

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

October 21, 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	
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	winthropesq.com	
Dave Carlon	LCAC, Hull	david.carlon@mac.com	
John McVeigh	LCAC, Randolph	jmcveigh@randolph-ma.gov	
Irene Walczak	LCAC, Boston-Hyde Park	hydeparklogancac@gmail.com	
Bruce Shatswell	LCAC, Dorchester	bashatswell@gmail.com	
Myron Kassaraba	LCAC, Belmont	myronkassaraba@gmail.com	
Cindy Christiansen	LCAC, Milton	clcmilton@gmail.com	
Michael Andresino	LCAC, Milton (Alternate)	mandresino@PBL.COM	
Chris Sandfoss	Independent Consultant (IC)	csandfoss@landrum- brown.com	
John Williams	Project Consultant (PC)	jwilliams@ricondo.com	

Discussion Points

J Williams (JW) opened the meeting and said the intent was to update status since the October 14, 2016, meeting. He referred to two items that were distributed prior to the meeting, including a preliminary updated budget and schedule for completion. The updated budget reflects the reallocation of funds based on discussions in the October 14 meeting. He said that the IC is still reviewing both the budget and schedule. JW also said that the PC and IC are reviewing the second amendment to the scope as well.

J Falbo (JF) asked why the meeting was abbreviated. JW said the intent, as discussed at the October 14 meeting, was to get an update on status.

JW summarized the status of the census track centroid noise analysis, saying that due to the size of the runs (approximately 50,000 grid points), the time required for each of multiple INM runs to be completed, and computer issues experienced by Wyle, the completion of the analysis is delayed and that he hopes to

[DRAFT]

have results by October 28. He said that Ricondo & Associates has offered to assist by providing additional computer resources, but that has not occurred as of yet.

C Sandfoss (CS) summarized the status of the runway use program guidance tables and said that the latest version would be provided to D Pomicter (DP) later in the day (Friday, October 21). He said that the version to be sent incorporates the most recent comments and that if the changes are acceptable, full reports would be provided by October 28, 2016. DP said that he was looking forward to the latest version and acknowledged that the noise analysis would be late.

DP said that he had sent an email to CS simplifying the request. He said that he had taken current tables for 2015, 2014, and 2013 and will accept those prior periods to calculate the 3-year average and also hopes to get a report of the last 12 months; he hopes that what he receives reflects the simplifications and that he is using current templates rather than more difficult ones. JF asked CS for comments. CS said that he was not aware of the request for a 3-year average. F Leo (FL) asked if DP was referring to the email sent on October 20. DP said yes and the intent was to simply for CS and Massport. FL asked if DP was looking for two spreadsheets. DP read an excerpt from the email. (A copy of the email is attached, with the portion read by DP highlighted.) DP asked if CS had received 2016 year-to-date data for all aircraft. He said to use the latest available 12-month period and would ask Massport to continue to create rolling 12-month runway use statistics.

JF asked CS when he has been receiving data from Massport. CS said that he has been receiving it in pieces and did not have exact dates. JF asked for approximate dates; CS answered that he had received September data for all aircraft approximately a week and a half prior. FL said that it sounded to him like DP will have what is needed and whether the October 27 meeting would be held. DP said that if they have the level 1 data, they will have the meeting. What is needed is the total prior 12-month total runway use night weighted. From there they will have runway use prioritized by runway use and by persistence.

FL said that the Tower is asking for a priority ranking 1-6, separating arrivals and departures so that the can make runway use decisions. He said that he wants to make sure that LCAC is meeting in the intent of the Tower request and assumes that they are. DP said that runway use is the primary runway selection metric and that persistence is secondary. He said that annual runway use is to be presented prioritized 1-6 (bolded), then persistence for the prior month (unbolded) and vice versa. He said that the sooner he sees the report and the sooner he can get graphics, he will know about proceeding with the meeting. FL said that he will hold the training room for the LCAC meeting, which will be attended by LCAC only (no FAA or Massport attendance). DP said that he needs all that is spelled out in the email. DP said that CS can work through the data until Monday, October 24, if necessary.

