding how to approach this information, with an in-depth discussion following Mr. Shank's eventual presentation of the material to the Roundtable. Mr. Chancellor asked Mr. Roth if he had any additional comments to add prior to showing the presentation.

Mr. Roth stated that he read the MAA response and found it interesting that it was very similar to the Roundtable's submission. However, there were a few areas where he thought more discussion should occur, and that the MAC should be involved in this discussion. Mr. Roth commented that he saw three areas for the Roundtable's attention:

- The application of the Schultz curve of annoyance versus the DNL level.
- Mitigations for areas outside the 65 dB day-night average sound level (DNL) contour. Mr. Roth noted that the MAA's response raised the question of what those mitigations would look like or involve. He thought since the MAA posed the question in their response, the Roundtable should share some of their own ideas for what those mitigations look like or involve.
- The application of noise metrics other than DNL. He noted that this relates to the Roundtable's suggestions of separating east and west flow and other similar ideas.

The video of Mr. Shank's presentation to the MAC was played. Upon its conclusion, Mr. Chancellor pointed out that the video only included a short discussion, which was why it was important to distribute the full document to the Roundtable. He reiterated that the full discussion would occur at a later meeting. Mr. Chancellor stated that it is important to note that the Roundtable was described as a model, and he thinks that is because they got their procedures through the PBN Working Group and moved to a level of publication that the other roundtables have not.

Mr. Chancellor asserted that he thinks the Roundtable's advocacy was an important part of that recognition. He said it was very important to note that BWI Executive Director Ricky Smith and Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) Secretary Paul Wiedefeld said that the Roundtable should be a

model going forward. Mr. Chancellor pointed out that the Roundtable has been a model in the past, both at BWI and in the state. He noted that Maryland was one of the first states to use the types of analyses that led to the Part 150 noise procedures and noise abatement around airports.

Mr. Chancellor opined that Maryland has a long way to go to return to being a model for other states, but the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) provides a vehicle to do so. He further stated that the state must be proactive rather than reactive, saying that for many years they have been reactive and have been waiting for the Federal Government to determine how to address the noise issues in the state, but he said there is no reason for that. Mr. Chancellor also pointed out that Mr. Smith said that MAA and BWI should be a leader in health policy around those issues. He said he was very encouraged by this statement and by the meeting.

Mr. Chancellor said that he is both a member of the MAC and the Roundtable, which would allow him to share information between the groups to allow for mutual education. He noted that none of the Roundtable's recommended orientation materials were presented at the MAC meeting. As a result, Mr. Chancellor feels that his fellow commissioners do not necessarily understand the many noise-related health and quality-of-life issues in the way the members of the Roundtable do. He stated that he was asked to make the Roundtable materials available to the MAC for commissioners to review on a voluntary basis. He said he would continue to facilitate this information exchange between the MAC and the Roundtable as appropriate.

Mr. Chancellor then asked Mr. Bassarab to show the slide from Mr. Shank's presentation to the MAC comparing the Schultz curve to the new national curve produced by the National Environmental Survey (NES), saying he thought it was important for the Roundtable to understand the differences between the Schultz curve and the national curve. He stated that the Schultz curve has been used for years to determine the number of people that would be highly annoyed at certain DNL levels. Mr. Chancellor explained that 65 DNL was the cutoff for policy making purposes, saying that this threshold often leads to unhelpful outcomes. He stated that the shape of the national curve produced from the NES greatly differs from the Schultz curve. Mr. Chancellor continued, saying that the same number of people were annoyed at 45 dB on the national NES curve as at 65 dB on the Schultz curve. He stated that significant health issues resulting from aviation noise can occur at much lower DNL levels than previously thought, saying that the World Health Organization has recognized this.

Mr. Chancellor then drew everyone's attention to the statement at the bottom of the slide. He noted that this statement has been used for years in the industry and therefore he does not blame Mr. Shank for using this statement. He commented that it is a legacy statement that has some truth but also hides some truth. He reiterated that he does not think Mr. Shank did this purposefully, as this statement has been used by Congress, FAA, and airports, among others, when discussing this issue. Mr. Chancellor then read the statement to the group:

“Although the number of people exposed to aircraft noise has been reduced through quieter aircraft and noise abatement procedures, people surveyed are more annoyed at the same cumulative noise levels.”

