

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Runway Use Test #1 Planning Meeting

September 30, 2014

8:00 a.m. EDT

13-10-0793-2.1

Logan International Airport

Facilitator: John Williams **Note takers:** John Williams/Terry English

Attendees:

Name	Representing	Email
Flavio Leo	Massport	fleo@massport.com
Frank Iacovino	Massport	fiacovino@massport.com
Sandra Kunz	President Logan Airport Community Advisory Committee (CAC)	skunz@verizon.net
Jerry Falbo	CAC Officer	lawfsg@winthropesq.com
Wig Zamore	CAC Officer	wigzamore@rcn.com
Darryl Pomicter	CAC Officer	dpomic@aol.com
Terry English	FAA, Air Traffic Organization, BLANS Program Manager	terry.english@faa.gov
Andy Hale	FAA, Manager, Boston Logan Airport Traffic Control Tower	andy.hale@faa.gov
Mike Nelson	FAA, Manager, Cape Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON)	Mike.nelson@faa.gov
Brian Brunelle	FAA, Boston Logan Airport Traffic Control Tower	brian.brunelle@faa.gov
Coleman Hartigan	FAA, Manager, Boston TRACON	coleman.hartigan@faa.gov
Cully Beasley	FAA, Boston TRACON	cully.beasley@faa.gov
Rob Adams	Independent Consultant	radams@landrum-brown.com
John Williams	Project Consultant	j_williams@ricondo.com

Discussion Points

After introductions, J. Williams (JW) provided a brief update of the status of Runway Use Plan Test #1 (RUP Test #1):

- Goal is to begin the test as soon after November 1, 2014, as possible
- Clarification is needed from CAC on how to determine the "last nighttime configuration" to compare against the following morning, given that the runway configuration can change several times during the evening/nighttime hours before switching to the late night configuration
- The details of the communication between Massport and FAA regarding runway use needs to be finalized
- Environmental documentation (Initial Environmental Review [IER] and Categorical Exclusion) has been drafted awaiting final information and review; the documentation will be final in time for RUP Test #1 to begin

R. Adams (RA) stated that the last configuration in use for a full hour is the one that should be used to identify a different configuration for the following morning.

Regarding communication between FAA and Massport, JW stated that the original plan had been for Massport to communicate with FAA at approximately 2 p.m. each weekday afternoon to recommend a runway use configuration for the morning peak the following morning based on the configuration that it was assumed would be in use that nighttime period prior to changing to the late night configuration. On Friday, the recommendation would be for the following Sunday and Monday as well. The recommendations would be based on weather forecasts as well as known runway closures or other operational considerations that could affect runway availability. CAC representatives had stated that it was their understanding that there was a morning coordination call between Massport and FAA and that the call should be made at that time, when weather and other conditions are known, rather than relying on forecasts the day before. B. Brunelle (BB) said that communication with Massport did not occur early enough in the day for that to work, as the runway configuration decision is made before 6:00 a.m.

JW said that after discussions with FL and RA, a revised plan for identifying the recommended runway use plan was developed, which includes the development of a decision tree matrix that lists morning runway configurations in order of preference for each configuration that might be in use the prior night. The order of preference would match that developed by the CAC: (1) use a runway configuration that has a different primary departure runway and different primary arrival runway; (2) use a configuration that has a different primary departure runway; (3) use a configuration that has a different primary arrival runway. The purpose of the decision tree matrix would be to eliminate the need for the 2 p.m. calls and allow FAA to select the runway use configuration for the morning peak based on the actual runway configuration in use the night before. Depending on the last configuration in use for at least an hour the night before, the FAA would begin work through the list of configurations, selecting the first feasible configuration that could be used, based on wind and weather, runway availability, etc. JW distributed a draft decision tree matrix (attached) to be used as a starting point for developing the final matrix to be used.

BB said that the plan would work and could be implemented in the Tower. J. Falbo (JF) asked for a clarification of the playlist and when the call is made to determine the morning configuration. FL clarified that FAA wanted Massport to make the recommendations and that the matrix is a way to avoid having to make a recommendation the day before; CAC has recommended the overall concept of being in a different configuration the following morning and that FAA and Massport need to work up the final methodology for implementing the test.

D. Pomictier (DP) said that the matrix is a playbook and is totally wrong, as it doesn't reflect CACs desires, because it doesn't address runway use in terms of runway ends and the noise levels of arrivals and departures. R. Adams (RA) said that the purpose of this test is to change runway configuration from the evening/night to the following morning. He asked whether arrivals or departures are louder and suggested changes to the matrix to reflect that arrivals are louder than departures and the order of preference should suggest changing the primary arrival runway as a higher priority than changing the primary departure runway.

