

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

DATE: 10/06/09
TIME: 4:30 p.m. EST

Telephone Conversation
 Meeting
 Other

SUBJECT: Phase 2 Bi-Weekly Project Management Call

SUMMARY PREPARED BY: Rick Peloquin

DATE PREPARED: 10/06/09

ATTENDEES (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Steve Smith	PC
Jon Woodward	IC
Terry English	FAA
Flavio Leo	Massport
Jerry Falbo	CAC (Winthrop)
Sandra Kunz	CAC (Braintree)

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Alan Reed	FAA
Joe Davies	FAA
Maura Zlody	CAC (Boston)
Ron Hardaway	CAC (East Boston)

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

Individuals	Files
Project File BLANS Forum CAC BOS/TAC	

I. Attendance:

Steve Smith took attendance.

II. Approval of 7/28/09 Meeting Notes:

An observer's name was updated from Stan Lihosit to Stan Matthews. A typo was fixed in the last sentence of page one (space added between "official" and "Tower"). There are additional changes that T. English has, but these will be sent via email in order to save time on today's call. These were discussed on the 10/13/09 call.

III. Project Status Update:

- a. **2005 Noise Analysis** – S. Smith advised PMT that the IC review has been completed and Wyle is finishing the document. J. Woodward added that IC is still waiting for the grid point results, but these results won't change the outcome.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

- b. **2007 Noise Analysis** – Wyle has sent information to IC for review. S. Smith said that at a minimum, he would like to show the results from the '07 analysis at the upcoming BOS/TAC meeting. If time allows, a contour will be created.

- c. **Phase 1 Implementation Status** – J. Davies gave PMT an implementation summary for remaining Phase 1 procedures and advised that a more in-depth summary will be provided at the upcoming BOS/TAC meeting. Some of the highlights of his summary were as follows:
 - a. Alternative 6 was implemented on 10/1/09.
 - b. RNAV DP's to be published on 10/22/09.
 - c. Operational training to be conducted in January 2010 for RY9 procedures.
 - d. Phased implementation: Rwy 9 departures to be assigned RNAV beginning 2/1/10.
 - e. 90 day break-in/familiarization/unintended consequences evaluation period.
 - f. Rwy 04 departures to be assigned RNAV beginning 5/3/10.
 - g. Due to safety/separation issues, Rwy 15 and Rwy 22 procedures must be modified before implementation. First available date is 11/18/10.
 - h. Expect implementation for Rwy 15 and Rwy 22 on 11/18/10.
 - i. Only primary departure Rwy will be assigned an RNAV - secondary will be assigned LOGAN SID to ensure separation.

J. Woodward asked if the BOS SID was revised to reflect conventional departures from Phase 1? J. Davies responded by saying that nothing changed to the SID procedure because traffic is directed primarily by controller issued headings. The SID just shows the initial headings from the runways and the departure fixes.

S. Smith asked if the SOP for TRACON was changed to account for the conventional. J. Davies stated that the SOP did not need to be changed for the conventionals.

- d. **Website Update** – S. Smith notified PMT that the updates to the website are almost complete and it should be online by 10/9/09. He also said that an enhanced library is one of the new features of the update.

Action Items: (1) T. English to send PMT Phase 1 implementation schedule and comments from the 7/28/09 call.
(2) S. Smith to notify PMT when website update is complete and online.

IV. Level 1 Report Finalized Decisions:

S. Smith directed PMT's attention to the summary Level 1 decision matrix and indicated the screening effort is final. T. English said there has been a change to how decisions are documented. The term "rejected" was replaced with the term "eliminated" and there is information added to the

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

matrix as to why a specific measure was eliminated. For example, some of the fanned heading measures were eliminated because they contradict the CAC's goals and objectives.

S. Smith advised that there are 22 measures moving forward to Level 2. He also mentioned that the document is ready to be sent and would be posted on the public website.

