

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

July 25, 2016

11:00 a.m. EST

Teleconference

Facilitator:	John Williams	Note takers:	John Williams/Terry English
Attendees:	Representing	Email	
Flavio Leo	Aviation Planning and Strategy, Massport	fleo@massport.com	
Terry English	FAA, Air Traffic Organization, BLANS Program Manager	terry.english@faa.gov	
Mary Walsh	FAA, Airports Division Manager	mary.walsh@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	
Jerry Falbo	Vice President, LCAC, Winthrop	lawfsg@winthropesq.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	
Myron Kassaraba	LCAC, Belmont	myronkassaraba@gmail.com	
Irene Walczak	LCAC, Boston-Hyde Park	hydeparklogancac@gmail.com	
Maura Zlody	LCAC Official Advisor	maura.zlody@boston.gov	
Declan Boland	Massport/LCAC liaison	declan.boland@gmail.com	
Rob Adams	Independent Consultant (IC)	radams@landrum-brown.com	
Chris Sandfoss	IC	csandfoss@landrum- brown.com	
John Williams	Project Consultant (PC)	jwilliams@ricondo.com	

Discussion Points

After introductions, J Williams (JW) opened the meeting and said that R Dormitzer (RD) sent JW an email on Sunday, July 24, 2016, requesting 10 minutes at the beginning of the meeting to provide input. After discussion among the group T English (TE) deferred the final decision to D Pomicter (DP), wanted to proceed with the agenda as planned, but agreed to allow 20 minutes at the end of the meeting to discuss Ralph's issues. The purpose of the PMT call was to follow-up on requests from the CAC per DP's email to TE dated July 18, 2016.

[DRAFT]

DP stated that LCAC wished to reallocate remaining funds to ensure that intruding events (N70) and dwell and persistence calculations could be completed so that a runway use plan could be developed. TE acknowledged that the request had been made and that to this point, FAA has agreed not to close the grant. F Leo (FL) said that we need to make sure that we not just spending down funds, but that we were following an agreed upon approach that is within the project budget.

DP said that the officers of LCAC should proceed with MPA and FAA to get data and reporting complete and to develop a runway use program using previous test results and the requested data.

W Zamore (WZ) said that LCAC has no position at this point; there is no vote on an additional test and no vote to proceed as described. He said that he was not comfortable proceeding without the support of the LCAC.

DP said that LCAC had asked for intruding events to be reported and that MPA said no funds were available. He said that hourly data is needed by the IC for dwell and persistence calculations; these have been consistent requests.

WZ said that Phase 3 could not be completed without a full environmental analysis.

DP reiterated that LCAC wants reporting for both intruding events and dwell and persistence. FL asked what specific deliverable is being requested. DP responded; metrics and reporting for a new runway use program to be agreed upon by LCAC.

RD said that he disagreed and that execution by FAA Air Traffic Control (ACT) that will provide relief is what is needed. He said that there is no legitimate vote of the LCAC to proceed as described and that he believes that agreement on Runway Use Test 4 should be sought among LCAC. DP said to "go for it," but that the mandate from the July 12, 2016, LCAC meeting was to get as much data as possible.

D Carlon (DC) said that there was no mandate to proceed, no vote, no quorum, no meeting, no consensus to move forward.

I Walczak (IW) said to DC that she had brought up a question at the LCAC meeting regarding what metrics to be used for Test 4. M Kassaraba (MK) responded dwell and persistence; C Christiansen (CC) responded runway use numbers and dwell and persistence; IW responded dwell and persistence and intruding events. Others responded that there should be relief from aircraft flying low overhead.

IW said that she was concerned that members of the new Massport CAC (MCAC) were trying to get funding from the BLANS to develop their own program and referred to the requirements of the ROD. TE said that she was not aware of any attempt by MCAC to do so. TE confirmed that the ROD refers to the LCAC to be the participant on the BLANS. She expressed concern for timing of Test 4 and that ATCT staff had said no to Test 4, with no LCAC agreement to move forward with metrics and recording.

[DRAFT]

WZ said that we cannot move forward without a favorable vote by LCAC for data collection – this is a procedural problem. DP said that he received less than a two-thirds response to the poll. WZ asked for the number of votes for and the number of votes against the runway use test. DP responded that 10 more votes in favor would be needed to move forward with the test.

