

**Boston Logan Airport Noise Study
Project Management Team Teleconference
13-10-0793-2.1**

**July 31, 2014
9:00 a.m. EDT**

Facilitator: John Williams **Note taker:** Brian Philiben

Attendees:

Name	Representing	Email
Flavio Leo	Massport	fleo@massport.com
Terry English	FAA, Air Traffic Organization, BLANS Program Manager	terry.english@faa.gov
Sandra Kunz	President Logan Airport Community Advisory Committee (CAC)	skunz@verizon.net
Jerry Falbo	CAC	lawfsg@winthropesq.com
Declan Boland	CAC	declan.boland@comcast.net
Darryl Pomicter	CAC	dpomic@aol.com
Wig Zamore	CAC	wigzamore@rcn.com
Rob Adams	Independent Consultant	radams@landrum-brown.com
John Williams	Project Consultant	j_williams@ricondo.com

Discussion Points

Meeting agenda attached.

J. Williams (JW) began meeting with a brief recap of Phase 3:

- The Technical Committee kickoff meeting for Phase 3 occurred August 5, 2013, with a number of presentations from FAA, the Independent Consultant, and the Project Consultant.
- A management team meeting was held on September 4th that focused on development of a framework for the runway use program.
- Revised 2015 noise contours were prepared reflecting implementation of measures from Phase 1 and changes to some of the procedures made in 2013. (Note: Following completion of the noise contours, it was recognized that new FAA rules regarding operations on non-intersecting converging runways (converging runway operations [CRO]) will result in changes in runway use, particularly between Runway 27 and Runways 22L and 22R. A test of the CRO rules and their effect on runway use has been underway since April 2014 and will be completed in September 2014. The 2015 noise contours will be run again once the long-term effects of the CRO are confirmed.)
- A management team meeting was held on November 14, 2013 and included a presentation by R. Adams (RA) on behalf of CAC regarding a preliminary framework for a runway use program, with discussions on how to move forward with the development of a runway use program.
- A CAC meeting was held on February 18, 2014, at which a consensus was reached to continue to work to develop a Runway Use Program, consistent with FAA regulations, to be approved by the CAC, Massport,, and the FAA.

- A coordination meeting was held on March 26, 2014, to discuss how to further progress on Phase 3. During the meeting, RA reported that CAC had reached consensus on a framework for the runway use program in February 2014 and that he was preparing a revised framework specific to BOS.
- A coordination meeting, including the CAC President observing (without commenting), was held on April 23, at which the framework was presented to FAA and Massport by RA and discussions of tests of various components of the runway use program were discussed. It was stated that FAA was testing the effects of new rules for Converging Runway Operations (CRO) that are being implemented. The new rules most likely will affect arrivals on Runways 22L/R and 27. Tests of other arrival procedures are also ongoing. It was decided that any testing of the runway use program could not begin until October 1.
- On May 23, 2013, RA submitted a description of the first test period on behalf of CAC.
- T. English (TE) noted that after letter exchanges between FAA and CAC, that FAA had stated that it would agree to sign a document regarding the runway use program once the program is finalized.
- An internal FAA meeting was held on June 12 to discuss the test proposed by CAC and discuss questions regarding the proposed test, as well as administrative procedures to satisfy NEPA requirements.
- A follow up meeting was then held between FAA and Massport on July 15 to further discuss the test, including reporting requested by the CAC

JW said that the FAA meeting on June 12 had gone well and that Tower and TRACON staff were ready to move forward, but had a couple of comments and questions for CAC, as well as questions on how to communicate runway use configurations with Massport to determine the preferred runway use in the morning.

JW said that the July 15 meeting was to further discuss the tests with Massport. F. Leo (FL) said that the discussion at the July 15 meeting covered any questions from FAA over the test and a review of implementation of the test. The meeting also included a discussion of the requested reporting and output from the tests, as well as how to communicate the preferred runway use for the morning.

D. Pomicter (DP) said that he had an issue with information presented at the July 18 meeting requested by Senator Markey; that the CAC disagreed significantly with items in the FAA (and Massport) presentation and had no opportunity to state their disagreement or present their view. For example, the presentation included "CAC has proposed a Runway Use Program based on rotational use of the runway". And, Terry English also commented on rotational. With no mention of preferential or priority or of the relevant FAA documents which allow much more, that could be inferred/understood to be the extent of the RUP considerations.