S. Smith also notified the PMT that the measures were renumbered and why this took place. The reasoning behind the renumbering was due to a voluntary helicopter measure that was never voted on by CAC. Since this measure was similar to an existing measure, it was incorporated into the existing measure, thus requiring a renumbering to keep the measures in order. The CAC memo was changed to reflect the renumbering, which was noted, and was added as an appendix of the Level 1 screening document. S. Kunz and J. Falbo did not indicate any problem with the adjustment.

V. Elected Representative Update Letters:

T. English stated that there was some confusion surrounding distribution of the newly impacted community letters, and that they needed to be retracted because they had not yet received internal FAA review. She said that the FAA would still consider PMT comments on the retracted letter, but would redistribute another draft for additional comments prior to the next PMT call. She said that she wanted to obtain the consensus of the CAC and IC that the PC route corridors for Measures F-GG and F-DD reasonably depict the intent of the CAC measure. Once confirmed, this will allow the FAA to determine potential newly impacted communities for outreach purposes.

A discussion about the BLANS study area followed.

J. Woodward said that intent of the FAA to capture the newly impacted communities is good, but it conflicts with the revised Scope of Work. He said that the radius would have to be changed back to 25 miles from the existing 20 miles, since these communities are outside of a 20 mile radius from the study area.

S. Smith advised PMT that the miles that are being referenced are actually nautical miles and that the original figure of 25 miles in the scope was a typo. If the communities are really outside of the study area per the SOW, a supplemental study area may need to be created. However, he recommends that this be added to the scope if determined after further evaluation after the conclusion of Level 2.

T. English advised that the measures are within TRACON airspace, so they are within the scope; and the reason for considering overflights over those community.

It was then determined that IC and CAC agreed that the depiction of the intent of determining the newly impacted communities is reasonable for graphic F-GG. It was also determined re graphic F-GG, that new communities would be added to the study area if a more defined route within the depicted corridor remains and is moved to Level 3 screening.

F. Leo had asked if there were graphics for all of the other affected communities.

T. English responded by telling F. Leo that the measures F-GG and F-DD did not have clear route depictions and it was important to confirm where those may be to ensure outreach efforts that potentially involve communities outside the study area.

T. English then moved on to graphic F-DD and wanted to obtain the consensus of the CAC and IC that the depiction of the intent of determining the newly impacted communities is reasonable.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

S. Smith stated that the three impacted communities in graphic F-DD depict some of the same communities shown in F-GG.

It was then determined that IC and CAC agreed that the depiction of the intent of determining the potential addition of communities is reasonable for graphic F-DD.

T. English said that Allen Reed procured contacts (representatives) for the potentially added towns.

T. English described a plan for the letters.

1. Confirm proposed flight tracks w/A90 for Measures F-DD and F-GG.
2. Confirm the same w/CAC as CAC voted to recommend these measures.
3. Confirm potentially newly impacted communities based on input from A90 and CAC.
4. Determine POCs for each of these new communities.
5. Determine state and federal reps for the new communities.
6. Heads up (email) to federal reps re new communities potentially impacted for input on outreach.
7. Confirm outreach strategy after coordination w/Fed rep(s) and coordinate CAC President on involvement.
8. Expect telecon w/local, state and federal POCs for new communities with reps from FAA, MPA and CAC on line.
9. Prepare fact sheet to for telecon discussion purposes.
10. Post Final Level 1 Screening Report to updated BLANS website.
11. Follow initial outreach to newly impacted communities with formal letters to ALL communities in study area (including new ones) as well as the state and federal reps.
12. Send outreach letter to aviation industry at same time.
13. Conduct Media Release at same time.

J. Woodward said that it would be a good idea to re-contact non responders to the original outreach letters. S. Smith advised that this is going to happen when the letters get sent to all of the communities that are in the current study area.

T. English said that if the telcon to the newly affected communities can take place within the next two weeks, they should be able to send the letters out by the BOS/TAC meeting. J. Woodward and S.Kunz said that they could participate in an outreach telecon to new communities any day within the next two weeks except Monday.

