

**REAGAN NATIONAL COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP
REGULAR MEETING (49) FINAL SUMMARY**

**Thursday, July 28, 2022
6:00 P.M. – 8:11 P.M.**

On-Line/Virtual Meeting

Working Group Members Present:

District of Columbia:

Evie Washington	Primary	District of Columbia – Ward 7
Caroline Burwell	Alternate	District of Columbia – Ward 3
Richard Hinds	Primary	District of Columbia – Ward 2
Ken Buckley	Primary	District of Columbia – Ward 3
Mike Metcalf	Primary	District of Columbia – Ward 6

Maryland:

Ken Hartman	Primary	Montgomery County
Susan Shipp	Alternate	Montgomery County
Paul Janes	Alternate	Montgomery County
John Mitchell	Primary	Prince George's County - Accokeek
William Noonan	Primary	Montgomery County
Janelle Wright	Primary	Montgomery County

Virginia:

James Phelps	Primary	Fairfax County - Dranesville
Stephen Thayer	Primary	Alexandria
Richard Roisman	Alternate (Acting)	Arlington County
Steve Geiger	Primary	Arlington County
Carol Hawn	Alternate	Fairfax County (At Large)
Mike Rioux	Primary	Fairfax County – Mount Vernon

Airlines:

Tracy Montross	Primary	American Airlines
Dick DeiTos	Primary	Metropolitan Washington Airlines Committee

I. Welcome and Updates

MWAA

- David Mould welcomes group and thanks elected officials and their representatives, as well as MWAA IT staff

- **IT System Check/MWAA Statement**
 - No issues
- **Approval of April 28, 2022 Meeting Summary**
 - Approved without changes
- **Next Meeting (October 27, 2022)**
 - Set for October 27, 2022, fourth Thursday of the month. Group's subcommittees may, and often do, meet between quarterly meetings.
- **MWAA Update Statement:**

David Mould: We continue to see steady recovery in the air travel sector despite the continuing impacts of the pandemic on business travel, the effect of inflation on fuel and ticket prices, and airline staffing issues. Leisure travel continues to lead the recovery. Business and international travel are coming back also. Passenger levels are back near 80 percent of pre-pandemic levels.

Airport encroachment continues to be a noise issue in two ways:

(1) Residential Development in high-noise areas

- Building houses near or directly below aircraft flight paths is a bad idea, but developers keep pushing local zoning authorities and county supervisors to change zoning from commercial and industrial to residential. It's a continuing issue for Dulles. I know some members of this group have been in touch with the counties and we appreciate the support.

(2) Tall Building near DCA

- Flight paths over/near the Potomac River are best and have support of community, FAA and local government because no one lives in the river. Tall building near the flight path can hurt the viability of flight paths over the Potomac. FAA establishes height standards but the decision on how tall buildings can be is in the hands of local governments.

William Noonan: Does MWAA recommends no houses be built inside the 65 DNL contour? Does MWAA recommend that flight paths not be moved that create 65 DNL in residential areas? What are the daily flight operations counts?

Mould: The FAA changes to flight paths is a common discussion of this group. Building houses near flight paths creates a situation similar to what we all gather to talk about. We are trying to prevent that situation where it does not currently exist.

Mike Jeck: Flight operations are almost at 2019 levels.

Noonan: I would say that moving a flight path so that homes are suddenly in the 65 dBA DNL contour is similarly a problem for exactly the same reasons.

Mould: Duly noted.

II. FAA Update

FAA

a. Noise Portal Overview Presentation (Durre Cowan)

Durre Cowan (FAA): I'm the negotiation officer for the FAA Office Environment and Energy. I'm a headquarters employee, and I work in engagement policy.

A concern or a complaint would go through the portal. Data goes to the web form, the system routes the message to the correct regional administrator's office, it's reviewed, and then assigned to the appropriate office.

Our goal is to have a thorough research response in two weeks or less, but sometimes it takes a full 30 days.

Airports are typically the first point of contact for noise at their facility, and they can choose to participate in the FAA's Partnering Airport Program for noise complaint responses. DCA is not a partnering airport, but we would welcome the opportunity to have you all be part of the program.

Ken Buckley: With this new form, will a customer be able to paste a graphic in it?

Cowan: Yes.

John Mitchell: Will FAA accept complaints from 3rd parties?