Mr. Chancellor then explained that the number of people exposed strictly relates to the 65 DNL contour, which covers a small area of land. However, the number of people exposed to quality of life (QOL)-altering noise is greater than the number of people living within the 65 DNL contour. Mr. Chancellor

asked Mr. Bassarab to show a slide with a table Mr. Chancellor produced using public information to highlight the difference in the number of people in the 65 DNL contour compared to the number of people experiencing QOL-altering noise. Mr. Chancellor termed this a noise saturation statement, commenting that aviation noise is often discussed in general terms. He asserted that DNL and the NES highly annoyed percentages provide a better sense of how many people are affected and what it means from a potential health perspective. He stated that the percentages in the second column come directly from the FAA's NES. Mr. Chancellor pointed out that the table shows 0 percent of highly annoyed people in the 50 to 55 DNL contour because the Roundtable's work with MAA and HMMH never estimated the number of people in that contour band.

Mr. Chancellor stated that the third column provides the MAA's population estimates for each contour, which is based on HMMH's November 2019 population analysis of the DNL contours. He noted that the population data is somewhat old, saying that the estimates are conservative since populations have likely increased since then. He also said that these population data were used in Dr. Zafari's study on health costs related to the NextGen implementation at BWI. Mr. Chancellor said that the fourth column shows a range of the number of people expected to be highly annoyed by aircraft noise in each contour and explained the calculation used to determine those numbers. He stated that, within all contours, between 46,619 and 68,626 people would be expected to be highly annoyed given the noise currently generated by BWI.

Mr. Chancellor then compared these estimates to the highly annoyed percentages for the Schultz curve at 65 DNL, which represents the threshold for policy implementation used by the FAA. He stated that the Schultz curve estimates the expected number of highly annoyed people within the 65 DNL contour to be between 13.6 percent to 23.3 percent. Mr. Chancellor said that when he, Mr. Roth, and Mr. Dan Woomeer were developing the Roundtable's comments on noise policy, they thought that since the FAA used a threshold of approximately 20 percent of highly annoyed people for policy implementation when using the Schultz curve, the FAA should continue to use this or a similar percentage for policy purposes. He noted that far more people are impacted with the NES curve than with the Schultz curve and that these people should be able to receive mitigation via policy implementation.

Mr. Chancellor concluded with two final comments. In a document provided to the state budget committee, which he offered to share with the Roundtable, Mr. Chancellor stated that the MAA estimated that over 340,000 people in the area are exposed to aircraft noise between 45 and 55 DNL. He commented that the number of affected people is probably far greater than those provided in that document, saying that he does not think the document can be used to create policy. Mr. Chancellor then reiterated that the statements that airplanes are quieter now and that more people are exposed to noise than predicted by the current 65 DNL contour are both true. He stated that in the region, few people had noise concerns prior to NextGen, but now huge numbers of people are exposed to noise. He asserted that reducing the number of people affected is not necessarily an appropriate solution since one result of that could make flight paths even more concentrated and those still affected would be tortured by the noise. Mr. Chancellor recommended the Roundtable's original resolution of dispersion as the only answer to the problem. He stated that increasing concentration on flight paths would create a human rights issue and that should not be done. He reiterated that dispersion is truly the only answer.

