

**Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS)  
Project Management Team Teleconference  
13-10-0793**

**November 2, 2015  
1:00 p.m. EST**

**Teleconference**

<b>Facilitator:</b>	John Williams	<b>Note takers:</b>	Laura Brunn/John Williams
<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Email</b>	
Flavio Leo	Aviation Planning and Strategy, Massport	fleo@massport.com	
Frank Iacovino	Noise Abatement, Massport	fiacovino@massport.com	
José Massó	Community Relations and Government Affairs, Massport	jmasso@massport.com	
Terry English	FAA, Air Traffic Organization, BLANS Program Manager	terry.english@faa.gov	
Darryl Pomicter	President, Logan Airport Community Advisory Committee (	dpomic@aol.com	
Jerry Falbo	Vice President, Logan CAC	lawfsg@winthropesq.com	
Wig Zamore	Vice President, Logan CAC	wigzamore@gmail.com	
Rob Adams	Independent Consultant (IC)	radams@landrum-brown.com	
John Williams	Project Consultant (PC)	jwilliams@ricondo.com	
Cindy Christiansen (Observer)	Logan CAC, Milton	clcmilton@gmail.com	
Irene Walczak (Observer)	Logan CAC, Boston Hyde Park	hydeparklogancac@gmail.com	
Myron Kassarba	Logan CAC, Belmont	myronkassaraba@gmail.com	
Maura Zlody (Observer)	Logan CAC Advisor, City of Boston	maura.zlody@boston.gov	

**Discussion Points**

---

J Williams (JW) opened the meeting stating the purpose was to discuss the status of Phase 3 Runway Use Testing and the revised scope and budget that outline tasks to complete Phase 3 within the remaining budget.

JW said that a preliminary draft of the Runway Use Test #1 report, dated September 1, 2015, had been reviewed by CAC and comments sent back to the Independent Consultant (IC.) He then said that Runway Use Test #2 is scheduled to end on November 10, 2015. Some data have been received from Massport and work on the report would begin after the IC receives the final data.

D Pomicter (DP) asked about the exact status of the report for Runway Use Test #1 and stated that the CAC was told the report would be completed in August. CAC needs the report to determine if a noise analysis will be necessary. DP asked if R Adams (RA) has the information now to complete the report and also inquired as to exactly when Massport provided the data.

RA stated that he now has the information to complete the report for Runway Use Test #1 and that the last bits of data came in from Massport in late September/early October. The report preparation has been put on hold until contract amendments are in place to reflect the revised scope of work for Phase 3. As soon as the amended contracts are in position, the report completion will take approximately three weeks.

DP noted the large and many Test data files could not be reliably emailed to the Logan CAC, and should be available from the non-Public, Project Team section of the BLANS website. TE agreed. JW advised that section needed review and individuals reauthorized or a new method devised.

DP inquired on the status of Runway Use Test #2 and stated concern that the report will also be delayed due to the information transfer process from Massport to the IC. F Leo (FL) cited a series of specific dates when data was provided including additional requests made to Massport. He stated that Massport and L&B now have a better procedure established for data transfer and developed templates that will help expedite the process. FL stated that Massport should be able to transfer the Test #2 data to RA in late November or no later than early December.

DP asked how long the report preparation will take for Runway Use Test #2. RA stated that this report will be a little different than the report for Runway Use Test #1. He hopes to have the report completed by January 14, 2016, but will depend on the timing of the data transfer from Massport. He said he will have a better idea of the timing for the report in late November.

FL stated that Massport's priority is to make sure that the data are accurate and will not rush the transfer if it impacts the quality of the transmitted data. DP agreed the data needs to be accurate and complete, as requested, but there is urgency to report the tests promptly, without further, continued delay. He stated frustration with only seeing a little preliminary data at this point. FL stated that the focus should now be on the future and working together.

J Falbo (JF) asked what would be used as the baseline for Runway Use Test #2. JW stated that the baseline will be the same months of the previous year. JF asked if using only one year is sufficient. RA answered that he and JW discussed different approaches to establishing the baseline and that it was their combined professional opinion that this scenario will give a good indication for a direct comparison.

DP stated that he now wanted to talk about Runway Use Test #3 but also restated frustration with not receiving a Test #1 Report yet. RA replied that the report will be ready in three weeks following the receipt of amended contracts.

DP stated that the CAC wants the Runway Use Test #3 to focus on decreasing noise impacts during the night period, 10pm-7am, and during a late night/early morning sleep period. He stated that one focus is for Massport to review the schedule and eliminate any and all noisier, Stage 2 and Stage 3 Hush Kitted aircraft from the periods. A second focus is for Massport to review the schedule with airlines and move flights from the periods. A third focus is for the FAA to manage operations to be earlier and later than the periods. A fourth focus is for the FAA to manage operations—runways, routes, and procedures—for increased noise abatement, decreased noise created and further from people.