Cowan: We don't accept third-party applications. Most of those apps allow their users to send the same message over and over. This not only violates our one complaint policy, but it also spans our systems. Which means because humans are reviewing these complaints, we have about 40 analysts across the country that look at every complaint. We could miss something simply due to the volume, so we don't take them.

Janelle Wright: Will FAA respond to the same person with the same general complaint more than once?

Cowan: FAA will not respond to the same complaint over and over. If an inquiry is similar in nature to a previous complaint and will elicit the same response we've already sent, we'll reference that in our response back. If it's a completely different or new concern, we will research and investigate that issue and provide a new response. It's not the uniqueness of the sender. It's the uniqueness of the issue.

There are three main reasons:

- It is condescending and frustrating to receive the same answer over and over,
- It's a waste of taxpayer money even if we had it, which we don't, to spend hours coming up with different ways of saying the same thing.
- Requiring an analyst to think of a new way to say something creates a scenario where they've substituted something that inadvertently changes the meaning. It's not unheard of FAA to receive hundreds, even tens of thousands of the same complaint and we don't have the resources to respond in a unique way each time.

Wright: Did the FAA create this portal and this process in response to a congressional mandate that was maybe part of the 2018 reauthorization of the FAA?

Cowan: No, this began in 2015 when then administrator, Michael Huerta, was dissatisfied with how the FAA was responding to noise complaints.

Wright: Will this data be shared with the Department of Transportation and our members of Congress, or can members of the public or roundtables like ours make inquiries and get data from this either monthly or yearly?

Cowan: We are under strict privacy rules because of the personal identifiable information. We hope to publish the first of the aviation noise ombudsman reports for 2018 this year

Wright: That makes sense. I don't expect to see personal information, but it would be great to see high-level compiled information for trends. I would hope the FAA would be looking at that.

Cowan: You're going to see a lot of that in the aviation ombudsman report.

Wright: Lots of people are affected by the same problem and so the complaints will naturally be very similar. You say that if someone submits a complaint that is very similar to a complaint that somebody else submitted previously, which is highly likely . . .

Cowan: It's not the uniqueness of the complaint, it's the uniqueness of the sender. If you and five of your neighbors send the same complaint, you would all get the same response, but five different complaints, five different responses.

Noonan: We'd get the identical response going to each of us individually is what you're saying? Are you collecting statistics for the number of people who are registering complaint type A and complainant type B, et cetera?

Cowan: Yes.

Noonan: That will be in the ombudsman report?

Cowan: Yes. We do differentiate between number of complaints and number of first-time complaints and repeat complaints.

Susan Shipp: What is your response rate? How many total complaints are you receiving, and how many are being responded to because you have this criteria on you don't respond to everything?

Cowan: We saw significant drops in the core 30 such as DCA. As we see operations rise again, we do see the complaints typically go commensurate with air traffic. We had about maybe 500 complaints total and of that, maybe not even half were unique. We see far more repeat complainants than we do the first-time complaints. In the summer months we've had since June, we've seen an increase that is commensurate with uptick and operations. Then we saw about a thousand complaints in a month with only about 300 of them being unique.

Mitchell: What you do with the data? Most folks aren't that interested in getting a response, they want solutions. Are you going to be really using this to solve the problems?

Cowan: That that is why we do what we do. That's one of reason why we have the portal. The second initiative, and like I said, we are not there yet. We rolled out the portal by region. 2019 is when it started rolling out. We only had partial data, 2020 hit, 2021 hit.

Wright: I wasn't aware of this portal. How does the FAA plan - are you going to rely on round tables and community leaders like us to tell our communities about this opportunity to complain directly to the FAA? How are you going to get the word out?

Cowan: We've been operating now softly. We launched the full poll nationwide, September 30th, 2020. Typically, what we have found is that people who have a concern they want to share with, they to Google FAA noise complaint, pops right up.

Wright: I think it would be terrific if the FAA coordinated with people like Veda Simmons.

Simmons: I think that's a great idea. When different procedures or processes change, I will make sure that the round table is aware. Moving forward, as different improvements come up or if we revise anything, I will be able to share that information with you.

Wright: Thank you for opportunities to comment because the FAA often is seeking public comment. Sometimes we don't learn about those things in a timely manner. Veda, anything you can do to share those with us, we'll disseminate to our community, that would be greatly appreciated.

