

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study
BOS/TAC Meeting Agenda
Subject: Phase 2 Work Efforts
Time: 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.
Date: January 28, 2010
Location: Massport Logan Office Center - Training Room

Call-In Phone Number: 1-781-238-7745 pin# 1880

Meeting Objective: Review 2005/2007 Noise Results and FAA Level 2 Screening Criteria.

Reference Material:

- **2005/2007 Aircraft Noise Analysis Report**
- **FAA Level 2 Screening Criteria (provided on 1/8/10)**
- **BLANS Measures –Level 2 Status Update Matrix (provided on 1/14/10)**

Time	Topic
2:00 p.m. – 2:05 p.m.	Opening Remarks
2:05 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.	Phase 2 Status Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Schedule Status – PC• Website updates – PC
2:15 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	2005 and 2007 Aircraft Noise Results
3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	FAA Level 2 Screening Criteria
4:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Break
4:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	FAA Level 2 Screening Criteria
5:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.	BLANS Measures – Level 2 Status
5:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.	Next Steps/BOS/TAC Meeting Schedule

**Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS)
BOS/TAC Meeting
Massport Logan Office Center Training Room**

MEETING SUMMARY

2:00-6:00 PM

January 28, 2010

ATTENDANCE:

Boston Technical Advisory Committee (BOS/TAC) Members:

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-Terry English, Joseph Davies, Barbara Travers-Wright, Richard Doucette, Jon Harris

Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport)-Flavio Leo

Community Advisory Committee (CAC)-Sandra Kunz (Braintree), Wig Zamore (Somerville), Jerry Falbo (Winthrop), Robert Driscoll (Winthrop), Leo White (Beverly), Darryl Pomicter (Beacon Hill), Maura Zlody (City of Boston)

VIA TELEPHONE:

CAC-Bernice Mader (Quincy)

CAC-Ron Hardaway (East Boston)

CONSULTANTS:

Project Consultant (PC)-Stephen Smith (Ricondo & Associates, Inc.), Clint Morrow (Wyle Associates)

Independent Consultant (IC) Team-Jon Woodward (Landrum & Brown, Inc.), Stan Matthews (Crown Consulting)

OBSERVERS:

FAA-Brian Brunelle, Ed Kelleher, Gary Hufnagle, Alan Reed-Recorder

Massport-Frank Iacavino

VIA TELEPHONE:

FAA-George Yardley, Kristi Ashley

Attachments:

1. BOS/TAC Meeting Agenda, Subject: Phase 2 Work Efforts
2. BLANS Project Schedule Update-December 31, 2009 (Handout)
3. Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Phase 2, FAA Terms of Efficiency and Capacity and Application in the BLANS Discussion Paper, Draft-January 7, 2010
4. FAA's Operational Issues Screening/Evaluation Criteria Worksheet, For Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS) Level 2 Noise Abatement Measures, January 2010 Draft Version 1

References (downloadable from BLANS website):

1. BLANS, BOS/TAC Meeting #7 Slide Presentation
2. Boston Logan Airport Noise Study, CY 2005 and 2007 Noise Modeling Analysis, January 2010

3. BLANS, BOS STAR/RNAV Development Project Slide Presentation

OPENING REMARKS

S. Smith took the attendance from phone participants and those present at the Massport Training Room.

T. English wished to compliment the BOS/TAC membership for fostering forward progress, citing S. Kunz for her help with CAC coordination, F. Leo for providing ongoing support from Massport, the FAA Evaluation Team for their continuing efforts, and J. Davies and the BOS TRACON as they have been training controllers for the past month to ensure a seamless transition to implement the new Phase 1 RNAV procedures for Runway 9 at Boston-Logan. She wished to convey to the group that she sees a tremendous amount of effort taking place behind the scenes on a daily basis by all parties involved that not everyone may be aware of. She noted that although progress may seem slow at times, the BLANS continues to move forward one step at a time.