FL stated that the airport operator has no rights by law to require a carrier to change flight schedules. He also stated that he thought what the CAC was asking for was not an operational test, but more of questions answered. JF asked if Massport can pay the carriers to change the routes and schedule. FL answered that the airlines set the routes and schedule and that it is not within the rights of the airport sponsor to interfere. He also stated that the Stage 2 aircraft are now banned. F Iacovino (FI) stated that the records show a few Stage 2 aircraft "mercy-flights" for medical purposes during the nighttime. DP responded that the 2012/2013 EDR showed Stage 2 jets being re-introduced into the BOS fleet after a 5 year absence. (Table 6-10). And, decreasing percentages of Stage 4 aircraft by a number of airlines--including Delta, Southwest, Federal Express,, Miami, Atlas, ,and People Express (Table 6-15). FL stated again that what was being described for Test #3 was more of a dialogue than a test.

DP responded that Massport talking with airlines and gaining their agreement was critical for a successful Runway Use Program. And, Massport discussing and negotiating noise abatement with airlines—including restrictions on airport use—was part of their Airport Proprietor authority and responsibility, designated by the FAA. Absolutely part of developing a Runway Use Program. And, the FAA Noise Abatement Policy designates Air Carriers responsible for scheduling and flying airplanes in a way that minimizes the impact of noise on people.

JF requested that FL confer with Massport legal division and also provide him with the law that he is referring to that does not allow the airport operator to interfere with flight schedules.

RA added that CAC members at the September meeting had identified nighttime runway use concerns and that Test #3 could translate into an operational test. He said that CAC will need to get the data first and review. CAC will make the data request.

DP requested Massport provide arrival and departure operations by Runway End for both day and night. FL stated that they have jet operations data that goes back 10 years.

DP said that Massport data from EDRs going back 20 years includes non-jets in the Noise Model inputs, but reports jets only. And without arrival and departure totals—which do not total 100%. And, it is only by Runway Direction and not by Runway End, as experienced from the ground. He added that the Noise Abatement monthly runway use reports do not reconcile with the eventual annual EDR. There is a variance of plus to minus 2-5%, which cannot be rounding and simply omission of a type of aircraft operation, such as emergency flights. He also said that Cindy [Christiansen] has also done some analysis and also found that the monthly reports do not reconcile. DP said that a Massport Monthly Airport Traffic Summary, prepared by Catherine Stochaj for Ed Freni, Operations reconciles flights (and passengers) with EDR exactly. That Massport has capability to report monthly that reconcile with the EDR, but current monthly Noise Abatement reports do not.

DP also said that Massport and FAA have not recognized that jet engines are 30dB, 1000 times quieter than they used to be and that some props are now just as intrusive as some jets. Especially Cape Air (CA) flights Cessna 402 last built 1985, >10% Logan operations that are encouraged to fly low—noisier than current generation Boeing and Airbus jetliners, >50% Logan fleet. He said that Massport needs to include the 15% non-jets in the analysis. DP said that his personal experience is CA aircraft flying so low they

interrupt speech. The Noise Model in dB considers many less-noisy events equivalent to one noisier event. Noisier masks less noisy—at same time and place.. But non-jets are usually different routes—not same time and place—and are intruding events.

FL said Massport gets complaints about non-jets and is not saying non-jets don't contribute to noise at Logan. He said that the reconciliation between the EDR and monthly reports occurs during EDR preparation; HMMH has to go through each flight track and that is why there is delay in completing EDR. He said that if you look at macro data from that perspective and overall what is happening at BOS, the data base suffices. DP disagreed. He said that EDR states DNL is calculated as the year progresses (RealContours™ completes the task of computing noise by running the INM in the middle of the night to obtain DNL or other noise metrics for the previous day's operations, and then averages the results to obtain the annual contour). He said he has looked at another level at the Noise Abatement monthly reports and finds years where arrival and departures vary by 1,000. FL said that if numbers are off by 1,000 in a year with 400,000 annual operations, it is pretty good correlation and adequate for Massport purposes. DP said it cannot physically be different by 1,000 in a year (or 500 in a month), and that we are missing the point - that there is a structural problem with the reports that needs to be fixed.