Wright: We are talking about broader things than this noise complaint portal. There's are other opportunities where the FAA is seeking input from Americans on future projects and processes, and we just want the opportunity to know about those, so that we can comment.

Buckley: Did you say you rolled this out in 2020?

Cowan: Yes. We started in 2019, but it was rolled out by region. It was a soft launch, but nationwide, it went fully live on September 30th, 2020.

Buckley: I'm a little bit per perplexed because maybe other people on the group are more aware than me. This is the first time I've heard about it. Did MWAA know? Did our FAA local colleagues know about this? It seems perplexing to me it's taken two years to make a presentation to us. What's the secret about this?

Cowan: It's not. It really isn't a secret at all.

Buckley: Is the old FAA complaint system going away?

Cowan: It's already gone.

Buckley: Two weeks ago, it popped up.

Cowan: Are you calling it or emailing?

Buckley: There's a web application that Reagan National supports.

Cowan: This is not MWAA system, this is only the FAA system. We're not here to compete or replace anything that MWAA or another airport has in place. This is only FAA's exclusive system.

Buckley: When did MWAA know about this system?

Cowan: I don't know. Airports typically have such robust systems that they don't want to work with ours because we're not as good as theirs are. This is not a criticism of MWAA or any other airport by any means. This is our first attempt at getting better.

Buckley: I'm not trying to complain about your system at all. It looks good. It looks far more robust than the creaky old system that MWAA has pushed out. I'm just baffled that it's taken two years, but I don't want to take more of your time.

Cowan: My pleasure. I want to answer questions by also to be aware of the time. We have a program called the Partnering Airports. Airports identify a defined area around their airport. If we get something inside the airport's radius, we can't send our work to the airport. DCA has a solid complaint system. This isn't meant to replace or compete with that. The portal is just meant to be a resource for airports and a support tool for the public. When you agree to be a partnering airport, you're essentially allowing us to share non-PII information with the airport.

Shipp: I'm concerned because you're talking about getting 1,000 complaints a month, and DCA alone gets tens and tens of thousands of complaints a month. It seems like there's a whole lot of data being gathered at, I assume all the other airports just like through MWWA that apparently you're not getting or looking at for noise complaints and issues. That just seems like a real waste of good information. Is there any effort in your group that recognize the bulk of noise complaint information within the airports and you should be using that?

Cowan: It does seem like a waste but we can't combine systems

b. FAA Health Impacts Research (Don Scata)

Simmons: I'd like to introduce you to Don Scata. He is the manager of the Noise division from the office of environment and energy.

Don Scata (FAA): I manage the Noise division in the Office of Environment and Energy. Durre is one of the folks in my division that, so we handle noise complaints for the agency as well. I'll be focusing today on some programs where we're looking at potential health impacts related to aviation noise exposure.

Under our Health Impacts Research Program, we're working extensively with our university partner sponsored through The Ascent Center of Excellence and the FAA Tech Center. With Boston University's School of Public Health, we're engaged in a program to evaluate associations between aircraft noise exposure and cardiovascular disease outcomes.

With the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, we're conducting a new national sleep study to quantify the relationship between aircraft noise exposure on sleep disturbance.

We're sponsoring research with Boston University that's looking at leveraging existing longitudinal health cohorts from the Nurses Health Study and its following study, the Nurses Health Study 2. These efforts are evaluating potential links between health outcomes and aircraft noise exposure, while accounting for a wide variety of factors.

We're looking at the associations between noise and hypertension in the nurse's health study using 55DNL cut-point. The researchers examined the data and found that in a parsimonious model, which is adjusted for age, calendar year, race, physical activity, smoking status, and alcohol use found a 10 percent increased risk of hypertension with a 95% confidence interval of 1 to 19 percent.

The analysis is looking at using a 45 DBNT cut point due to small numbers of participants occurring at higher noise exposure levels. It's the studies looking at aircraft noise and sleep. It's looking at associations between nighttime noise and insufficient sleep and poor sleep quality and NHS data. Looking at multivariable adjusted longitudinal models, census block groups exposed to nighttime aircraft noise show higher odds of insufficient sleep compared with those not exposed.

