

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

DATE: 5/08/2012

TIME: 4:30 p.m. Eastern



Telephone Conversation



Meeting



Other

SUBJECT: Phase 2 Bi-Weekly Project Management Call

SUMMARY PREPARED 5/08/2012

ATTENDEES (include affiliation):

| Name | Affiliation |
|----------------|------------------|
| Terry English | FAA |
| Gail Lattrell | FAA |
| Flavio Leo | Massport |
| Sandra Kunz | CAC (Braintree) |
| Jerry Falbo | CAC (Winthrop) |
| Wig Zamore | CAC (Somerville) |
| John Williams | PC |
| Rob Adams | IC |
| Stan Matthews | IC |
| Brian Brunelle | FAA (Presenter) |

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

| Name | Affiliation |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Ron Hardaway | CAC (East Boston) |
| Maura Zlody | City of Boston |
| Jon Harris | FAA |
| Cheryl McCullough | FAA |

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

| Individuals | Files |
|--------------|-------|
| Project File | |
| BLANS Forum | |
| CAC | |
| BOS/TAC | |

I. Attendance & Approval of Notes:

John Williams took attendance. J. Williams stated that Brian Brunelle from FAA would present information related to Item IV.b. in the agenda and asked if that item could be moved to follow the discussion of meeting notes. The PMT attendees agreed. The notes for that discussion are provided below, in the same order as presented in the agenda.

II. Approval of 01/24/2012 Meeting Notes:

Although the notes had already been finalized and posted, J. Williams gave PMT another opportunity to comment. There were no comments or changes noted.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

III. Discussion and Explanation of the Results of the CAC Vote on the Level 3 Measures:

J. Williams informed call participants that the CAC voting results had been received and are currently being reviewed by FAA and Massport. T. English is coordinating with the FAA Evaluation Team, Massport, etc., and is hoping to issue a formal response by the second week of June. She also mentioned that there is concern that the CAC voted to implement numerous measures that don't show overall noise benefits and in some cases increase noise and appear to be inconsistent with the goals and objectives of the CAC. S. Kunz did not agree and said that the CAC feels that these measures did meet the membership's goals and objectives. J. Falbo concurred with S. Kunz and said that T. English's reaction to the voting results sounded dismal and asked what the alternative would be if the FAA does not support passing certain measures under the noise study.

T. English mentioned that certain operational measures could be considered, independently, by the FAA for NextGen projects and that CAC would be involved in the environmental reviews of those measures. S. Kunz requested a sit down meeting with the FAA after FAA's review of the measures is completed. T.English suggested that the review should be completed before June 30th.

IV. Next Steps:

a. Determine PRAS Intentions (CAC)

S. Kunz informed callers that she requested a vote by CAC members on this matter by May 21st.

b. Complete Post-Implementation Assessment (Task 3.2)

B. Brunelle from FAA provided an overview of the draft post-implementation exhibit that shows preliminary results of an analysis of shoreline crossing altitudes for aircraft following the RNAV SIDs using data collected for the entire year (2011). He discussed runway crossings and the increased altitude changes between Pre-Phase 1 and Post-Phase 1 departures. The average overall change is a 2,000 foot increase in shoreline crossing altitudes.

B. Brunelle stated that the data were received very recently, so further screening is being done to determine that all of the green flight tracks in the exhibit are in fact RNAV departures. However, he is pretty certain that at least 95% of these tracks are RNAV departures, but also mentioned that some of them may be above 14,000 feet and be out of the area of study.

B. Brunelle then briefly discussed the RNAV SID updates that were required because some aircraft (e.g. Boeing 737-700 and 800 series) are unable to follow the RNAV procedures because they are higher performing aircraft. MITRE's analysis on the "flyability" of these aircraft confirmed this issue. B. Brunelle said that the design criteria was changed several times in 2011 and again in January 2012 to require longer segment distance and more shallow turns, required by the higher performing aircraft. With this new RNAV design criteria, all shoreline crossing points can still be met by all aircraft. He then advised that there was one crossing that was affected. Shoreline Crossing Area "T" was moved farther south by about four miles due to a boundary issue with Boston

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

Center. With this change, this crossing will likely be out of the study area because aircraft will pass this crossing above 14,000 feet. The publication date for the revised procedure is anticipated for March 3, 2013. A decision on which measures to use must be made by August 1, 2012.

Lastly, B. Brunelle advised that Boston TRACON is working with JetBlue on an RNAV Visual to Runway 33L procedures that will provide enhanced guidance to the runway consistent with the intent of the existing Charted Visual to Runway 33L. This is particularly for Airbus aircraft, which comprise a large percentage of operations at the Airport.

T. English mentioned that the purpose of this assessment is to use it to help establish a game plan on how the CAC/IC may want to evaluate the success of the Phase 1 measures and to determine what else needs to be done to measure and monitor their success. She also said that this assessment only covered departures, so arrivals will still need to be assessed.

c. Prepare Level 3 Screening Report

J. Williams advised that a draft of this report should be available May 25th.

d. Convene Elected Representatives Briefing

T. English said that June 19th was set aside as a potential date for this briefing, but given the request for a sit down meeting between CAC and FAA to go over the review results, this date may be too soon. She suggested that this date could be used for the requested sit down meeting and the elected representative briefing could be pushed back.

e. Determine/Develop Phase 3 Scope of Services

The determination/development of a Phase 3 Scope of Services is dependent on the outcome of the CAC voting results review. S. Kunz added that she hopes that there would be funding for the IC to assist the CAC if this occurs.

V. Project Schedule:

a. Updated Project Schedule

J. Williams briefly discussed this schedule.

b. Schedule of Items to Complete by June 30th

J. Williams briefly discussed this schedule. T. English asked if the website would remain active after Phase 2 is completed. J. Williams said that he thinks it would be beneficial for it to remain active and will look into if/how to provide the funding.

T. English asked Massport if the contract could be extended, if needed. F. Leo advised that a contract extension, which only extends the term and not the budget, would be okay. G. Lattrell added that an extension would not affect the grant.

W. Zamore asked if the level of precision in Phase 2 was put in place because of the possibility of a federal environmental process at the end. J. Williams said that the purpose was to have this level of precision in the event that it led to an environmental

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

document. The determination of a need for a NEPA document and the type of document, such as an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement, will be made after the FAA makes its determination on the CAC's recommendations and if more information is necessary, it would be scoped for Phase 3. W. Zamore also asked if the determination of a requirement for an environmental document would occur simultaneously with the FAA's findings on the recommendations and J. Williams replied that it would.

S. Kunz requested that the CAC be informed in advance about any issues to measures identified during the FAA review. The intent is to have an understanding of the issues that exist before the sit down meeting with the FAA.

VI. Miscellaneous:

J. Williams opened the call for any observer comments.

R. Hardaway asked if aircraft company names would be added to complaint reports. F. Leo responded by saying that if the company name was requested, it could be added to a specific complaint.

R. Hardaway made a comment about how there is an inconsistency in how RNAV works across various aircraft types. J. Williams replied by explaining that there is still a mix of aircraft in the fleet and that work is being done on how to meet the capabilities of each aircraft type.

M. Zlody did not have any comments.

The call was adjourned.