

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS) Project Management Team Teleconference

June 27, 2016
1:00 p.m. EST

Teleconference

Facilitator:	John Williams	Note takers:	John Williams/Rick Peloquin
Attendees:	Representing	Email	
Flavio Leo	Aviation Planning and Strategy, Massport	fleo@massport.com	
Betty Desrosiers	Director of Strategic & Business Planning, Massport	dbesrosiers@massport.com	
Jose Masso	Director of Community Relations, Massport	jmasso@massport.com	
Terry English	FAA, Air Traffic Organization, BLANS Program Manager	terry.english@faa.gov	
Bryon Raykoff	FAA, New England Region, Manager, Planning & Programming Branch	byron.raykoff@faa.gov	
Gail Lattrell	FAA, New England Region, Community Planner	gail.lattrell@faa.gov	
Brian Brunelle		brian.brunelle@faa.gov	
Andy Hale	FAA, Logan Airport Traffic Control Tower Manager	andy.hale@faa.gov	
Darryl Pomicter	President, Logan Airport Community Advisory Committee (LCAC), Boston- Beacon Hill	dpomic@aol.com	
Wig Zamore	Vice President, LCAC, Somerville	wigzamore@gmail.com	
Ralph Domitzer	Clerk and Treasurer, LCAC, Cohasset	rdormitzer@gmail.com	
Dave Carlon	LCAC, Hull	david.carlon@mac.com	
Cindy Christiansen	LCAC, Milton	clcmilton@gmail.com	
Mike Andresino	LCAC, Milton (alternate)	mandresion@PBL.com	
Myron Kassaraba	LCAC, Belmont	myronkassaraba@gmail.com	
Irene Walczak	LCAC, Boston-Hyde Park	hydeparklogancac@gmail.com	
Jim MacDonald	LCAC, Dedham	jimmacdonald2003@aol.com	
Joanne Keith	LCAC, Boston-Roxbury	joannefeith@gmail.com	
Alan Wright	LCAC, Boston-Roslindale	alnwright@gmail.com	
Declan Boland	Massport/LCAC liaison	declan.boland@gmail.com	
Chris Sandfoss	Independent Consultant (IC)	csanfoss@landrum- brown.com	
John Williams	Project Consultant (PC)	jwilliams@ricondo.com	
Rick Peloquin	PC	rpeloquin@ricondo.com	

Discussion Points

F. Leo (FL) opened the meeting and said that the study is at a critical point and the goal is to have a viable test to proceed with before the end of the summer. The FAA has said that the BLANS needs to wrap up a recommended runway use program by September 30, 2016; it is important to reconcile disagreements and move forward. The two primary topics are (1) the definition of the test and (2) reporting.

T. English (TE) said that FAA agrees to move forward with finding an agreeable solution; although nothing has been decided on the next test as referenced in Massport's letter to the LCAC dated June 24, 2016.

FL said that Massport (MPA) sent a letter and worksheet to LCAC on Friday following PMT meetings on June 2 and June 7 describing a proposed test that met LCAC goals and FAA requirements. The proposed test meets LCAC goal regarding short-term persistence and providing FAA with runway use choices. FAA Tower provided guidance on what information to provide them as a mechanism for tactical decision-making by the Tower supervisors. Reporting to LCAC includes runway end use (including combined arrivals and departures for physical runway ends) and daily, weekly, and monthly reporting. FL said that MPA is working with B. Brunelle (BB) to put together a worksheet for the Tower, and the noise office is collecting data and preparing snap shots of reports to LCAC as they are available. He said that the pieces are in place, we just need to reach concurrence and move forward.

W. Zamore (WZ) asked if MPA could provide more hourly data. FL said that MPA could send a spreadsheet with each row representing a flight. The IC could mine the data in any way LCAC wants. Once the test is completed, MPA can work with LCAC to automate the reports. WZ said that this is something the noise office is already doing. FL said that it can be done in a basic manner, but that he didn't understand the reluctance of the LCAC to use the budget and resources of the IC. He said that MPA is willing to work with the LCAC, but LCAC needs to leverage the IC.

D. Carlon (DC) asked why a volunteer group is being asked to do this work; there is agreement on how to report, but the question is who is to do the work. M. Kassaraba (MK) referred back to the May 12, 2016 LCAC meeting; when asked to scale back expectations on test, why are we not talking about how to report hourly when hourly is part of what we are trying to address. He said he is confused as to what the Tower is going to get from aggregated percentages. How does the new test relate to persistence? How do we provide respite or relief?

BB said that after completing the last test, the Tower has been waiting to move forward with the next test. Wind and weather are what drive runway use and can dictate the same runway use for days at a time; however, FAA can use a runway selection to use less-used runways when they have an option. BB said that FAA needs an effective tool to help make choices for the test and ongoing in the future. MK asked if hourly data would help. BB said no, that they need something to use in decision-making regarding runway use.

[DRAFT]

FL said that we need to thread the needle between what LCAC wants for reporting and what FAA needs, which is a simpler tool for decision making. The goal is to provide FAA with a tactical tool for decisions and to provide ongoing reporting to LCAC. BB said that this is a test and that what is needed for that test is different than what is needed for reporting.

MK said that in this test, only one variable is being considered and that more variables were considered in Tests 1 and 2. FL said that Tests 1 and 2 reflected specific LCAC goals; this test is the same process. BB said that this test is not as specific as the prior tests; the difference is that we are not looking back at the immediate previous period to make decisions, but looking back at what runways were used over some prior period. MK said he is concerned that more detailed information is not being used.