Mr. Roth returned to the slide comparing the Schultz curve to the NES curve. He said in 1978, the FAA decided that the limit of tolerance is if 12 percent of people are highly annoyed, as measured with the

65 DNL contour, and communities with higher levels of annoyance should receive mitigations. He commented that over time, the 65 DNL number has been separated from its original justification for it, which was the level of annoyance. Mr. Roth stated that the Roundtable's position should be that if a community has a noise impact resulting in more than 12 percent of people being highly annoyed, that community should unequivocally receive mitigation. He continued, saying the metric used to measure annoyance should change per the findings of the NES. Mr. Roth noted that when using the NES curve, 12 percent of highly annoyed people would be better represented by the 50 DNL contour instead of the 65 DNL contour, and therefore people within 50 DNL or greater contours should be eligible for mitigation. Mr. Roth stated that the Roundtable should not focus on numbers from 1978; instead, they should assert that if over 12 percent of people in a community are annoyed, the FAA must take action or give mitigations.

Ms. MacDonald asked if anyone else had comments. Mr. Howard Johnson commented that, based on the NES curve at 50 DNL, on average, people are 19 percent irritated. He noted that, as this is greater than 12 percent, the FAA needs to adjust the effective DNL rate down to 50 or 45 DNL. Mr. Roth agreed, saying that the important number is not DNL but the number or percentage of people who are highly annoyed, regardless of the metric used. He then asked what appropriate mitigations look like, saying that the MAA's response to the noise survey included ideas such as soundproofing or tax credits. He opined that these ideas are concerning from an equity standpoint, saying mitigations should be based on number of people, not households, and certainly not based on income levels and tax credits. He went on, saying that mitigations need to be at an individual level and the Roundtable should consider a direct cash payment to those affected.

Mr. Roth then raised the question of how to effectively use noise metrics. He said that in the Roundtable's response to the FAA, they noted that the averaging inherent in DNL obscures the periods of time where many flights, and thus annoyance, occur. He stated that the process for mitigation should include a count of number of flights and the individual noise levels for an individual, rather than using metrics that average and obscure noise. Mr. Roth then said that he and Mr. Chancellor propose that the Roundtable writes a position paper, and if they decide to adopt it, then share it with the MAA and the MAC. Mr. Chancellor agreed that the position paper would be a good idea, but commented that the Roundtable owes Mr. Shank and the MAA an opportunity to have a dialogue with them since the MAA has exhibited an evolution of their reviews as evidenced by several commonalities in the MAA's and the Roundtable's responses to the FAA. He stated that this evolution is a positive development and should be built upon. Mr. Roth responded that he thinks the Roundtable should collectively think about whether they should write a position paper, should they discuss with Mr. Shank first, and what to do with a position paper if written. Mr. Roth reiterated that he thinks that a position paper would be beneficial and stated that it should include the three major points he previously identified, which are the application of the Schultz curve, identification of appropriate and equitable mitigations, and the use of alternative noise metrics.

Ms. MacDonald commented that, for her, this discussion highlighted the fact that 65 DNL in 1978 is not the same as 65 DNL in 2024. Although engine and aircraft noise levels have decreased, the number of flight events has increased. Ms. MacDonald pointed out that 65 DNL in 1978 and in 2024 represent two different experiences and is a weakness of the DNL metric. She concluded by saying that considering the two DNLs equivalent does not make sense. Mr. Roth agreed, saying that a 65 DNL resulting from

constant noise is very different with regard to annoyance than a 65 DNL that occurs due to intermittent loud events averaged with quiet periods.

Mr. Chancellor suggested that the Roundtable ask Mr. Shank to meet with them for a discussion and that the Roundtable then think about the position paper. He said that the position paper could then be shared with the MAA and others who might benefit from it, including introducing it to other commissioners on the MAC. Mr. Roth suggested creating a working group to begin drafting the position paper, since that can be done concurrently with the discussion with Mr. Shank.

Mr. Roth made a motion that the Roundtable create a working group to draft a position paper on how to apply noise metrics and how to make appropriate mitigations. Mr. Pierson seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

Ms. MacDonald said she would communicate with MAA to find a time for Mr. Shank to deliver the MAC orientation presentation to the Roundtable.

Mr. Roth clarified that this motion is only to set up the working group and write the draft; this motion does not mean that the position paper is endorsed by the Roundtable. Mr. Chancellor then asked if there were any volunteers for the working group. He and Mr. Roth both volunteered. Ms. MacDonald asked if anyone else was interested. Mr. Roth stated he expects significant feedback once a draft is distributed to the group and Ms. MacDonald agreed.