Wright: Yes. I noticed for the socio-demographic study, you were doing it at what, 40 DNL, 50 DNL, 55 DNL, which is great. According to the EPA they determined safe noise exposure to be 45 decibels, indoor and 55 decibels outdoor. Why do you have a 55 decibel DNL cutoff point on the hypertension study-?

Scata: Sure, the simplest answer is because of where the nurses lived and where they reported their data from really is driving where we can look at the different levels.

Wright: Thank you. I'm hoping later on in your presentation, you're going to share with us that there's a study about event frequency because noise averages fail to capture the event frequency of noise exposure that many of us have over our communities with channelized flight paths.

Scata: Well, it does but not maybe in the way that you're thinking of.

Noonan: Speaking as a person who is subjected to aircraft noise, I can attest to the fact that the problem with the aircraft noise and the reason why it is so disruptive is that it's not because it's an average noise in the background. It's because it's extremely loud for a short period of time. Then that noise spike gets repeated often. The DNL noise metric seems to be a poor metric to correlate with health effects. My follow-up question is that the choice to use the DNL metric as opposed to other noise metrics, was that a choice of the researchers or was that a part of the request for research proposals that was put out by the FAA?

Scata: I was not in my position when this research project was started. I don't know the answer to that question. I certainly have the ability to go back and look at how we framed the project when it started, but I do not know off the top of my head.

Noonan: Would it be possible for you to find out and let us know? That would be, actually very interesting to us.

Scata: I certainly can.

Noonan: In your response, who will you communicate with you'll communicate with MWWA and they'll let us know? How does that work?

Scata: Veda could let you all know how we typically take IOUs and follow up.

Simmons: Yes, I will follow up with Mr. Jeck and he usually distributes it that way.

Ken Buckley: Was there a purposeful sampling scheme for getting the reporting on cardiovascular incidences instances? Is this a localized reporting of the willing?

Scata: When we're doing this research the importance of the data is that it's over a long period of time, we call it a longitudinal study. In this case, it was the nurse's health study or the nurse's health study. They're self-reporting.

Buckley: The statistics then are really just for this cohort, you can't really extrapolate at all about a population or even to make any hypothesis between those who live under a path and don't live under an aircraft path because it's really self-reporting.

Scata: I said there was a 10 percent increased risk in hypertension, which is different than cardiovascular disease. I don't know that I would agree with you that the European studies are more robust or they have stronger statistics than our study. We have taken much care in how we've designed this study and our researchers are experts in their field, and the approach that we've taken for this research is intended to allow us to draw conclusions from it. It's not necessarily structured so that we can only draw conclusions for nurses.

Buckley: I was an epidemiologist and that was my graduate training. I get a little sensitive when there's conjectures made about population statistics when the underlying sampling and the underlying statistical framework is somewhat constrained.

You can certainly make statistics about the cohorts you have. I have problems when this is being represented as some study that's going to be able to be applied more broadly to determine is there a higher incidence of hypertension or cardiovascular disease for those people who are living under flight paths. I'm disappointed that the FAA hasn't taken a more rigorous approach and partnered with somebody like the NIH that do a real more fulsome study.

Scata: The nurse's health studies are run by the NIH.

Buckley: One of the conjectures that disturbed me was at the beginning when you were talking about some of the properties of populations living in airport paths that they might have lower education and be more minority. I don't think that's true.

Maybe from the nurse's data but I find that somewhat surprising. Again, I hope that maybe the FAA can take the more learned approach to.

Scata: You'll be very interested when we have more results to share.

Caroline Burwell: Thank you, Ken, for mentioning the NIH. I have been working with some leading cardiologists in my job. Heart disease remains the number one killer of Americans, men, and women it is a serious health issue. My question for you, are you able to circulate the research design and some high-level points about this study? Who's funding it? What the research design looks like, the cardiologist that you're involved with? Potentially this is a great opportunity I don't know if you've already brought in the American Heart Association. Are they partnering with you on this?

Scata: I don't believe that we're directly partnering with The American Heart Association.

Burwell: There potentially is an opportunity to bring in some partners to help with the study design. Is it possible to circulate among this group, the core elements of the study? The research design, who's funding it, who are the cardiologists who you're working with?

Scata: It's important to recognize where we are in this specific study as far as it's life cycle. It's close to being completed. As I mentioned, we're continuing to work in this space. There's maybe more of a potential for us to take on interest and input on the continuation of this study, as opposed to pivoting the direction it's in. all of the information that you're asking for it's up on our Ascent website.