F. Leo added his accolades to the support and forward progress being made on behalf of Massport.

S. Kunz noted her encouragement for moving forward as well.

Phase 2 Status Report (Reference 1)

S. Smith reviewed the agenda (Attachment 1).

- Project Schedule Status-S Smith reviewed the project schedule (Attachment 2) and noted the end of Phase 2 is December 2011.
- Website updates
 - After a brief discussion on the website, he noted that **large** files will be available on the website, **small** files will be emailed
 - Once files are finalized, they will be available on the public portion of the website
 - All public documents are in the Document Library
 - Although suggestions for improvement of the website are welcome, please give some detail to the suggestion, keeping in mind the limited website budget
- Implementation Update (Slide 5)-B. Brunelle stated that all Runway 9 training is complete for Feb 1. S. Smith noted that the rest of the slide is still current and Runways 15 and 22 changes are scheduled to take effect November 18, 2010.

2005 and 2007 Aircraft Noise Results (Reference 2)

S. Smith announced that the draft report information related to the 2007 update requires further evaluation, and will require adjustments to the runway operating configuration weighting assumptions. The results in the draft report are based on what appears to be a

duplication of departure operations on Runway 33L. When compared to the 2007 and 2008 EDR, the use of Runway 33L ranged between 19 and 16 percent for 2007 and 2008, respectively. The BLANS 2007 Update, based on runway operating configuration weighting, depicts 25.9 percent. A DNL value for Massport measurement site 15 was also calculated using the BLANS 2007 model, and was compared to the measured level for 2007 and 2008. The measured values were DNL 62.4 and DNL 61.7 for 2007 and 2008, respectively. The BLANS 2007 modeled level was DNL 65.3, which is DNL 2.9 and 3.6 higher compared to the 2007 and 2008 measured levels, respectively. This comparison clearly indicates that the BLANS 2007 update is overestimating departures from Runway 33L. S. Smith explained that the decision to account for a FAA-reported configuration, arrivals on 33L and departures on 33L, in Configuration 6 may be causing the overestimation. PC, along with IC input, will need to investigate the runway use definitions for each runway operating configuration that includes departures from Runway 33L. S. Smith stated that PC does not want to overestimate starting values and wants to vet the information better. He emphasized that IC will play an integral role in the review process and their concurrence will be sought.

J. Woodward stated that we have EDR data and two sets of inconsistent information that need to be reconciled. He reiterated S. Smith's assessment that the modeled 26% for Runway 33L is too high and suggested a 3-5 dB comparison between modeled and measured levels is concerning. He stressed the need to be consistent and not overestimate noise levels, which would impact CAC's ability to address expected noise exposure levels.

S. Smith confirmed that the actual data was taken from 2007, and consisted of: every flight grouped into one of the six major configurations. Of importance was distinguishing between configurations and ensuring that the unique identifiers used by the FAA were assigned to the appropriate runway operating configuration. J. Falbo asked if EDR was used as a baseline. S. Smith responded that the BLANS 2007 was based on the BLANS 2005 model as a start, and then adjusted to reflect the use of Runway 32 and two additional runway operating configurations. In addition, Runway 27 departure tracks were reviewed to account for any improvement made to the WYLLY RNAV departure. He further explained the EDR is a different methodology whereas the BLANS develops noise modeling input for each runway operating configuration first, then combines them using annualized percentage use of each to weight the noise appropriately and then add all together to calculate the AAD.

S. Smith indicated that PC plans to identify the anomaly, identify a resolution with IC assistance, and re-calculate the results by the end of February to mid-March. Timeline will greatly depend upon the resolution.

FAA Level 2 Screening Criteria (Attachments 3, 4)

S. Smith summarized the Efficiency and Capacity Discussion Paper (ECDP). He explained that FAA tasked the PC with conducting research on the terms efficiency and capacity to determine whether and/or how these terms have been previously defined in

applicable FAA laws, regulations, and guidance documents and/or how they may have been applied in other FAA relevant projects. He said that PC's used the internet as the primary source of information. Based on their research, PC concluded that the FAA terms efficiency and capacity encompassed a wide range of meanings that changed depending on the specific airport or airspace being studied and that there does not appear to be an agency-wide concise definition for the terms, or specific criteria used to consistently evaluate effects to efficiency and capacity. In addition, there is no threshold of significance related to operational impacts. S. Smith noted that the FAA also reviewed the report to note any inaccuracies with FAA information cited, but that the report remains a PC report with a PC recommendation to the FAA. Regarding operational impact and noise abatement, an analysis that looked at both was the NY/NJ/PHL Airspace Redesign mitigation analysis, which IC assisted in developing for the FAA. PC reviewed the report, and concluded that:

- every situation (recommended change) was evaluated differently with varied conclusions;
- no general rule of thumb related to significant impact to operations or compromise to FAA's mission and goals; and
- conclusions have all been dependent on the specific procedure and airport under evaluation.