DP said that he had reviewed the IC's invoices and that everything was acceptable and that he noted participation by V. Mestre (VM) and said that he would like to see more involvement by VM. He said that there were 7 months of no work (December 2015 – June 2016) and that a revised work order should have been produced in July rather than October. He also asked where the meeting notes from July. T English (TE) said that she has notes from previous PMT meetings that she is reviewing and plans to have reviews completed by Monday October 24 for distribution and review.

[DRAFT]

JF said that after reading through emails, he was concerned that FAA and Massport no longer have the BLANS as a priority and that he will review the contracts if necessary. JW said, referring back to the October 14 meeting, that the IC has expended in excess of \$40,000 responding to the requests of LCAC and that only \$15,000 had been allocated; this indicated that work has been and is being done. FL said that there was a lot of work and back and forth was done trying to come up with a Test 4 and a lot of effort was expended going back and forth to come up with a test and test parameters that would be acceptable to the Tower. He said that Massport had even suggested the format of a Test 4 that would have been acceptable to the Tower, but the test never happened. He said that he disagrees with the perspective that nothing has happened and that Massport and FAA don't have the project as a priority. DP said that Massport was late providing data and that they still don't have data from the EDR. FL said that there are issues with the AEDT [Aviation Environmental Design Tool] that is now being used for the EDR and it is requiring a different approach for requirements.

JW summarized again that a draft reallocated budget and project schedule were provided prior to the meeting. He said that there are still some items to fill in on the schedule and that need to be discussed further. TE said that one item to identify is the date that LCAC intends to have a draft runway use plan.

JW said that the budget reflects the discussion of leaving \$20,000 for the IC to complete reporting on the Test 1 and Test 2 data, with a small amount for the PC to do a peer review. All of the remaining funds in the IC budget for Test 1 and Test 2 analysis, along with all of the funding for Test 4 analysis were reallocated to Task 3.9 as agreed during the October 14 meeting. On the PC side, \$8,850 has been added to Task 3.2 budget to complete that census centroid analysis that was not anticipated as part of the original reallocation of the Phase 3 budget. The funds are reallocated from the Test 1, Test 2, and Test 4 funds that will not be used. JW said that PC had expended just over \$4,300 assisting LCAC in the development of a Test 4 framework while the contract funds were being reallocated. In addition, a small amount remaining was reallocated to Task 3.9, as agreed during the October 14 meeting.

Cindy Christiansen made a comment at this point, but we were unable to hear enough of it to record.

JF said that he was concerned that the PC and IC are communicating prior to communications with LCAC. He also said that the reasons for the delays, including the census block centroid noise analysis delay should be put in writing and any miscommunications within the PMT.

DP said that when it is needed, the LCAC will need to know how long it will take to do the noise analysis once a recommended RUP is in place. He said that the overall goal is to decrease persistence and to demonstrate that we are doing our best to change runway use in a way that is beneficial to persistence. He said for noise modeling, it may be necessary to conduct a sensitivity analysis that would show, for example, a 5 percent decrease on combined 4 Arrivals/22 Departures, along with a 1 percent increase on all other runway ends.

JW stated again that the time required and the ability to model the effects of the runway use program will depend on the recommended RUP and how the modeling will be done. For example, if the desired changes such as those suggested by DP (see last sentence of previous paragraph) could be modeled

[DRAFT]

simply by changing the percentage use of the configurations, the analysis would not require any new INM runs, but would just require re-annualizing the use of the various configurations. In that case, there is the potential for one or more sensitivity analyses to be performed. If, on the other hand, it is necessary to change runway use within one or more of the configurations, additional INM runs would be required, increasing the complexity and time required to complete the analysis. TE asked if the work would take one or two weeks. JW said that the work could be completed within two weeks (perhaps less) if just changes in annualization are needed, but it could be a bit longer if additional INM runs are required, particularly if new census tract centroid runs are required, as they are computer intensive.

The meeting was adjourned and it was agreed to conduct another PMT update meeting on Friday, October 28, 2016.

Action Items

- ✓ PC to send meeting notice for October 28, 2016.
- ✓ TE to complete review of prior PMT meeting notes and return to PC for distribution.
- ✓ PC to distribute second amendment to the Phase 3 scope of services.

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
20161021\pmt_meeting_20161021_notes_v02.docx