RD said that a test is needed and that direction is needed to move forward; no runway use test = no runway use program. Any further expenditure on the program must be toward a runway use program; if no runway use program delivered, BLANS would be a waste of money.

FL said that prior to initiating Test 4, the MPA noise office was sharing data with the FAA and that the mechanics of how the test would run were being worked out. He said that if LCAC can coalesce to a clear recommendation and approach to a test, MPA would support moving forward with a test.

J Falbo (JF) asked if it was possible to continue trying to get a vote for Test 4 in place and at the same time work to obtain and analyze the dwell and persistence data. Then, if no Test 4 occurs, there is still data to work toward a runway use program.

TE reiterated the request to move forward with trying to get agreement and a LCAC vote on Test 4 while collecting other data. She said that the ATCT was clear just before the PMT call that it was too late for a Test 4. She had already requested that they stop training on the previous Test 4 proposal when DP informed her that there was no quorum for a CAC vote. She also reminded the group of the upcoming runway closure scheduled for mid-September and beyond. She agreed, however, to convey to the BLANS FAA team, 1) concerns from some CAC members that there was no favorable CAC vote to move forward with data collection, and 2) a proposal for a new Test 4. She said she would get back to DP ASAP on the team's response.

DP said that the LCAC had agreed to a Test 4 as well as collection of dwell and persistence data and intruding events and that FAA/MPA rejected it as not being clear; MPA developed a revised test that LCAC did not approve. He noted that RD had voted against the test.

RD said that he wants something that produces results that demonstrate an effective runway use program. He said that the two tweaks to the version MPA provided: the 7-day average data for prioritizing runway use data is not appropriate and that 24-hour data would be more appropriate; the table for runway use prioritization must acknowledge the available runways given weather conditions. He said that two changes would remove concerns about the 7-day average and would provide real options changes after 4 hours in the morning, evening, and 24-hour day. He said that this approach would be simple and doable.

FL said that the list of runway ends provided to FAA was what the controllers had asked for. IW stated that when Brian Brunelle had presented what they wanted, there were data for every day, not just the average. FL said that the average approach was developed through conversations with FAA and LCAC and was not a MPA recommendation. The goal was to devise something that ATCT could execute and

[DRAFT]

would have the input they need. LCAC can look at the average period and decide what they prefer. He also noted that the data have a one-day delay for the runway use data.

DP said that he believed the test that RD proposed is legitimate; RD asked if they could move forward with a test using 24-hour data for prioritizing runways. FL stated again that the method of providing runway priorities to the FAA in the Test 4 plan was not something devised by MPA, but was based on what the ATCT wanted for the superintendent to make the appropriate decisions.

DP asked again if MPA would provide dwell and persistence data as well as intruding events data. FL said that they have provided data timestamped by flight that can be analyzed in any way that LCAC instructs IC. DP said that authorization is needed as those items are not in the current scope. He said that he believes there is \$60k that could be reallocated to assist and that IC would need to develop a revised work plan. Intruding events calculation was estimated at \$15k and that updating the baseline is \$12-15k.

TE asked the PC and IC to check what is in the scope to make sure other tasks can be completed. FL said that \$30k had been allocated between the IC and PC.

RD asked if there was a way to get runway use data for the 24-hour period given the delay from getting FAA data. FL said that they could use the runway logs to get lists of runways used, but it wouldn't include actual runway use in terms of numbers of aircraft operations. DP said the 24 hour delay would make the decisions difficult. RD asked if there were data to keep analyzing as well as having the proper information for controllers.

RD asked if the LCAC should get a revote on a revised Test 4. TE said that she would have to go back to the BLANS FAA team to determine if ATCT could do the test at this later date, after already having said it was too late DP said that the test has to be defined and then go back to LCAC for a vote. RD said that we need to know what happened in Tests 1, 2, and 4 and then review to develop the runway use program.

IW asked what metrics would be reported. RD said: what runways they were on for the prior 24 hours and whether they changed the next day to give relief and how long they were on the different runways. IW said there are still problems with altitude; RD agreed, but said that altitude is not part of the test.