S. Smith opened the floor to discussion.

S. Kunz stated that the word "significant" should be in each criterion. It was noted that this comment was meant for the FAA's criteria worksheet and not the paper and that we would revisit it during the discussion on the worksheet. The comment will be discussed when the group gets to the form.

J. Falbo questioned the Disclaimer on the inside cover of the document noting that it specifically says that the discussion is applicable to the BLANS and no where else. S. Smith stated that it is important that the general public understands the ECDP is only for application to the BLANS and is produced by the PC. J. Falbo commented that this opens the door to many questions.

S. Smith re-stated that during the research for the ECDP, any information or methods applied by previous FAA projects or guidance applicable to BLANS would be highlighted. Unfortunately, PC was not able to find such information. S. Smith said that what matters is how the FAA defines key terms and previous application related to impact to their mission and goals. The PC paper serves as a reference upon which to base questions (to the FAA).

J. Falbo found it amazing that FAA has nothing to relate to this since 1956 (FAA celebrated its 50th Anniversary in 2008) and felt as if the CAC doesn't have a say in the matter, which means CAC discussions are of no value or premature.

J. Davies reminded the group that FAA's official vehicle regarding noise studies is FAR Part 150, with the BLANS being outside of this realm. The ECDP helps guide FAA through this unique study (BLANS), which is not black and white in any respect, thus FAA cannot quantify anything in this new territory (capacity and efficiency criteria).

J. Falbo stated his discomfort with this. He reflected that T. English has said that FAA will not redesign the (Boston) airspace. The only way measures will be compatible is if a redesign happens. He also noted that the ECDP doesn't include environmental considerations in the efficiency portions.

S. Smith reflected important points used in the ECDP:

- capacity and efficiency are not interchangeable terms and mean different things
- intent is not to increase noise
- the Record of Decision (ROD) specifies we need to account for efficiency and capacity and we cannot ignore it—we must address it in this process
- FAA has struggled with identifying applicable criteria, which is what the paper attempts to do – provide some insight on how other areas of the FAA may have applied the terms.

D. Pomicter commented that BLANS was court mandated with the approval of the construction of a new runway (RWY 14-32); all 14-32 studies and submittals maintained that capacity has not increased; and that the construction of the new runway was necessary to increase the actual, operational capacity during bad weather periods, but did not increase the theoretical maximum capacity of the airport. He commented that it doesn't seem to be fair, right, or acceptable to change this normal capacity definition (through this paper) for this resulting noise study. He believed: if short-term increases in operational capacity from the new runway in bad weather do not increase the airport's maximum capacity, short-term slight decreases in operational capacity from noise abatement procedures should not decrease the airport's maximum capacity.

D. Pomicter also noted the ongoing noise disturbance he experiences from what he believes are short takeoffs and climbing and turning over downtown Boston on Sunday mornings and also; during low traffic periods are another example where extended takeoffs to turn at higher altitudes seem to be ignored, considered less efficient and decrease capacity even in slow periods—that decreasing noise is not being considered even in slow periods. He emphasized that the FAA needs to consider noise as part of the criteria throughout this court mandated noise study and it seems that aviation professionals, focused on safety, efficiency, and capacity can easily eliminate all of the proposed noise measures—if their normal balance is not directly shifted. All of the noise abatement measures can easily be considered counter to the normal aviation goals. He also noted the study goal- to reduce noise-and believes it is to be of significant consequence (when tempering minimum and maximum levels) and must be included in the process.