TE confirmed DP's statement that the program could include more than rotational runway use, but that the presentation she gave at the Markey meeting was to report on what is currently being proposed by the CAC which is testing for a rotational type program. DP said he understands that the first phase of the test is a rotational use, and the latest document includes; "After the end of the test periods, the feasibility of percentage –based goals would be determined...".

DP repeated his request for a Runway Use Historic Baseline of operations, as discussed at the August 5, 2013 Technical Committee Kickoff Meeting: "D. Pomictter stated that we need to start with knowing the current noise impacts baseline. Arrivals and Departures by each of the six Runway Ends. For the past five years since the opening of R14-32 shifted runway use patterns, and for at least the five years prior to Runway 14-32. All modeled aircraft—jets, turboprops, and piston props." He stated that he thought FL had agreed by the end of that meeting—FAA and Massport were even going to consider and advise for CAC consideration what shifts they thought might be possible from the historic Runway Use Baseline: "F. Leo stated that he likes the idea of using the past ten years as a baseline. That Massport would consult with the FAA and try to propose changes to the CAC from current actual." DP also noted from the May 26, 2014 Coordination Meeting Notes: "BB said that FAA will not be in favor of a runway use change, unless it would actually improve something; FAA will not initiate a runway use change just to have a runway use change. BB said that he had hoped to have CAC recommendations on changes in annual runway use percentages, based on the 10 year runway use averages – not on changing runways more often.'

DP then repeated his request that Noise (Exposure and Impacts) by Runway End and Noise (Exposure and Impacts) by Community (including from Runway End) should follow (With the FAA Noise Model determining annual Day-Night Average Sound Level for exposure. And, then Sound-Level Weighted Population for impact.)

FL stated that current historical data is available through EDR. FL stated that there are complicating factors with tailoring data to specific needs. Different communities will have different perspectives and would have different needs for data. In addition, communities farther from the Airport get overflights from a number of runways. Closer communities would more clearly be able to see impacts from operations, communities farther out may need more specific data sets.

DP responded that Massport needs to provide 1st level data, operations of all aircraft. And, that his requests were initially through the EDR & ESPR process. He noted that Massport EDR and ESPR report Noise Abatement Runway Use only for jets—not the >15% turboprops and piston props (which are included in Activity Levels and in the Noise Model. The non-jet operations are non-reported Events, which are significant intrusion impacts. (The >10% Cape Air Cessna 402C piston props are noisier than Boeing and Airbus jetliners with >10X Passengers.) He noted that Massport EDR & ESPR report Runway Use by Runway Direction—with Arrivals and Departures over opposite ends and different Communities—and do not report Runway Use by Runway End—with Arrivals and Departures over the same end and the same Communities. He added that the Massport EDR for 2012 & 2013, delayed a year to Fall 2014, should include the more complete reporting—for clear Public information, Community understanding, and BLANS Phase 3 and New Noise Abatement Committee assistance.

FL addressed the need to establish a standardized CAC protocol for obtaining data from Massport. A standardized CAC protocol is necessary to ensure the data reflects the need of a runway use monitoring program and to avoid numerous unique requests from specific individuals and locations. He said that Massport is willing to present all available data through a formal request process.

SK asked if RA could incorporate DP's suggestions into formal requests. SK expressed the formal request process is a concern to go over with all of the CAC membership. SK suggests requests should go through RA instead of individual members.

FL requested any additional input from other attendees on the data request protocol.

W. Zamore (WZ) stated that Massport data is currently organized by census tract. Data could be provided to more accurately show percentages of population impacted. WZ emphasized the importance of transparency through the availability of data.

WZ agreed with DP on the importance of distinguishing between short-term impacts and long-term metrics. While residents are annoyed with short-term persistent impacts, short-term impacts are often measured through metrics that have been developed to analyze long-term conditions. Environmental epidemiology has most impacts measured on an annual basis and data should be evaluated with this in mind.