FL said that the ATCT has asked for clear ranking on runway priorities; will have to see what the FAA says about the Test 4 proposed by RD, but said that what RD suggested seems consistent. FL said that MPA would use runway use logs to help the ATCT make runway use decisions, but that it would be a tactical decision requiring follow-up. RD said it would be important to sit down and get better input on what is provided and used for decision making.

FL said that MPA can produce data for each flight every month with date, time, aircraft type, runway used etc.; all data that can be mined as desired. RD asked if the data would show explicit times of runway use changes and why they happened? FL said that in Test 1, ATCT kept a log of runway use changes, weather conditions, reasons why runways couldn't change, etc. IW said that Test 1 was a failure, FL said he disagreed, CC asked FL to stop referring to Test 1 as a success. TE said that the IC report said that 70% of

[DRAFT]

the time the runway change occurred. CC said that FAA said 63% of the time the runway change occurred.

FL said that data could be provided after the fact that could be mined, along with a runway use log to catch changes and reasons why changes did not occur. The raw data would not specifically have runway use changes and definitely not why they didn't occur, but could be combined with the log to provide a complete set of data.

TE said that she has the impression that DP is not sure where LCAC stands on this and that there may be differences among LCAC members. IW said that a vote was taken in May and why that test wasn't done. TE said that it couldn't be done as described. DP said that he tried to bridge between the LCAC voted test and what FAA said could be done; DP did not get the needed LCAC vote needed to proceed. DP said that LCAC did not concur with Test 4 but there was agreement to move forward with monitoring and reporting.

FL said that there is a fixed amount of funding and that funds can't be spent without an agreed upon plan; we need a plan to move forward within a scope.

DP said that RD wants a tangible test, he should try to get the votes, but he does not believe he will get the vote.

TE said that we are running out of time and asked if we could move forward with monitoring and reporting while FAA addresses the potential to get Test 4.

FL said to have the IC review the data to assess costs of new requests; input is needed from the IC and PC.

DP said that there was \$4,000 less billed than what had been anticipated and that there is an additional \$15,000 for the IC, along with \$40,000 set aside for Test 2 analysis.

FL said that we need a summary from the PC and IC on the work plan and what could be done with remaining budget, including some assessment and analysis of the nighttime data provided as part of Test 3. J Williams (JW) summarized that a work plan was developed and a budget agreed upon. To change, we would need to go back and review both the scope and budget. TE said we need to look at how to reallocate.

JF said that we need a time reference; RD to send another request for a vote on a test. RD said that just naming the least used runway over a period is not enough, as weather conditions dictate runway use. FL said that ATCT staff would run down the list of runway priority and pick the first one that would be available given wind/weather conditions. FL said that the way the list is presented now is how the FAA wants to see it. RD said that to review the request to what LCAC would want requires working with the ATCT.

IC and PC will work behind the scenes on the work plan.

[DRAFT]

The following were listed as next steps:

1. TE to get back to the PMT on FAA BLANS team decision on request for new test 4 and claims by some CAC members that a CAC vote is needed to move forward with requested data.
2. Schedule meeting with ATCT, TE, LCAC
3. RD to provide Test 4 description
4. PC/IC to work on revised work plan
5. Schedule overall project through December 2016

DP said to use \$15k in PC funding for intruding events analysis. RD asked if intruding events would be affected by a runway use program and how it helps LCAC decide on a runway use program. DP said that it is a supplemental metric that MPA can use to help manage; intruding events is the primary metric to supplement DNL. IW said it could be plotted as contours.

The July 28 meeting was then decided to be set for August 1, 11:00 am to meet DP availability.

TE said she would get information from the FAA BLANS team as soon as possible.

RD said that we could not move ahead with metrics without a vote from LCAC. DP said that metrics and reporting has been agreed upon in the May 12, 2016 meeting.

Action Items

- ✓ RD to develop new language for Test 4 and request a vote.
- ✓ TE to check with FAA BLANS team on whether another test can be conducted considering disagreement among members on CAC vote required for the test to continue.
- ✓ IC to review data provided to identify holes in the data and what additional might be needed.
- ✓ PC and IC to review work plan and see what funding could be reallocated.

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
20160725\pmt_meeting_20160725_notes_v03.docx