FL said that Massport has data they can share that is rigorous enough to make decisions on, but to go further and fix DP's concern, would require determining what it would take and how much budget is available in this project to do so. DP said that HMMH has done a full massage of EDR data; the necessary data is the same data that is used in 8 Tables and Figures across more than 400 pages of the EDR, and that Massport already has an estimate of \$30,000 to provide that data. DP said that he thinks it should be paid for out of the 2001 MEPA Section 61 commitment for more reporting; or Massport should at least pull it out of the \$100,000 promised to CAC in 2013 or somehow come up with \$30,000 in current budget revision (with the \$250,000/year provided for the Massport CAC not yet being used). This would give the historic baseline and all the things he (DP) has asked for. FL said that if that's something we (PMT) want to look at and the consultants can fit it within remaining budget, we can do that. DP asked about the \$100,000 commitment to CAC and the Section 61 commitment. DP stated that there are supposed to be quarterly noise abatement reports, but those haven't been since the 2001 Massport Board Commitment.

FL said that he had held conversations with Logan (LCAC) about post noise study reporting. At the time, with the noise study about to end, the CAC requested a venue for the LCAC to continue conversation with Massport and LCAC requested \$100,000 for ongoing noise studies. A letter was sent from LCAC reflecting what would happen once the noise study is completed. However, now there is the Massport CAC (a legislated body). DP said that the letter from Massport to LCAC came out in January 2013 and there was a series of meetings with FL and the LCAC officers. The intent of the \$100,000 was to hire a consultant to help LCAC then, not to wait for five years. FL said that was for post noise study LCAC work. Now, with the Massport CAC being formed, it was advocated by some LCAC members, including \$250,000 annually authorized to Massport CAC. JF said that Massport CAC doesn't exist except by statute and asked why \$30,000 from those funds could not be used to get reports. FL stated that in meetings with J. Masso (JM) and LCAC, it was noted that there is a budget related to the noise study and that if LCAC wants to spend \$30,000 for this baseline data, then we could, but it needs to be within the noise study budget. The \$100,000 was related to post noise study work for LCAC, and was pre-Massport CAC.

DP (to JM) said that the Massport Board made Section 61 commitments in 2001 for increased reporting including monthly quarterly reports. An earlier statute organization was to get \$25k per year, also LCAC was to get \$100,000, and then Massport CAC was to get \$250,000 each of last 2 years. DP asked if Massport could come up with \$30,000 outside of the noise study; and said that we are not moving ahead until CAC gets the information. DP said that we would run out of money for the noise study unless Massport wants to apply for more money. JM stated that there is budget under the noise study and that CAC must decide within the remaining budget what they want to do, including allocating \$30,000 to get the baseline data. Before considering asking for more, the allocated budget must be used.

JM said that the Massport CAC doesn't have \$250,000 in a bank, Massport will allocate the funds once Massport CAC has become a running entity; the money is off the books until then. DP said it was money that Massport saved. JM said it was allocated but taken off the books without Massport CAC in existence. JM said that with respect to the \$100,000 for LCAC, he remembered being in early meetings with Sandra Kunz and JF, but the conversation was before Massport CAC came about and the \$250,000 allocated to Massport CAC. He reiterated that the \$100,000 was for post noise study, but when Massport CAC became legislated it changed the ballgame.

JF said there had been difficulties getting Massport CAC organized and that another \$250,000 will go by the wayside this year. JF said that the issue is if CAC voted to apply for \$100,000 despite the fact it isn't post noise study, would Massport go along? JF asked what does IC state would be lost if we use the \$30,000 for the baseline data.

JF said that despite thinking Massport CAC would be formed and initiated, he had remembered FL saying that he wanted to see LCAC on a new noise abatement committee. FL said to clarify, in conversation with LCAC related to post noise study funding there was concern there was no vehicle to fund and get data to a consultant to report to them. Then, conversation about post noise study was that the noise abatement committee (NAC) would continue the dialogue. Now, Massport CAC has noise as part of the same mandate, plus a large overlap of membership with LCAC.

DP said that FAA has regulatory responsibility for a monitoring program and for implementation and effectiveness. He said the NAC was intended to get started after Phase 1 and that CAC is not happy with implementation of the Phase 1 measures. Then it was intended to start monitoring at the end of Phase 2 for implementation of Phase 1 and 2 measures, but got bogged down, because Massport proposed no Phase 3, and only have Phase 2+, with runway measures carried from Phase 1. NAC was supposed to start in the November 2012 to May 2013 timeframe and the CAC letter dated January 2013 was intended to start looking for a consultant to assist.

DP (to TE) said that the ROD [Record of Decision] states that "Massport Board Section 61 commitments" serves as basis for approval. If commitments not kept, FAA has the responsibility to put pressure on Massport to meet the commitments; Massport has not fulfilled responsibilities. TE said she will have to go back and look at ROD language and check with legal. DP said Chris Poreda said there are no FAA responsibilities. TE said that she sees the role of FAA in Phase 3 is to provide input and technical assistance, and to conduct the requested tests. FAA is looking for CAC and Massport to provide recommendations/requests to do that. TE said that monitoring fell through at the end of Phase 2 when

no agreement was reached on metrics or how to do it. We are still willing to look at metrics as part of Phase 3.