Action Items: (1) T. English to send action plan for outreach letters to PMT for review.

VI. Scope Reassessment:

S. Smith advised that this was sent last Friday and he understands that this didn't allow much time for PMT review. He explained that until now, PC had to keep track of all changes along the way as the PC scope required adjustments. He explained the two times that the scope was adjusted and funding had to be rearranged to conduct TAAM calibration and the 2007 noise analysis updates. The scope PC started with is the version after the 2007 noise modeling update was added.

He identified some high-level topics that need to be ironed out, which are highlighted in yellow in the text.

PRAS –The Massport-CAC decision related to PRAS should be discussed before other runway use measures are evaluated, because all of these measures would be linked to the future of PRAS. As agreed to at the beginning of Phase 2, detailed runway use analysis pending the PRAS decision would take place in Phase 3, if needed.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

J. Woodward said that he isn't sure that PRAS should be used due to all of the constraints involved. He believes that voluntary runway use or preferential runway use is better than PRAS to yield runway noise abatement.

F. Leo stated that the decision related to PRAS should just involve whether PRAS should be maintained, adjusted in some manner, or eliminated.

S. Smith said that he isn't looking for a decision to use or not use PRAS at this point, but is interested in knowing if the order is okay.

1. Outcome of measures
2. A decision on PRAS from Massport and CAC
3. Detailed discussion regarding runway use measures (conducted in Phase 3 if some form of PRAS is maintained)

When reviewing, PC is requesting PMT to review the proposed language in the preamble.

Action Items: (1) S. Smith to send scope reassessment to PMT for next call on October 13, 2009.

Post Implementation Noise Monitoring: S. Smith advised PMT that IC has a proposal to add to the scope.

J. Woodward explained that the south shore wanted to see what changes are affected by Phase 1 measures and wanted IC to check/monitor to see if aircraft were flying where they should. Also, certain CAC members requested that IC go into the field to measure noise to prove or confirm that Phase 1 improvement measures were meeting expectations. S. Smith indicated that this was not part of the original scope. J. Woodward agreed, but indicated that CAC wishes to add to the scope.

S. Smith asked when this task would end. J. Woodward said that it will end sometime after 11/18/2010, assuming all Phase 1 measures are implemented at that time.

F. Leo said that he was concerned with the budget.

J. Woodward said that this doesn't cost more and things can be shifted within the budget to accommodate this proposal.

S. Smith asked if this proposal is intended to compare actual day versus modeling findings which use an average annual day. He said that there should be a caveat when comparing data to the model. He is concerned because the Cat Ex and ROD are based on operational data and the definition of the procedure, not single event levels. If a single event noise reduction isn't achieved, what does IC and CAC expect to do with the results?

T. English stated that even if a reduction of noise isn't accomplished, the FAA is still in compliance with the ROD if the average operational data reasonably reflects what was expected in the operational analysis.

J. Falbo asked why the FAA would say that it is in compliance if no reduction of noise is proved. S. Smith responded by stating that the ROD is based on an environmental review related to DNL and

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

the federal action as defined in the ROD, which is the description of the procedures to be implemented, not single event levels. Operational data is the primary source that FAA may apply to determine if procedures are not operating as expected, not single event noise.

PMT agreed that more time is needed to discuss the topic, and that all review IC's proposal.

VII. BOS/TAC Agenda Discussion:

S. Smith advised that four hours is allocated for the upcoming BOS/TAC meeting on 10/22/09.

J. Falbo stated that four hours is too long and that it should be three hours.

The rest of PMT agreed that four hours is ample and necessary.

The meeting is scheduled on 10/22/09 from 5 – 9 PM at VOLPE (large room). FAA to confirm.

S. Smith asked PMT to email any comments to him regarding the BOS/TAC meeting agenda.

The next PMT call 10/13/09. This is a supplemental call.