FL said that there are different impacts from all of the different configurations and that each community says they get the most noise. He said that the focus should be on the fundamental idea of rotating and balancing.

RA said that he is comfortable with the concept, but would not make any recommendations on runway configuration choices on behalf of CAC.

S. Kunz asked RA if he believed that the concept was ready to present to the CAC; RA responded "yes" and SK said that she is comfortable to say to CAC that this is a test and to just get it going

DP said that the group still needs to decide whether arrivals are louder than departures. He asked T. English (TE) which is louder. TE said that based on FAA noise screening tools, departures are considered louder than arrivals. DP said that he would send an email with the question to TE, who would forward it to the FAA Office of Environment and Energy for a formal response.

RA said that list of runway use change preferences were based on the thought that departures are louder than arrivals.

W. Zamore (WZ) said that the text addresses changes from night to the following morning, but does not address dwell and persistence. FL said that dwell and persistence is typically the result of weather conditions or loss of runway for construction, etc. WZ said that people notice things based on their own schedules and that he felt the test factors could be simulated, but that he is ok with tests.

JW summarized that there is general agreement on the concept of using the decision tree matrix, but that the matrix needs to be tweaked. BB said that the revisions and recommendations need to come from Massport.

SK said that we need to just move forward and try it; this is a test to see if it works.

DP said arrivals came as the priority (i.e., the second preference would be to change the primary arrival runway) in the April submittal, but that the current plan had been changed based upon input from the representative from Hull.

FL said that in their review of the matrix, they would go forward with the concept of departure runway first, then arrival unless official notice otherwise is received from CAC.

C. Beasley (CB) said that we should try it and see how often configurations change.

JW said that there is no longer a need for the 2 p.m. call and that FAA would use the decision tree matrix to make the call in the morning as to what configuration to be in; BB and FL said that they agreed that was the process.

RA asked if this would be a static decision tree matrix and said that over time there may be desire to modify it based on runway closures, etc.; FL said that he agreed and that Massport will work with the Tower to discuss needs for operational changes.

RA asked if any lengthy runway closures were planned; BB/FL said that 4L and 4R both need to close for about 2 weekends and potentially at times during the week. FL said that Massport will make recommendations for what to do during those times as has been done during previous runway closure periods. FL said that there are high percentages of desired nighttime runway use (79% or so over a tested 100 days).

RA asked if there will there be a modified decision tree matrix to be used during these times; FL said no, that Massport will offer an option to FAA to address the closure period.

BB said that a primary driver for runways is wind and weather and that operations today (September 30, 2014) are a good example in that they are landing on 4s and departing on 9 just like they had the previous night, because of the wind.

TE asked how often there would be follow up discussions during RUP Test #1; would they occur every week?

FL suggested that a discussion be held after the first month similar to what was done when Runway 33 was closed. TE asked who would be on the call; FL said it should be the same group as in this meeting.

DP said that during the initial period of the Runway 33 closure, the operations were only consistent with the plan for about 30 percent of the time, but the process improved after conversations.

TE said that the plan is still for this to be about a 3-month test. FL asked how much flexibility; TE responded that it could go up to 6 months, but no longer to be consistent with the Categorical Exclusion.

TE said discussions of the next test need to begin soon, perhaps starting in 2nd month of this initial test. FL said that future meetings will have two topics: the current test and the next test.

TE asked RA if the thought is still to go through with tests of all concepts of the original plan; RA responded "yes."

JW began a discussion of the operational noise analysis; DP asked about the test and how to use the noise modeling money. JW said that the plan is to have HMMH prepare the noise analysis using their proprietary Real Contours system, which uses the INM to calculate contours based on actual radar data that would be collected for the test period. DP asked how HMMH's work would be funded and suggested that it be paid by Massport through their on-call agreement. JW said that the work that HMMH would do would likely be within the budget that had been set aside for Wyle to do noise analyses of runway use options and there would be little to no effect on the overall budget for BLANS.

JW said that the question about comparing noise analysis remains; the desire of CAC is for a noise analysis of the test period to be developed, but it is unclear as to what the analysis should be compared with and that this is a question for CAC. RA said that we had discussed using a 3-month comparison and to determine what should be used as a comparison – the prior 3-month period or the same 3-month period from last year.

SK asked if we could find something that is a true apples to apples comparison. JF said that he thinks using the same 3-month time period from last year is best. FL said that that would allow a comparison during similar traffic periods, whereas traffic levels during the months prior to the test would be higher.