DP said that this is what we are asking to do, monitoring. FL said there is a line item in the existing draft budget that was distributed for monitoring and metrics: it is Task 3.8. DP says it is has to happen as part of the tests. DP asked what we lose from the project for the \$30,000 and if we run out of money to complete, what do we do?

FL said we have been doing this collectively for over 10 years and with \$8 million. CAC is incorporated so that they can execute contracts; this is the framework and there is fiduciary responsibility for all. We have hit bumps in the past and have worked together within budget reallocating to get to a product throughout this study. We are now at a point in Phase 3 to do that. The PC and IC have put together a roadmap to complete Phase 3 within the budget. Money is proposed to be reallocated from the PC contract to the IC contract to balance resources. We have a roadmap – if CAC feels it isn't the right approach that is another conversation. PC and IC have given a legitimate roadmap to get to completion: Prepare final Test #1 and Test #2 reports, conduct Test #3 and prepare a report and then the final report.

JF said there was a unanimous Logan CAC vote to get the requested data. FL agreed and said that will require resources and budget to do so. We have to live within the contracts and budget to complete. He said that the current runway use data at a macro level will answer the questions that have been asked, including changes that have occurred due to things such as CRO or pre and post R14/32 changes.

JF again asked what will be cut out of the project to get the \$30,000. TE said that the PC and IC should answer. RA said that there are a couple of options: eliminate Test #3; eliminate task 3.8 to develop monitoring which had about \$25,000 to \$30,000 allocated – those are the two most obvious options. DP offered an alternative, to include Test 3 and Test 4 that the Test #1 analysis completion for \$17,000 and the Test # 2 analysis for \$36,000 were perhaps not needed – they didn't seem useful. DP said he had just seen the changed scope and budget. FL said this is the way it has always been done. The PC and IC work together to get to a starting point for FAA, Massport, and CAC to consider and then work together to come to a conclusion.

DP said that Massport was to provide the historical baseline data in August 2013 and avoided and is now saying there is no money or it will come out of the Phase 3 budget. FL responded that the historical base data are there, if referring to jets and runway use. DP said that all props are in the noise model, therefore in the database, and should be reported. FL said that when asked how to report the data it costs \$30,000. DP said to sit with the noise consultant to see how to get the data; all requests are sets of data already in the EDR data.

JF asked what task was it that RA had said had \$25,000 to \$30,000 allocated. RA said it was the metrics and monitoring task to develop the program. JW said that just over \$29,000 had been allocated to that task in the draft budget.

DP said that they need baseline data; they don't need the analysis of Test #1 and Test #2 and then asked where the noise analysis is done after the tests. He said that the Test #1 and Test #2 analyses are of no

value and does not think the measures are enforceable. JF asked RA his position. RA said that if the CAC is not supportive of the Test #1 and Test #2 programs, it is their decision. JF asked what effect there would be of not doing the Test #1 and Test #2 analyses. RA said that he doesn't see how CAC could make educated decisions if there is no reporting at all. JW added that we may need the Test #1 and Test #2 results to help make educated assumptions about the effects on runway use to include in the final noise analysis of the runway use program. DP then suggested doing a more basic analysis of Test #1 and Test #2.

FL said Test #1 showed promise before weather moved in. The reason for test is to see what does/doesn't work and it is good to have a report to know what happened. Look at Task 3.8 and see if that is a good way to get \$30,000 into the existing budget to get the baseline data.

DP said to prepare a budget revision with requested baseline data, Test #3 to address night noise and sleep period and a Test #4 that follows up with potential FAA runway use changes: 5% off of Runway 4 landings to Runway 15, and then to balance operations between 27 and 33. He said to get ATC involved for their ideas

FL said that he needs to talk to HMMH, to see if they can provide raw data to the IC, who can then see what analysis they could do. DP said that he wants it to be ongoing reporting – work it out with HMMH for quarterly reports. FL said that the expectation is that once the noise study ends, whatever is agreed to report will be included in the EDR.

FL then said that, with regards to the runway use shift, the suspension of head to head operations at night resulted in a case study of a shift in runway use from the 4s and 22s to 33. This showed an increase in population within DNL 65. He said that information could inform how to move forward and that Massport will not support an increase in population within DNL 65 – that would be against the goals of BLANS.