Burwell: Can you put that in the chat also? Who's funding the study?

Scata: It is an FAA-funded study.

Burwell: Correct. Who is the leading cardiologist or who is overseeing the research? What is their name?

Scata: We call that person the principal investigator, and her name is Jeanette Peters.

Burwell: What hospital, or what government entity is she affiliated with?

Scata: She's from the Boston University School of Public Health.

Burwell: Is she a cardiologist?

Don: I don't know.

Carolyn: Are there any cardiologists who are overseeing the study on cardiovascular health?

Scata: I'm not sure. It sounds like you're interested in the credentials of the researchers that are performing the research on this project. Is that correct?

Burwell: That's correct.

Scata: Yes, I can definitely provide links to any recent publications for this project.

Burwell: Any recent publications, I thought you said they're still working on the study. Have you already published the results?

Scata: They have published some of the results. Yes, that was what this presentation was based on.

Burwell: Where are they published?

Scata: I don't recall the specific names of the journals. I'll have to get back to you.

Burwell: Can you guys drop it in the chat stream, where this has been published?

Simmons: That's going to have to be a follow-up.

Burwell: When can you send that just so we can be on the lookout for it?

Scata: Maybe sometime next week.

Noonan: Does the FAA plan to fund any sort of expert review of all that prior studies where you kind of pull everything together, and compare them?

Scata: That was one of the suggestions that we do sort of have a look at what's been done. We're seriously considering doing that.

Burwell: When is the project on cardiovascular health completed?

Scata: Yes, we don't have a specific date, but we're hoping that it's being wrapped up sometime in the next six months or so.

Burwell: Do you intend to do a press release?

Scata: We haven't gone through a communication strategy development for the completion of the study yet.

Scata: This is another project that we're doing with the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, and HMMH in WestCap. It was initially developed through

ascent project number 17, and now it's funded through the FA Tech Center. The objective was to is to generate a dose-response relationship between aircraft noise exposure and sleep disturbance, and use a scientifically sound yet inexpensive study methodology to obtain objective measures of sleep disturbance.

In 2021, we began field study sampling around 77 airports around the United States. We envision it's sort of a two-year data collection effort. I'll talk a little bit about that in a subsequent slide. The overview is we're doing a national field study to acquire their data on sleep disturbance

The goal of the study is to rely on an inexpensive methodology of using actigraphy and electrocardiography that was tested through our sent pilot studies and found to provide a sensitive measure of awakenings. Participants living near 77 airports are being selected using a stratified random population sampling so that the sample will be generalizable to populations most affected by aircraft noise. A total of 400 participants are going to be recruited over a period of two consecutive years.

Shipp: Basically, you're talking about one person per airport at a certain noise level. Does that one person - does that seem like an adequate number of data points, to really give a picture?

Scata: We're not looking to develop airport-specific dose-response relationships. It doesn't really matter which airport folks are around. It matters how many people are within the different strata of exposure. I'm not a statistician, but the folks that are helping us with this project are. They've done a lot of work developing power calculations to confirm that this is the right number of participants that we need to get reliable values. A lot of this information can be found in the specific links to the Ascent projects. It's Ascent project 17 that we where we developed the pilot study and developed the methodology for this work.

Buckley: What sort of policy changes could possibly change regarding noise? Would this be less flights at night?

Scata: I'm not able to guess what policy changes could come out of the research at this point.

Buckley: It the said group also looking at aircraft noise as related to cognitive development of students in schools that are subjected to a high level and incidents of airplane noise? This is another set of studies that's been done in Europe and here, but I've always been surprised that the FAA really hasn't looked at that.

Scata: We've looked at it in the past. I don't recall having that suggested.

Buckley: You didn't read my response then.

Scata: Maybe you did suggest it but it certainly wasn't a commonly suggested project. If it's something that you all are interested to do, we're happy to have discussions about what that could look like.

Buckley: We are. Because with Reagan National, at least in DC, there's roughly 17 schools ranging from preschool to higher-level universities that are directly beneath the flight zone or the flight paths.