D. Pomicter (DP) said that the role of the IC is to vet work from MPA and PC and give additional views; not to create documents. It is the responsibility of MPA to prepare the data report. He said that MPA has responsibility to report by runway end. The results of Tests 1 and 2 showed that some runway use changes can lead to more persistence. MPA and FAA do not address dwell and persistence (D&P); they are not addressing approved goals and objectives (G&O) of the LCAC. He said the MPA dismissed the G&O of the LCAC and latched on to FAA's plan. FL said that the contract revisions provide funds to the LCAC for additional work by the IC.

C. Christiansen (CC) said she agreed with DP that if the focus is on one thing we are not going to solve problems. LCAC should come up with something easy to understand; it can't just be airplane counts and percentages. FL said that we are trying to thread the needle. He hears what LCAC wants for reporting, but FAA needs simple guidance to follow for runway use decisions.

FL said that MPA is trying to get data to FAA quickly for runway use decisions and is willing to see what can be prepared. WZ said that hourly count by runway (departures/arrivals) is a 5-minute query for noise office.

R. Dormitzer (RD) said that we want to make sure ATC knows what runways they have been on for the last 6 hours and asked what could be provided so that controllers can move flights to other runways. FL said that it was his understanding that the 7-day average had been agreed upon. RD said that it doesn't matter on Tuesday what happened on Monday – what is important is what happened the last 6 hours. Using the 7-day average would be too late to provide relief on a several-hour basis. FL said that the rolling average is based on 7 days of data and can be used to cause change on a real time basis.

DP referred back to the June 2, 2016 meeting and said that the data to be provided to the Tower is insufficient; the 7-day average should not be the only thing considered. A. Wright (AW) said that he didn't understand the argument and that if the data are there, it should be used for analysis and decision making.

FL said that MPA had provided sample reporting spreadsheets to LCAC. The 7-day average was agreed-upon. (BB noted that Runway 4L departures did not show in the table.) BB reiterated the test: use the report from MPA to pick the morning configuration; use the report again to change after the morning

[DRAFT]

peak, if possible; and any other time for a runway use change would be when operating conditions would require a change. BB said that the Tower needs a priority tool to select configurations; he also asked if overnight should be treated differently.

DP said it has long been his argument to include all aircraft (including piston). He said that Cape Air flights are louder than jets and take early turns that could be a greater impact than large air carrier jets.

FL said that MPA is working with FAA on a draft guidance tool. J. Masso (JM) asked if we have a description of a physical test.

DP said there are 2 problems: 1) tests as proposed are not what LCAC approved in its meeting and 2) the tests are meaningless for a 7-day rolling average during the busiest time of year. FL said the test uses runway data to prioritize runway use selection, runway balancing is not included. The process gives FAA a playbook for runway selection.

MK said that the following are missing: 1) hourly reporting and 2) the points at which runway use could change. BB said that the supervisor is in place 24/7 to ensure the right runways are being used for safety and efficiency. He said that Test 1 showed that there could be a morning configuration different from the night configuration and that Test 2 was found to be successful for the period after the morning push. MK asked when the next change would occur; BB said that if winds were calm, they would stay in the configuration switched to after the morning peak for the rest of the day.

DP said that it is important to focus on the 6 runway ends and to combine arrivals and departures for a physical runway end (e.g., 4R arrivals + 22L departures) and that priority ranking should be based on the totals. BB said it didn't matter to FAA as long as they have a priority ranking. DP said that a priority is needed for north/east/west/south by runway combinations.

DP said he is trying to bridge between what LCAC approved for a test and what is being proposed. FL said that the idea is to give FAA data and a simple priority ranking and to report to LCAC on all other requests, providing a basic hourly report. He said there are three things: 1) priority ranking by physical runway end, 2) report to CAC on an hourly basis, and 3) provide dwell and persistence data. JM asked what the runway use selection priority would be based on. BB said that ATC can use any runway priority but that he agreed with FL that the combined runway end might not be a good measure due to different areas that are affected by departures and arrivals.

FL said that MPA wants to send a letter to FAA today or tonight to initiate the test and that the letter would state whatever priority is established. B. Desrosiers (BD) said that MPA could provide departure and arrival runway use separately and combined. FL said the data could be provided separately for arrivals and departures or combined as suggested by DP. BD asked what data would LCAC prefer be provided to ATC. DC and MK said whatever is best for FAA. J. Keith (JK) said that she wasn't sure if one data point is sufficient for making runway use selections.

[DRAFT]

TE said that we could move forward with one method for some period of the test and then another method for the rest of the test; a recommended program is needed by September 30. BB said ATC could work with whatever priority is provided and that realistically, there could be a maximum 5-week test.

DP said that we have to bridge with what CAC approved.

DC and MK asked BB what makes most sense. BB answered that it makes the most sense to use single runway data with arrivals and departures separated rather than combined arrivals and departures at physical runway ends.

JM said there are two factors: 1) time and 2) input and that a decision is needed to move forward. WZ said he preferred FAA's approach (separate arrival and departure runway use), but would be okay with the combined numbers for physical runway ends as suggested by DP. FL said that they could provide both: arrival and departure runway use separately and combined arrival and departure runway use by physical end. BB said they could use either.

DP said that they are still waiting for Test 1 and Test 2 data.

A. Hale (AH) said that he supports BB 100% -- just provide the runway use priorities for arrivals 1-6 and departures 1-6. BB said they would likely choose the departure runway first. DP said you can't make two decisions independently; arrivals are 16dB louder than departures. He said he wants to use runway end first.

BB – Need to pick arrival or departure first, then use the other.

Distribution:

16-06-0930

Meeting Attendees

c:\users\jwilliams\desktop\jcw files\client files\bos\01 - blans phase 3\01.02 - faa coordination\02 - pmt meeting materials and notes\pmt meeting

20160627\pmt_meeting_20160627_notes_v02.docx