DP agreed that we don't want to increase population within DNL 65 and said that Runway 14-32's existence, even if not used, allowed for a shift from Runway 27 departures to Runway 33L departures that were intended to be prevented by wind the restrictions. DP said that the Tower recommended a balance of Runway 33L and Runway 27 departures. Another was 4R arrivals to be reduced 5% from historic baseline and 15R arrivals increased 5%. FL said the latter was the concern regarding increases in population within DNL 65. Data in EDR shows that increase. That is a good place to start though for a test.

JF said that the PC and IC could come up with Test #1 and Test #2 analyses that would be less than currently proposed but still meaningful.

TE said that money could be taken out of the metrics and monitoring development task. FL suggested taking budget from both buckets. The question was asked if we are we sure it is \$30,000? FL said that he gave the exact task to HMMH and they came up with the cost, but that it may be cheaper for the IC to do the analysis.

DP asked if CAC could meet with HMMH and Massport. FL said that the budget and scope need to be in place first. We need to agree on a top level scope and allocation of budget to amend the contracts; need to amend contract with Massport and CAC and with CAC and IC.

W Zamore (WZ) said that there is a unanimous vote from CAC to support a request for a different database that can be pulled from the existing data. He said it would be helpful to have a conversation with HMMH prior to preparing a final budget to get their input on what it takes to respond to DP's request and his request as well. JF agreed.

FL said he disagrees – that there are a lot of asks and there is scope and budget to work with for the noise study, waiting to finalize gets us on the wrong path and delays what needs to get done. There is no budget to go beyond what they are already doing with HMMH.

JF said there is a problem with developing the scope of work until meeting with HMMH to discuss the particulars of the request for the \$30,000. FL said that HMMH was given the specific requests and it will cost \$47k to get what they asked for in both requests. WZ said that there has been no direct conversation with HMMH to make sure they are on the same page.

FL said that we are getting off of the conversation of finishing the noise study and getting to a scope and budget to complete. WZ said that the CAC hasn't been in the room in discussions with HMMH and that the requests are old. FL said there is no progress in the meantime, because there is no scope or budget allocated to the work from the noise study. JF said that the meeting could be set up in 1 to 2 weeks.

FL said we have a roadmap and have provided data when needed, but we keep delaying this process. JF said it is not a significant delay; we can have PC and IC proceed with modifying the scope and budgets for Test #1 and Test #2.

FL said we need to get this on paper: first are changes to Test #1 and Test #2 reporting, second is Test #3, asking Massport questions about late night activity and what flexibility they have with airlines. We need to get this down regarding budgeting. Next is looking at balancing of Runway 27 and Runway 33 departures and an increase of 15R arrivals and decrease of 4R arrivals. We need the PC and IC to work on this and come up with reallocation of budget.

WZ asked what does it cost to have a one hour meeting with HMMH. FL said we can have that, if needed, but we just need to figure out where we are with the scope and budget first. JF suggests moving forward with the meeting, that we have sat on this for a year. FL says there has been no budget. DP said that past President Sandra Kunz was in compliance with the information request protocol in her September 2014 request to get the data, and Massport has sat on and avoided it since August 5, 2013 Phase 3 Kickoff Meeting. WZ said that CAC hasn't seen anything as to details of what \$47,000 buys. FL again said that he forwarded the specific request from CAC to HMMH.

FL said that the PC and IC need to be working on a scope and budget from direction given today. Four aspects have been identified: Test #1 and Test #2 summary reports; reallocation of some funds out of monitoring and metrics task; questions about late night operations; and 4R/15R reallocation. JF said we are narrowing down to have a meeting with HMMH and have PC and IC come up with a plan relative to

Test #1 and Test #2 – that’s what we are talking about right now; then establish the full scope. FL said that the point is to get team to work on the full scope; can’t wait until we hash out the baseline data.

TE asked if JW and RA can work on the reallocation to get \$30,000 for the baseline. RA said yes we can do that. TE said we also heard of another test. DP said there would be a request for an operational test of runway use options. TE agrees that the Test #3 request seems more like questions and answers than an operational test. DP said we want a test, and to ask the Tower guys what they think is possible to move operations out of the 10 to 7 period.

DP (to JM) said that we are trying to build an ongoing relationship that lasts. Tom Glynn said he wants a metropolitan solution. DP said letters referring other communities (Belmont) to the Logan CAC were not copied to the Logan CAC. Reports to other Communities have not been provided to the Logan CAC. DP wants to know if there is budget to improve noise reporting that hasn’t been updated in 12 years. He said that a study was done for Belmont and two for South Boston – all said he expected were \$30,000 to \$50,000 studies, why can’t CAC get some of that? JM said that the funds for those studies didn’t come from his budget. FL said that Massport has budgets and programs to respond to specific areas on issues such as the Runway 33L RNAV change. Massport was asked through a political process to look at those areas and do have some resources to do that. Because of the RNAV change, Milton, Belmont, Watertown, and South Boston requested studies through the political process. Massport doesn’t tell everyone yes that requests a study.