WZ stated that long-term runway use allocation is considerably more important than the short-term. He continued that long-term cannot be tacked on to the short-term project. [Moved from separate, closing below.]

JW began discussion of FAA comments related to the proposed runway use program test. FAA comments include a request regarding the preferences for runway use changes the following morning. Specifically, FAA is fine with the first three in order of preference (different configuration entirely, different primary departure runway, different primary arrival runway). FAA stated that weather and operational conditions should be stated as a condition to implement any change the following morning, rather than that being the fourth in order of preferences.

RA requested that FAA's questions/comments be provided in writing.

JW said that FAA would like clarification for the configuration/time at night to establish baseline to compare against the following morning, as runway can change several times between 8:30 and midnight.

SK asked if this was discussed in the previous meeting. SK stated that Massport and FAA need to clarify what protocol is followed as a general practice. Massport has had plenty of time to get information in place. SK also said that the comments/questions must be provided in writing.

TE said that the information will be sent to SK and the group. JW said that he would prepare a memo with the comments/requests.

JW stated that the purpose of the test is to see what protocols are working and what needs adjustments in order to develop procedures and the program.

SK asked about resolving legal issues regarding 4 different test areas, JW responded that this issue will be covered later in the meeting.

There then occurred a discussion on when recommendations for runway use be made to the FAA from Massport. FL reviewed with the group the process that was used when R33L was closed in 2011 and 2012 due to the safety area construction- by 2 p.m. Massport made a recommendation to FAA on the configuration for the following morning. This recommendation would be based on forecasts for the remainder of the evening and the next morning. The recommendation of Friday at 2 p.m. would include recommendations for Saturday, Sunday, and Monday mornings.

RA inquired as why Massport wouldn't make a recommendation for the period from 8:30 to midnight. FL responded that the recommendation for the next day is based on the use pattern for the current day into the evening and that it would pretty well be known at 2 p.m. what configuration would be in use between 8:30 and midnight.

DP questioned why Massport is omitting consideration of long-term goals in their daily recommendations in the current test program. DP suggested that daily, weekly and monthly short-term recommendations and reporting need to work towards long-term goals. In Runway 33L RSA construction, Massport alternative recommendations and FAA actual matched significantly more over time—with daily communication and short-term tracking and reporting.

FL responded that it was his understanding that the current goal is to test components of a runway use program and observe results. Long-term goals would be developed once results of the runway use program tests are understood.

DP reiterated that there needs to be consideration—short-term tracking, consideration and reporting—for percentage of runway use.—to develop, affect, and improve more equitable distribution.

JW stated that presently the team is testing the ability for implementations to occur and to check how protocols are implemented. Currently we are looking incrementally at the runway use program and the purpose of the first test is to understand how the implementation would work.

TE stated that there is nothing in the test proposal that includes long-term goals at this time.

RA stated that currently they are measuring the runway use program through these first tests on protocols. After this work is complete would be the appropriate time to discuss and develop long-term goals. At this point without the results of the tests it would be too challenging to develop any long-term goals.

DP stated that Massport needs to think about long-term goals. Better recommendations will force FAA to be more attentive to the needs of the airport. There needs to be goals for runway use. He said some long-term goals are obvious for more equitable distribution—use the Runway Ends with >30% less, and use the Runway End with <10% more.

RA agreed with DP on the eventual need for long-term goals, however at this point there are issues not yet agreed upon regarding morning and night use protocol. Long-term goals should be developed once

the tests are understood. SK said that she agreed that the tests needed to be completed and the full program needed to be developed before considering any runway use goals.

TE stated that currently four, 3-month tests have been agreed upon. In accordance with FAA Orders, a test approved under a Categorical Exclusion (CatEx) is not to exceed a total of 6 months. TE discussed with the FAA Environmental Policy Group whether the tests could be considered four separate tests instead of one test with four parts. They agreed that they could be separated into four separate tests. The FAA Legal disagrees with this premise however. TE asked the group whether a full year of tests is absolutely necessary to obtain accurate data. TE requested that if so, both CAC and Massport should respond in writing why it would be necessary to have a full year of data. TE also asked as an alternative, whether it is feasible for IC/Massport to implement four incremental 45-day tests within the 3-month tests, which total 180 days or 6 months of testing days

RA responded that one full year of tests is extremely important and that this could be put into writing for TE. RA said that he does not understand the issue that FAA Legal has with the four separate tests, since many airports are testing various conditions that exceed six months. TE asked RA if he could let her know where this be happening, since to date no one in the FAA has been able to cite an example of where this has been done before.