Ms. MacDonald then asked for final questions or comments on the discussion. Mr. Chancellor encouraged everyone to read the full MAA response, saying he thought it would help understand the ideas included in the draft position paper. Ms. MacDonald said she read the MAA response one and a half times to understand it. She noted that not understanding all the technical aspects should not stop members of the Roundtable from editing and reviewing this paper as they can learn a lot doing that. She also pointed out that reviewing from a non-technical viewpoint helps improve the document for a broader audience. Ms. MacDonald stated that she hopes that some new people would become involved with the position paper. Mr. Roth commented that he would need help with proofreading and polishing the document once he drafts an initial document.

Ms. Libby Lewandowski asked Mr. Chancellor what he meant by dispersion, saying she did not know what he meant. Mr. Chancellor directed her to some of the early documents provided to the Roundtable by the FAA for background information. He then explained that prior to the implementation of NextGen, aircraft were vectored into the airport, directed by air traffic controllers using radar, which is not as precise as NextGen technology. Additionally, he commented that flight paths depended on air traffic controllers and their individual styles of controlling traffic. He compared NextGen to the Empire State building, saying that the building was overdesigned compared to modern skyscrapers because at the time of its construction, no one knew the loads and stresses that a building of that size would be subjected to. He went on, saying that the pre-NextGen air traffic control system had more flexibility inherent in it because it depended more on human interaction, which led to greater dispersion of flights on both arrival and departure. Mr. Chancellor stated that prior to NextGen, BWI was not a center of noise pollution, pointing to the noise complaint data as evidence. He noted that at some of the initial Roundtable meetings, the MAA agreed that BWI did not have a noise problem prior to NextGen. Mr. Chancellor said that now the region has a major noise pollution problem, saying that the only way to return to the "status quo ante", or the conditions prior to NextGen, is to reimplement dispersion.

Mr. Chancellor then stated that the FAA has categorically said they would not reinstate vectoring at BWI, although he mentioned that, under pressure, the FAA has done so at other airports. He asserted that the Roundtable is forced to work with very rigid and limited technologies, such as RNAV and PBN. He said that these technologies simply move the noise issues around within the region instead of solving the problem, which is unacceptable in the long term since negative effects of the issues are beginning to appear. Mr. Chancellor thinks that a return to vectoring is unlikely since the flight procedures designed for that system have been retired and are no longer available for use. He stated that radars are still used but not in a manner that enables dispersion as he described. He emphasized that the FAA and the aviation industry must identify better solutions than the existing options that are causing residents to suffer.

Mr. Roth chimed in, saying that as a representative of a community close to the airport, dispersion does not do much for such a community as there is no opportunity to disperse. He stated that dispersion is valuable for communities farther out from the airport. He noted that communities closer to airports have been historically protected by noise by established noise zones that prohibit residential development. Mr. Roth explained that NextGen routed flights away from those noise zones, rerouting them over communities that already had high DNL levels. He pointed out that when implementing new procedures, dispersion should not be implemented for close-in communities in exchange for routing flights out of established noise zones with restricted development. Mr. Roth concluded by reiterating that dispersion is appropriate for communities farther from the airport.

Ms. Veda Simmons, the FAA representative, informed the Roundtable that the FAA has a webpage for updates for the Noise Policy Review process and provided a link in the chat (www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview). She stated that the FAA provides regular updates, saying that an update was posted yesterday. Ms. Simmons confirmed that over 4,857 comments were received by the FAA, 203 of which were from Baltimore. She reiterated that she posted the link in the chat. Ms. Simmons said the FAA is still reviewing the comments, and they would consider several options, including the use of DNL. She reminded the group that the FAA recently posted an update on the process and instructed the members on how to find the update. Ms. Simmons encouraged all members to check the link periodically for updates.