FL says we have an established budget and scope for a noise study and that is what we are working under. Massport will allocate funds to the Massport CAC. JF said that Massport CAC is not a player right now, but hopes it will be a major player.

FL asked if RA and JW have enough to go by to reallocate money based on what DP described for next phase of testing. JW said that we can work with what we have and that there’s more than just the baseline data request, there’s a 3<sup>rd</sup> and possibly 4<sup>th</sup> test. We will work with all that with the remaining budget to get a better idea of what has to be cut and where we can cut it.

DP said there are other reporting issues: flight tracks with RNAV routes that has become the FAA standard for reporting. The Runway 33 final environmental analysis shows RNAV routes with flight tracks color coded by altitude. A lot of people say the aircraft are not at appropriate altitudes and we need flight tracks color coded for altitude along with the RNAV. DP said this reporting should not be part of the BLANS, and Massport didn’t include it in EDR. FL said that Massport did something for Ralph Dormitzer about 6 months ago (April/May) that showed RNAVs and laid out flight tracks to see if it was in keeping with the ROD. FL said that BLANS will give direction on what Massport will be reporting; otherwise if reporting is done a certain way, FAA may look at it and say it is fine and then community will say it’s not fine.

DP (to TE) the final environmental analysis and one year evaluation of Runway 33 shows flight tracks color coded by altitude and shows the RNAV route. TE agreed. DP asked if it needed any more definition. TE said that yes, because in BLANS there were both conventional and RNAV corridors that were defined and there needs to be more information on how to monitor. For 33L, FAA just reported what tracks were

there during a certain time period and graphically displayed their relationship to the RNAV route. . DP said to put the RNAV route with flight tracks and color code by altitude. FL said that last time it was done, it was shown to FAA and Ralph and there was a disagreement as to how to lay out the RNAV tracks and the width of the corridors, etc. DP said to take the FAA post implementation report and report the same in the EDR and BLANS reporting. FL said that we need help from the BLANS to get agreement regarding reporting.

DP said to just meet the FAA standard that has been the standard for 8 years. FAA needs to calculate center of flight track and standard deviation but has never done it. TE said it was done for Runway 27. DP said it wasn't published. TE said that she has the information and can send it. DP said the center of flight tracks and standard deviation is the ROD requirement for Runway 27. FL said Massport publishes the Runway 27 report. DP said that it is not with center of the flight tracks and standard deviation. FL said there is a table in the EDR and has been there every year. DP said the center of flight tracks and standard deviation have never been calculated and shown, that FAA has never published the data. TE said that this was a conversation to take off line. FL said that all of this discussion shows that we need to get to agreement as to what to show. TE said there are other details such as the number of flight tracks, periods of data collection, etc. that need to be agreed upon.

FL said that he will send DP what they prepared for Ralph Dormitzer. DP said to take the graphics that are in the EDR and show the center of flight tracks and the standard deviation calculations. FL said he will send what was done for south shore and get input from CAC and FAA. DP asked if FL had seen the Final Environmental Assessment post implementation report. FL said that those were prepared by FAA using TARGETS and that Massport does not have that software. FL repeated that he will show what was done for Ralph Dormitzer and start from there.

DP said that many people are located in the lower DNL areas, but are driven crazy say that DNL doesn't make sense for them. DP says DNL is valid, but additional metrics are needed. The number of events over 70 decibels, Intruding Events, seems to be an appropriate metric for RNAV impacts at lower DNL and that metrics will need to be addressed in Phase 3.

JF said FL will send information to DP and we can go from there and that the PC and IC will work to see what has to be cut to meet the CAC requests.

FL asked WZ to send an email note to get the specific request for the meeting and to include the baseline requests. DP says they have the requests; the meeting is to discuss what the intent is. FL said HMMH based the cost estimate on the specific motions and that he just needs a note to provide the intent of the meeting. DP said let the motions stand as is. FLFL said he wants to get to the goal of the meeting. DP said that they just need to meet and talk about it. WZ said that DP has had a number of offline conversations about the motion and has emails from DP that he has talked to FAA and Massport. DP says all he did was to repeat the motion. WZ said that the request is how to get the motions implemented. WZ said he will send a request and copy DP, JF, and whoever else wants to see copy; he wants to make sure HMMH and CAC are in sync as to how to efficiently fulfill the requests.

JF said that as soon as the email is sent from WZ to set up the meeting with HMMH to get on with the major scope. FL said the PC and IC should work on the scope. JW said we could look at that and get something put together by the time the HMMH meeting occurs.