FL concurred that due to the location of Boston Logan on the eastern seaboard, weather patterns are not consistent and change throughout the year. These conditions create a need for longer testing periods in order to obtain the necessary data.

JW began discussion of the next steps for the team, and that he will provide questions and comments from FAA regarding the first test period. He will also be preparing a schedule for Phase 3, working with RA. At this time, the schedule will be based on a yearlong test period. CAC will need to provide any requests regarding runway use date.

JW said that we have reached a point where it is time to review the scope and budget for Phase 3 for both the PC and the IC, as the overall methodology for developing a runway use program has changed. JW discussed the data requested by CAC for the test periods. Massport said that they could provide all of the requested data, but would need additional work from HMMH for the initial setup for conduction the requested noise analyses. FL requested that budget for this comes from Phase 3.

DP said that funding for this activity should come from Massport.. Exactly what work is HMMH proposing of use only by BLANS? Exactly what work and funding is Massport proposing being used from BLANS Phase 3 Scope of Service contract? Substantially behind schedule—with very little progress since the August 5, 2013 Kickoff, following negotiations from late 2012 to avoid the FAA and Massport intention to replace Phase 3 with an abbreviated "Post Phase 2"—isn't all current funding required to complete the intended? What happens if current/remaining funding is or becomes insufficient to complete—will Massport agree to reimburse/supplement BLANS? At least some additional work is appropriate by Massport for more complete EDR reporting. For more complete online Noise Abatement reporting. For Massport's agreed new Noise Abatement Committee. Isn't HMMH on-call/on-retainer consultant for Massport? Can't Massport fund this as they did the HMMH R22R Departure reports, responding to

neighborhood complaints—totally independent of, unknown to the CAC? How will Massport provide funding for the future CAC data requests FL has promised to respond to—if properly formatted)? (“He said that Massport is willing to present all available data through a formal request process.”) JW replied that a specific budget has been set aside in Phase 3 for Wyle to test various runway use alternatives. He said that a revised baseline contour will be needed to reflect the effects of the CRO tests, as well as a contour at the end of this process to assess the effects of the Runway Use Program. Funds would need to continue to be aside for those noise analyses.

FL stated that money set aside for the program tests may be better allocated to HMMH since this would provide a baseline for the ongoing monitoring that will be needed once the implementation is completed. This could be based on what is scoped in the existing contract and is work that will be done by the project anyways.

Action Items:

- ✓ CAC to develop standardized protocol for requesting data from Massport (CAC)
- ✓ FAA comments/questions on the runway use program test document to be provided in writing (PC)
- ✓ Responses in writing from CAC and Massport for FAA why it is necessary to have a full year of data (CAC, Massport)
- ✓ Schedule for Phase 3 (PC, working with IC)

Attachments:

Runway use plan document

Distribution:

13-10-0793-2.1

Meeting Attendees

Read File

c:\users\jwilliams\desktop\jcw_files\client_files\massport\logan_airport_noise_study\phase_3\phase_3_meeting_notes\pmt_meeting_07312014\20140815_pmt_meeting_07312014_notes_final.docx

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study

Project Management Team Meeting

July 31, 2014 9:00 AM – 10:00 AM

Teleconference Call in Information:

877-273-4202 (Conference Room: 8948278)

Agenda

Phase 3 Recap

Status of Preparations for Proposed Runway Use Program Test 1 Planned to Begin October 1, 2014

Test Protocol dated May 25, 2014 from CAC

FAA Discussion on June 12, 2014

FAA/Massport Discussion on July 15, 2014

FAA Comments Related to the Proposed Runway Use Program Test

Massport/FAA Procedures for Implementing the Test

Status of FAA Legal Discussions of NEPA Approval for Test

Massport to Request Test in Writing

Public Notification of Testing and Outreach

FAA Legal Advising that CatEx Approval is not to Exceed 6 months of Testing

Next Steps