Simmons: I sent a copy of Don's presentation to Mike Jeck, if you could all just read through and maybe forward Mike any questions you have.

c. Recommendations 22, 23 and 24 (Matt Fisher)

Matt Fisher (FAA): I've got an update for Recommendation 23, which is a request to publish or encourage the use of NADP-1. This has been reviewed by the airlines and the P-56 incursion mitigation team. We've got a meeting slated for August to discuss if NADP-1 impacts the progress we've made in reducing incursions into P-56.

Tracy Montross: American has published NADP-1 at DCA, and it is being used by all of our mainline aircraft. It took about two months to do that. The procedures between Airbus and Boeing are just a little different.

Buckley: There's eight carriers that operate at National. One is still waiting for some information from their flight department, but five of the carriers as both you and Matt have mentioned are waiting, they're concerned about the impacts on P-56. I think at least three of them said they would get back to us after that meeting. I think when we see what comes out of that meeting, we'll see where it goes with that.

Wright: Tracy, thank you very much. We'll wait for the P-56 meeting, but then it would be great - you're mentioning 1,500 feet, 3000 feet - to get just get a summary.

Montross: I just put some of that language in the chat so you can see how we're using it on the Airbus and the 737 fleet. I would ask though, if you would pay attention to the differences in noise that you may be experiencing, recognizing that our bigger birds are flying differently than they have in the past. I'd be very interested in going back to this group within the next six months to really see if you're finding a difference. So that we can report back to our team that worked so hard to get this published so quickly. Thank you.

Fisher: Recommendation 24 was to publish 5,000 feet at Alex's waypoint approximately at 10 to 12 DME, northwest of the airport over Montgomery County, Maryland. The departures in a North configuration with a tailwind; we're crossing Alex anecdotally in the vicinity of about 6,500 feet. I'm curious to see how the data

plays out and how often we're below 5,000 feet with departures over Alex and we'll take that information and have an update for you during the October meeting just to see how much of a positive impact this will make.

Recommendation 22, GPS Runway 19. We're working through some environmental questions on that new procedure, and we will hopefully, my plan is to brief that in October.

Wright: The FAA IFP gateway website it shows a publication date of February 23rd, 2023. It sounds like that is unrealistic based on what you just said.

Fisher: That was the date as of about two weeks ago. There's some questions about environmental. From my perspective and experience, it should just be a CADAX . With some of the turnover and getting folks up to speed, it's been difficult to schedule those meetings to get everybody on the same page.

Wright: We'll look forward to an update in October. Any updates about the location for the new DARIC, on the CIA property? Have you gotten any closer to pinpointing exactly where that will be?

Matt: It'll still be on the localizer for the LDA Zulu to match the two procedures. I'm not in a position to release those yet because again I'm trying to get them past whatever their concerns are on the environmental piece. My hope is to pre-send that information out so you guys have a chance to review it before the October meeting if that opportunity presents itself.

Buckley: Would you be presenting a status of implementing the RNAV GPS procedure to be able to reduce the use of the LDA Zulu?

Fisher: Yes, that was my hope. My plan was to present that this evening and that plan, because of some other factors and concerns didn't come to fruition. My goal is in the October meeting to present the final design for the GPS Yankee approach, which is a new GPS approach associated with recommendation 22 and the associated approaches that it affects.

We'd like to be able to present the whole package, screenshots with where we're going to be flying over the top of as far as the final design, as far as overlaying with street maps and whatnot, so you guys can get a picture of what it looks like. I'd like to be able to get that to you ahead of time so you have a chance to review it and come at me with some good questions so we're being more efficient with our time come October.

Buckley: Would you also be able to include some schedule as to when it might be implemented?

Fisher: If I have that information in October, I will give a tentative date as usual. Any other questions, reference the follow-ups for 22, 23, or 24?

III. General Working Group Discussion

a. Montgomery County TAA Concept

Working Group

Mould: The next item is Montgomery County TAA concept.

Hartman: I was seeking an update on how we're doing with tracking the compliance with TAA. I know Jim Allardice had been working with Mike Jeck on mapping out an area and seeing how many flight were complying, how many weren't. We can take this up later or offline given the hour but we're very much interested in how are we doing. What percentage of flights are in the box, how many aren't.

Jeck: I provided the second quarter TAA data to Janelle a couple of weeks ago.

Hartman: That's fine. I will follow up with Janelle and have her share an update.