RA said that we will reduce the budget to cover the requests. DP said just the \$30,000 and not the \$17,000 portion. FL said that Massport doesn't have the budget for either. TE said there are two requests, one \$30,000 and one \$17,000, but now wants to clarify it is just the \$30,000. RA said that IC and PC will come back with two or more options.

TE said that there was also discussion of a Test #3 and Test #4. According to DP, Test #3 isn't just questions, but CAC actually wants to test things. Test #4 is a reallocation of runway use. RA said the budget now has three tests; we don't have the budget for four tests. DP said we have four tests scoped and budgeted. RA says we don't have any scope finalized with the word "test" in it and that is why we are going through this.

FL said he thought a lot of the late night requests were questions and answers about what Massport could and couldn't do and was not an operational test. DP said the test is to accomplish something and wanted to find out what the Tower thinks they can do about moving flights out of nighttime hours. FL said that FAA and Massport cannot do anything to move flight times; Massport can give information about what is happening in the late night. DP said to start with Stage 2 and hushkitted Stage 3 aircraft. FL said that all aircraft at BOS meet the FAA's noise standards. If they don't, it's for an exemption such as an emergency/medical flight. DP said that the question is what can Massport or FAA do about noisy aircraft and if nothing why not? FL said that Massport can respond to questions with current law. DP asked if Massport can get Turkish Airlines, who they are paying to start flying to Boston, to depart before midnight, rather than after 1:00 a.m. FL said that Massport cannot tell an airline when to fly. DP said that Massport can talk to them and ask if they can change their schedule. FL said that Massport can provide the answers to questions, but this is not an operational test.

RA said that he wants to confirm that this may be an operational test, that some CAC members said they wanted an operational test of a late night runway use program. He said that if the CAC as a body decides they want a certain thing tested, there could be a test. The scope should not assume there is no operational test regarding nighttime conditions. He said that regardless, there is only one operational test. He said that we can gather data and CAC will decide if there is needs to be an operational test; that's all that needs to be said in the scope. If we go into too much detail it could box us in.

DP said to scope Test #3 and Test #4, and eliminate all further reporting on Test #1 and Test #2 as an option. RA said that now we have three different budget and scope scenarios.

FL said that the \$47,000 request is one ask. DP said it is two requests; the second (\$17,000) is an embellishment that he would like to have that would allow anyone to sit down at a computer and get whatever they want, but the first request (\$30,000) is the one required now. DP said he is looking to cut \$30,000 from other tasks, but not the full \$47,000. FL asked where the \$17,000 was going to come from. WZ said that the motions were for information needed for the Phase 3 runway use program. DP said that the ability to sit down and get information is a noise abatement action. FL said that we need prioritization

from the CAC. DP and JF said there is prioritization. WZ said there is not; the votes speak for themselves. WZ said to have the meeting with HMMH first to see what they could do in response to both requests and then prioritize. FL said that we need to prioritize to optimize the budget and that CAC has not yet prioritized. WZ said the votes are the votes. DP said that the Queryable Database Motion was for Massport and FAA to discuss data availability with CAC (and another Motion for CAC subgroup to propose for CAC consideration and refinement before any move to implement). DP asked that, with the mandate to the PC and IC, what are the scenarios to cut \$30,000 from the budget;? if we can get all of the requested information for \$30,000 that would be ideal. WZ said that if we cannot get all of the requested information for \$30,000, CAC will have to figure out priorities.

JF said to end the meeting. To expedite moving forward with the budget and SOW, TE said JW, RA, FL and she would coordinate post call to identify what they had heard and send a summary back to the CAC officers for clarification instead of waiting for the draft meeting notes which would take longer. JW will email the summary this week.

DP asked if Massport can pay L&B now or make them keep waiting. FL said that we have to amend contracts and need to get the reallocation amount. DP asked if there had been any contract amendments for cost. JW said there had no amendments for cost. FL said that we need the exact amount to reallocate within the amended contracts. DP said that as part of the record, RA (the IC) is on hold until Massport amends contracts. FL said that Massport is not holding up amendments, the scope process is holding up the amendments. L&B has hit their contract maximum and that we are trying to get the correct amounts to amend the contracts. JF suggested an interim/minor modification to get them paid for outstanding invoices while holding off on the major change with the scope. FL said that we can work that way, but it doesn't get L&B back on track. We still don't have a final scope to develop full budget amendments. FL said that it takes a while to approve the revisions and complete the amendments. Massport has to amend its contract with CAC and then CAC will have to amend its contract with L&B. FL said that the idea is to agree on all changes soon and just have to do one set of amendments of all contracts. If this is going to take a long time, then maybe we should do an interim amendment, but don't want to hold up the process.