Ms. Simmons then noted that there had been a proposal for cash payments as a possible mitigation, and asked where the funds for those payments would come from. She noted that if the funds were from the government, the source of those funds would need to be considered, mentioning that taxes might be one source. Ms. Simmons commented that this is something that should be kept in mind when considering mitigations.

Ms. Simmons also commented that the FAA was tasked with modernizing the airspace to support the amount of air traffic and flights and to improve the predictability of where flights are in the sky. She stated that the FAA wanted air traffic controllers to have the ability to see an aircraft's location on a map at all times, saying this capability is like "having a GPS in the sky." Ms. Simmons confirmed vectoring did provide dispersion but that the FAA has moved away from it as part of the goal of modernization, instead employing technology to ensure the safety and efficiency of the airways. She concluded by asking if anyone had questions for her.

Mr. Roth stated that, with respect to cash payments as mitigations, Ms. Simmons' questions are much farther along the path towards implementation than the Roundtable. He noted that the motivation

behind cash payments included the health costs of NextGen on the community as raised in the Zafari study. He said that, in response to the study, the MAA pointed out the gigantic economic benefits of the airport to the community. Mr. Roth asserted that if the airport does have this significant positive benefit to the community, it should be able to compensate those affected by the air traffic. He clarified that he thought that these mitigations would be statewide rather than nationwide, but that it does not have to be. He reiterated that if the economic impact is as big as MAA noted, and that the MAA already provides mitigations in the form of soundproofing, other ways of mitigation should also be considered to provide compensation to those affected by noise.

4. Committee Reports

Technical Committee

Mr. Bruce Gartner provided a presentation summarizing the noise reports from Vianair. He stated that the Roundtable has been waiting for the delivery of several monthly noise reports from Vianair. He said that the Technical Committee received the reports over the holidays, and Ms. MacDonald previously shared the link where the May through November 2023 reports are posted. He stated that he, Mr. Chancellor, and Mr. Roth wanted to summarize the findings for the Roundtable. Mr. Gartner then thanked Mr. Chancellor and Mr. Roth for their assistance with the presentation.

Mr. Gartner stated that the reports included some new pages needed to get to the east flow/west flow contour maps. He said that the presentation highlighted some of the new pages from the November 2023 report and then provided a comparison of the May, August, and October 2023 report slides. Mr. Gartner noted that this presentation was compiled quickly, and all comments and improvements would be welcomed and appreciated.

Mr. Gartner first provided a brief explanation of east flow and west flow, saying that this information has been included in previous reports. He stated that these slides describe airport operations and runways in use for each flow configuration, as well as reasons for operating in each configuration. He then showed a snapshot of a typical day of traffic over the region, emphasizing that the figure does not represent an entire month or a specific month. He noted that additional descriptions would be added in the report, saying that the figure summarizes where the aircraft fly when arriving or departing BWI.

Mr. Gartner showed a set of slides showing contour heat maps for east and west flows, saying that Vianair produced these by individually looking at east flow and west flow operations. He pointed out that the figure shows data from Anne Arundel County and Howard County for November 2023. Mr. Gartner noted that usually DNL contours are done over a longer period, but the Roundtable has been waiting for data from MAA updates that only happen every few years and the Vianair study has provided some more real-time data updates in the interim.

Mr. Gartner then pointed out a specific southerly shift in the location of the 55 DNL contour when comparing the west and east flow maps. He also noted that one of the previous criticisms was the difficulty in identifying landmarks on the map. He believes that is still an issue in the older reports but in the most recent reports, Vianair added the highway labels and other features to help identify specific locations on the map. Mr. Gartner said that this presentation provides an example of the new work that has been done to break out east flow and west flow. He concluded by saying that Mr. Roth has been instrumental in pushing for Vianair to provide this type of analysis.