Wright: I disseminated it to the group. Everybody saw it, I think it was early July. In April, 16% of the flights were outside of the zone. 11% in May and 15% in June. I don't know if Matt Fisher's still on, I hope so. This probably reflects an uptick in volume at the airport. We understand that there was a second awareness briefing on May 10.

We appreciate anything that you and your shop can do to continue to make controllers aware of this and promote it when the airspace isn't busy. We understand what your constraints are, that you need the real estate to space and sequence when it is busy, but we greatly appreciate the adoption. We're hoping as time goes on that more air traffic controllers will be willing to try it and decide they might actually like it and that it's really meaningful to people that live under the channelized flight paths. I just wanted to thank you. Thank you to Mike Jeck for tracking it for us and it's something that we'll look forward to just touching base briefly on at every meeting.

b. Wards 6, 7, and 8 and Anacostia River

Mike Metcalf: As the current operations are, the vast majority of departures go straight over land that is north of the Anacostia River rather than over the Anacostia River.

Jeck: You can submit a recommendation for working group consideration. It does not have to come through the North of the Airport Subcommittee.

Metcalf: Okay. Can I do this through you by email?

Jeck: You can send me the recommendation and it can go on to the agenda. It will be an agenda item that will be voted on by the working group.

Metcalf: Good. That's all I ask. That's exactly the answer I wanted. I appreciate it. In the next week or so I'll send you the proposal as written along with copies of the two flight path charts.

Jeck: Matt, I think all Mike's really asking for is when aircraft are departing runway 4 that the same goal with the other runways, maximize over water, minimize over land, be applied. I think all Mike really wants is to see aircraft to the extent possible, if it's feasible, to be relocated from over land to over water.

Metcalf: That's right.

Fisher: Mike, I would welcome the recommendation and something that we can review as far as how that fits in the GPS world because the runway for departures now coded as part of the departure procedures, and that was something that we briefed a few years ago. Having that design goal with a possible revamp of Runway 4 is certainly something we can take a look at.

Metcalf: I assure you, it's easy. It's an easy presentation and it looks like an easy solution to us. Maybe we don't know about that. At any rate, it looks like it's easy, so easy to fix.

Fisher: I know for a long time, depending on the years that you're looking to track data it was heading off the airport and that's always subject to what the winds are doing and how the pilot flies and when they should turn. Now it's all GPS based so it should be pretty consistent. The same channelization that's causing us problems everywhere else, we should be able to work to your benefit in this area if we can. Just want to look at the technicalities and see if we can even pull it off. If so, it's something that when the opportunity arises there should be no reason not to pursue it unless it just doesn't work.

Metcalf: I'll send that over next week sometime.

Fisher: I would get your document together and then in the October roundtable present it to the group and you all can vote on it

Metcalf: Thank you very much for hearing me and considering me.

Evie Washington: Where I represent is where the aircraft arrival and departures come nowhere near the Anacostia River. They are dense residential areas. Now, if

they go straight down the Anacostia, that would be perfect, but they don't do that and they not going to do that. I know that.

Metcalfe: My hope was that once we get this recommendation submitted, we can turn to this Ward 7 issue, which is a little more complicated.

Mould: Sounds like we have a topic for next time.

Fisher: I do want to set expectations that we have a final design on the procedure and response for Recommendation 22 that's been under works for about four years now, and we're looking at a mid to late 2023 chart date. We've not even started design work on anything as it pertains to Anacostia. This is not going to be a quick resolution. I wouldn't even guess a date right now.

Metcalfe: Okay. Thanks a lot.

c. Other Business

Mould: Further items before we close?

Buckley: Is it possible to include a list of any observers, anybody else who participated on a call outside of the community work group and the FAA?

Mould: I'll have to look into that. I don't know.

Buckley: I don't need names, but it'd be interesting to know just by count, and if they are government officials, from what jurisdictions they were from.

Mould: We will look into that.

Mitchell: When we had the face-to-face meetings, it was always a rich experience to see who was actually attending in the audience and be able to have some sidebars perhaps after the meeting. Now we don't even know if there's anybody there essentially. Unless we hear some indirect matters. I think it would be an excellent idea to be able to provide some visibility into who else is in the audience who's not a panelist.

Mould: We'll look into it.

Motion to adjourn made, seconded and approved.

Meeting ended at 8:11 p.m.