DP agreed that this is a tough question about comparison and to look at historic runway use since Runway 14-32 had opened; the professionals need to make the recommendation and asked RA for his recommendation. RA said that there are some advantages on historic, and that Real Contours gives as close to the real snapshot as possible. DP asked if the historic average of runway use over time could be used to develop a baseline.

CB reminded the group that the test of this procedure is about changing runway use not specifically about noise; RA agreed that this is more about changing runway use, but it is still important to consider the overall effects on noise.

DP said that it is possible that the runway use program could make a better distribution of noise without changing DNL.

JF said that he found information that 26 congressmen had recently supported reducing the contour of significance to DNL 55. DP said that EPA has said to stick to with DNL 65, because the cost to mitigate to DNL 55 would be too high.

SK said that she needs CAC to buy in to the concept of using the decision tree matrix. JW said that FAA needs a test document ASAP to get it going and asked SK if there is a need to get any further approvals from CAC. DP said that there was no CAC approval, only consensus.

SK said that she agreed there was no final approval, but there needs to be a presentation to and agreement from CAC and that she would get back to FAA ASAP.

RA said that he would prepare edits for the runway use test period document and have them in place in time for the CAC meeting that night (September 30, 2014).

BB asked Massport to provide recommendations based on FAA's actual configurations.

TE said that the FAA IER/Categorical Exclusion were nearly complete but could not be finalized until the final test document is in place, but that they would be completed in time for the test to begin.

TE said that the final document is also needed for public notification and that FAA will send the public notification to the same recipients as before; SK and JF agreed. TE also said that at some point there may need to be a large public meeting.

BB said that once the final document is in place, FAA would develop an internal notice describing the procedures to supervisors and staff (there are 5 supervisors) and controllers in charge at night, some of whom will make the decision for the morning configuration. The notice needs to provide background, what the program is, how the program functions, and what the goals are. Individual briefings and some group briefings will be held, but no simulations would be required.

SK said that if they have to have a CAC vote, it could perhaps take a week and her goal was to be final within a week of the meeting (September 30, 2014).

A. Hale (AH) announced to the group that he was leaving to go to DC on a one year detail and that Mike Nelson is serving as Interim Acting Manager; AH leaves on Friday, October 3.

Action Items:

- ✓ DP to provide email to TE regarding noise levels of arrivals vs. departures for TE to forward to FAA Office of Environment and Energy
- ✓ RA to prepare revised RUP Test #1 document prior to CAC meeting on September 30, 2014
- ✓ SK to seek consensus/approval from CAC and provide final RUP Test #1 document to FAA
- ✓ TE to complete the IER/Categorical exclusion for RUP Test #1 once the final document is received
- ✓ BB to prepare internal briefing materials for Tower staff
- ✓ Meeting date to be established to discuss how RUP Test #1 is proceeding and to start discussions regarding RUP Test #2

Attachments:

Draft Decision Tree Matrix

Distribution:

13-10-0793-2.1
Meeting Attendees
Read File

c:\users\jwilliams\desktop\jcw_files\client_files\massport\logan_airport_noise_study\phase_3\phase_3_meeting_notes\september_30_runway_use_test_1_planning_meeting\runway_use_test_#1_planning_meeting_09302014_v01.docx

First Draft of Runway Use Configurations

	Dep	Arr	Dep	Arr	Dep	Arr	Dep	Arr	Dep	Arr
Evening	4L/4R/9	4L/4R	22L/22R	22L/27	27/33L	27/33L/32*	22L/22R/15R	22L/22R	27/33L	33L/33R/32*
Morning 1	33L/27	27/33L/32*	33L/27	33L/33R/32*	4L/4R/9	4L/4R	33L/27	33L/33R/32*	4L/4R/9	4L/4R
Morning 2	22L/22R	22L/27	4L/4R/9	4L/4R	22L/22R	22L/27	4L/4R/9	4L/4R	22L/22R	22L/27
Morning 3	15R/9	4L/4R	15R/27	22L/27	22L/22R	33L/33R/27	15R/9	22L/22R	22L/22R	33L/33R/27
Morning 4	4L/4R	33L/27	22L/22R	15R	27/33L	22L/22R	22L/22R/15R	15R	27/33L	22L/22R

Evening = The last configuration that the Airport was in place for an hour during the evening push.

Morning 1 and Morning 2 = Potential configurations representing full configuration change (first preference from CAC)

Morning 3 = Potential primary departure runway change (second preference from CAC)

Morning 4 = Potential primary arrival runway change (third preference from CAC)