Mr. Roth stated that he reviewed the most recent reports, and he believes the flow-specific contours look as expected. He stated that the value of heat maps and contours comes from reviewing the differences between them and the combined contour of all flows. Mr. Roth pointed out the lobes of the contours and said that when periods of quiet are excluded from the average, the contours expand. He specifically noted the contour changes in the Elmhurst area, which falls into the 65-70 DNL contour south of the airport. He asked the Roundtable to remember this for when the combined DNL contour heat map is shown; at that point, the group should note the reported DNL at that area. Mr. Gartner then displayed a slide showing the difference for all three months. Mr. Roth pointed out that for Elmhurst under east flow, the noise is 10 dB higher than what is reported in the averaged-out contour, saying this is a lot. He commented that the Roundtable should highlight the difference in noise levels between the combined traffic and east flow and west flow.

Mr. Roth continued, saying that the level of annoyance does not align with what is expected from the data in the combined contour diagram. He stated that this is because people are annoyed when the planes are overhead, and when the planes are overhead, the DNL is higher than the DNL that includes the quiet times. He asserted that these diagrams start to show that. Mr. Gartner then asked Mr. Chancellor if he had anything else to add; Mr. Chancellor did not.

Mr. Gartner then provided a listing of the report pages that he included in the presentation, which included DNL contour maps, flight density heat maps, and maps and tables of the Howard County and the Anne Arundel County virtual monitoring grids. Mr. Gartner noted that the three months selected for this presentation (May, August, and October) captured the spring, summer, and fall seasons. Each month's slide showed a bar graph of the operations flown by airline and a bar graph with operations by aircraft type. Mr. Gartner pointed out that the data in May and August were similar, but said that October's data was somewhat different, with traffic volume higher and more 737 and 738 Max aircraft than the other months.

Mr. Gartner reminded the Roundtable that the contour maps are updated every few years, but these reports are provided monthly. He said that the maps are generally similar month to month and that reinforces the idea that DNL is not a great measure of the lived experience. He noted that the maps are inconsistent with scale and orientation, saying that he is working with Vianair to fix that so that the maps can be more easily compared. Mr. Gartner reiterated that the contour maps would be in each monthly report.

Mr. Gartner then showed flight track density heat maps for Howard and Anne Arundel Counties. He said that the density slightly increased in August and again in October. He then discussed the number of events above (NA) 55 dB for Howard County, noting that similar information exists for Anne Arundel County but that this presentation only provides highlights of the report. He stated that red sites experience 8,000 to 12,000 events per month and orange sites experience 6,000 to 8,000 events per month above 55 dB. Mr. Gartner highlighted an area in Howard County that had two high volume (red) sites and two medium volume (orange) sites and showed the changes in NA over the three months, saying that the NA did not change much aside from in the highlighted area. He then showed the corresponding data tables, saying they provide greater detail on the NA events, and specifically pointed out the two high volume locations in the monthly tables. Mr. Gartner stated that the table shows, for each noise monitor, the total number of events above 55 dB, the daily average number of events over 55 dB, and the DNL for the given month. He pointed out that in May, the two high volume sites had over

300 events above 55 dB daily, and that the DNLs were 58.1 and 70.07 dB, respectively. He then showed the changes in the number of events and DNL for August and October.

Mr. Gartner showed similar data for Anne Arundel County. He noted that the sites at Arden on the Severn and Shipley's Choice Elementary had between 4,000 to 8,000 events per month and that the daily average over the three months was 142 to 200 and 191 to 260 events, respectively. He commented that October 2023 had the highest activity. He pointed out the changes in daily averages by month for Arden and commented that the DNL at that site remained around 55 dB. Mr. Gartner concluded by saying he wanted to highlight the month-to-month variation for the metrics at the higher volume locations and requested that Mr. Rineer provide the reports on the Roundtable's webpage.

Mr. Gartner confirmed that Vianair will continue to provide the monthly reports and said that Vianair was unable to complete the December 2023 report for this meeting. He stated that Vianair was caught up on the report backlog and that they would continue to collect data and provide the raw data and the reports to the Roundtable.