RA said that we have to make sure we have a scope that we all agree to and understand and get the scope and budget in place. He said there are two issues: back payment on outstanding issues and the fact that we have reached a point where we don't have funding or a proper scope and budget to complete the study. There is no funding beyond what there is today and there is no clear track to finish. RA said that he would prefer the entire scope/budget be figured as that was the higher risk, rather than back payments to the IC.

JW said that he and RA have a list of what we need to do; they will discuss with TE and FL and then forward to CAC to make sure it is exactly what CAC wants. He said that we need to move as quickly as we can to get through all this. TE said that the goal is to have something to CAC Tuesday or Wednesday, in advance of the notes being completed.

## **Action Items**

- ✓ Massport to transfer data for Runway Use Test #2 to IC by end of November, early December 2015.
- ✓ TE to check language from the ROD and to speak with FAA legal regarding potential FAA responsibilities to be carried out.
- ✓ WZ to send an email to FL regarding a request for a meeting with HMMH, including a statement of the intent of the meeting.
- ✓ FL to provide CAC the information provided to Ralph Dormitzer regarding the RNAVs and flight tracks over south shore. Note that this item has been completed and sent to L&B.
- ✓ FL to confer with Massport legal regarding laws that prevent airport operators to imposing flight restrictions and to provide a copy of the laws.
- ✓ TE to provide flight track center and standard deviation statistics related to Runway 27 RNAV procedures to DP.
- ✓ TE, FL, RA, and JW to prepare potential list of alternatives to modify the scope and budget to include the items requested by CAC – the list will be sent to CAC for confirmation.
- ✓ CAC to identify level of analysis and information to be provided for Runway Use Test #1 and Runway Use Test #2 reports – IC to complete Test #1 report within three weeks of receipt of amended contract.
- ✓ RA and JW to review scope of work and budget to reflect changes requested by CAC once confirmation is received on list provided to CAC (see prior bullet.)
- ✓ JW to review BLANS project website and make the necessary adjustments/authorizations to enable the LOGAN CAC to access and download project data files from the website's non-Public, Project Team section; or to explore other means for sharing large files.

**Attachments:**

Excerpt from November 1, 2015 email reply from Darryl Pomicter to John Williams with comments on a draft agenda

**Distribution:**

13-10-0793

Meeting Attendees

c:\users\jwilliams\desktop\jcw files\client files\massport\logan airport noise study\phase 3\phase 3 meeting notes\pmt meeting

20151102\pmt\_meeting\_11022015\_notes\_final.docx

Excerpt from November 1, 2015 email reply from Darryl Pomicter to John Williams with comments on a draft agenda

- Phase 3 Status Update
  - Runway Use Test #1 (Change Morning configuration from End-of-Day configuration, Completed May 10) Report  
(When did Massport finish requested info to IC—October? What Historic Baseline for comparison? When will IC report to Logan CAC?)
  - Runway Use Test #2 (Change Configuration late morning and afternoon, May 11-Nov 10) Update  
(When did Massport provide substantial requested info to IC—October? What Historic Baseline for comparison? When will IC report to Logan CAC?)
  - Runway Use Test #3 Decrease noise impacts Night and Late Night-Early Morning Sleep. (Massport to work with Airlines on aircraft and schedule. When will Massport provide requested schedule info to IC—Baseline before Test?)
  - Runway use Test #4 More equitable distribution of Arrivals and Departures. (Developing FAA ATCT Nov 14, 2013, Possible Format for Runway Use Recommendations by CAC (attached). When will Massport provide the Historic Baseline of Operations?)
- Information
  - Historic Baseline of Operations: 5 years before new Runway 14-32 in 2007 and since. (Requested and agreed August 5, 2013 P3 Technical Committee Kickoff Meeting.)
  - Basic Logan Airport noise abatement information:
    - Runway Use (Arrivals and Departures) by Runway End—all aircraft.
    - Noise Exposure (DNL) by Runway End and by Community from Runway End.
    - Noise Impact (LWP) by Runway End and by Community from Runway End.(Logan CAC BLANS information protocol request September 2014. Massport/HMMH estimates \$30K, including Historic Baseline)
  - Flight Tracks with RNAV routes. (Flight Tracks with altitudes color-coded and RNAV routes per current standard, FAA R33L DEP FEA and 1 Year Post Implementation Report. Center of flight tracks and standard deviation of dispersion per R27 DEP ROD.)
  - Intruding events (N70) by Runway End and by Community from Runway End. (Metric for RNAV impacts, including DNL<<65dB(A).)
- Phase 3 Budget to Complete
  - PC and IC Contract Budgets
  - Remaining Budget to Complete Phase 3
- Phase 3 Scope
  - Changes from Original Scope
  - Outline of Revise Scope to Complete Phase 3
- Next Steps to Complete Contract, Scope, Budget Revisions