Mr. Chancellor said that it has taken a long time to format the report to provide relevant information, but progress has been made. He noted that the reports have been formatted consistently since May 2023. He stated that one of the original purposes for the reports was to gather baseline data on flight paths throughout the region ahead of the flight path changes that the FAA would implement soon. Mr. Chancellor said this data would allow for a comparison of the current flight paths to the planned flight paths to see if the expected effects occur and what the impacts to the people on the ground are. He stated that he is amazed that the Roundtable is the only entity that wants to do these comparisons. He commented that the FAA and the aviation industry do not, but that the MAA might consider it if they had funding. Mr. Chancellor said that the Roundtable would attempt to make these comparisons available to the public. Mr. Chancellor thinks the next step would be for the Technical Committee to delve deeply into the reports, saying that Mr. Reese's expertise would be needed to help prepare for the new flight paths planned for publication in May and July 2024. He stated that the MAA should be included since the Roundtable would like to maintain anonymity on what it means from an outgoing perspective. He continued, saying that he wants technical experts from the MAA in addition to community members reviewing the reports. He would like the MAA to help guide and form the comparisons, as well as informing the Roundtable of the expected outcomes of the procedural changes.

Ms. MacDonald thanked Mr. Roth and Mr. Chancellor and stated that those reports and summaries required a lot of work. Ms. MacDonald said she was glad the information was provided. She reminded the group that they have the links to the reports, so the group can review the reports in more detail.

Legislative Committee

Ms. MacDonald moved to the Legislative Committee update. She said that at the November 2023 meeting, the group discussed how to move forward with the committee following Ms. Mary Reese's departure from the Roundtable. Ms. MacDonald spoke to Mr. Dan Woomer, who planned to talk with Ms. Reese and begin to figure out what the committee could do to move forward with the ideas discussed at the November 2023 meeting. Ms. MacDonald said Mr. Woomer had not gotten back to her yet and since he was not in attendance at this meeting, the update would be tabled until the next meeting.

Communication Committee

Ms. MacDonald had no updates for the Communication Committee.

5. Public Comment

Ms. MacDonald asked if there were any public comments in the chat. Mr. Rineer stated that no comments were in the chat and said that three members of the public were in the meeting, but he did not think they had any comments.

6. Planning For Next Meeting

Ms. MacDonald asked if the bi-monthly schedule was still sufficient. Mr. Chancellor asked Ms. Simmons if she expected to have any updates in the next 60 days. Ms. Simmons said that there were no changes to the PBN publication schedule, saying publication for the SIDs is still planned for May 16, 2024, and STARs and IAPs for July 11. She reiterated that all the procedures are still under evaluation by the environmental group and flight procedures group, and that she expected no new updates. Mr. Chancellor asked if any incremental updates would be available. Ms. Simmons said she would pass on any updates as she received them but had not gotten any. She added that the only update might be confirmation from the FAA that they are moving forward in the publication process.

Mr. Roth suggested that the next Roundtable meeting be scheduled for after the next MAC meeting. Ms. MacDonald agreed and asked Mr. Chancellor when the next MAC meeting was scheduled. Mr. Chancellor said it was scheduled for February 21, 2024. Mr. Roth asked how often the MAC meetings occur; Mr. Chancellor replied that they occur approximately quarterly. Mr. Roth said he did not think he could have the position paper drafted by February, so he would prefer to meet in March. Mr. Chancellor said the next MAC meeting after that is May 29, 2024. Ms. MacDonald asked if they wanted to have the next Roundtable meeting in March 2024. Mr. Roth thought that would work, saying that if the Roundtable wanted to provide the position paper to the MAC at the May 2024 meeting, having a meeting in March would allow for a discussion with Mr. Shank before finalizing the position paper. Ms. MacDonald then said that a March meeting would be contingent on Mr. Shank's availability. She suggested March 12 or March 19, saying that she would schedule the meeting for March 12 and then work with the MAA and Mr. Shank to ensure Mr. Shank could attend the meeting. Ms. MacDonald said she would work with the MAA to schedule Mr. Shank's attendance.

Ms. MacDonald again asked if there were any public comments. Mr. Rineer replied that there were none. Ms. MacDonald asked for any final items; there were none.

7. Meeting Adjournment

Mr. Roth made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Johnson seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.