S. Smith requested group acknowledgement that FAA has tried to work through the lack of precedent related to this type of project. He emphasized to everyone to recognize the limitations the FAA has (in remedies within the study) and the primary mission placed upon them by Congress. He stated that to date, the FAA has pushed the boundaries related to their primary mission to implement procedures that reduce noise several miles from the airport. T. English acknowledged that identifying noise abatement procedures is the main purpose of the BLANS, but that the main purpose of the EDCP is to address the definition of the FAA terms of efficiency and capacity so that the FAA can move forward in the Level 2 screening process as stated in the scope of work. The paper serves as one of many sources the FAA Air Traffic Evaluation Team may reference to derive the criteria that they will use for BLANS.

D Pomicter questioned the EDCP's purpose, noting that the 26 pages of the PCs time and efforts seems excessive—certainly from the CAC's viewpoint. He noted it does not say anything relative to “significant”, nor does it mention “noise”. He believes it is overly focused on efficiency. S. Smith acknowledges that the paper does focus mainly on capacity and efficiency, and the reason for the lack of any information related to “significant” and “noise” is because PC did not find any FAA documentation that connects operational impact to noise or a threshold of significance related to efficiency or capacity. The paper, in fact, concludes the lack of such information.

W. Zamore added that although the EDCP doesn't mention “noise”, he acknowledged it is meant to get noise progress. He recognizes that the BLANS is outside of the bounds of a FAR Part 150 study and does not see the discussion in the EDCP as arbitrary. He believes it shows the issues, what they mean, and how to apply them.

J. Falbo requested S. Smith to elaborate more about the lack of a noise element in the paper. Continuing the discussion, S. Smith said that no noise was mentioned because PC was focused on finding a consistent definition of efficiency and capacity, and impact to it to reduce noise levels. PC did not find any FAA guidance related to operational and noise tradeoffs. J. Falbo recognized the parameters intended for the EDCP, but cannot accept the definitions. He noted the criteria on p. 20 of the document lacks a real definition and believes it could have shown environmental considerations.

J. Davies followed, noting which operational criteria are applicable to the BLANS for Level 2 (L2) screening and stated that there will be a time when FAA will be able to quantify (definitions) more clearly. What it's trying to come up with is a way (in this uncharted territory) to work through this process. J. Falbo felt as if the CAC now must absorb a difficult document to understand.

J. Davies acknowledged all Phase 1 proposals were a compromise in efficiency and all future measures for screening represent a potential compromise in efficiency. D. Pomicter respects the safety and efficiency aspect but would like to keep noise on the “scorecard”. J. Davies stated that the FAA does not know yet what the measures will do. W. Zamore believes the way to progress is to get the metrics in parallel with these efforts.

R. Doucette noted that he agreed with almost everything-unsure of the terminology. Related to the ECDP and environmental consideration, he made the following observations:

- when defining terms, we cannot contaminate them with outside influences
- we have not defined the cost associated with the proposed changes
- the decision-making process at the end will combine the elements considered
- FAA has discussed different takes within the agency on the terms and continues to struggle in refining those terms.

S. Smith stated that many metrics have been considered in the paper, with no conclusions about the significance of changes. There are plenty of means to assess impact, but no ultimate conclusion related to significance was found. The ECDP is just a look at what the PC found in FAA documents available to the public on the internet. Right now, there are no clear metrics to give FAA a direction related to operational impacts. T. English added that the FAA's goal is to ultimately identify and apply consistent definitions and screening criteria throughout the BLANS process for everyone to see.

(Reference-Screening Worksheet, Attachment 4)

S. Smith recommended that he review the Level 2 process with the group. He thought it might answer some of the concerns. S. Smith continued, stating how the Level 2 Screening process is applied (Slide 9 of the presentation). He discussed the flow chart and talked about why FAA will select "yes's" and "no's" and will make a professional judgment from each and the thought process involved. He then gave an example of how each question asked will get vetted. FAA will review the defined measure and determine if it significantly compromises the FAA's mission and goals. If found to be significant, the PC will review the definition to see if a mitigated procedure could be designed. This would then go before the FAA for an additional review. The process does look at each circumstance or measure to see if something can be adjusted to make it work. If nothing else can be done to meet the intent and avoid significant compromise, the measure would be eliminated from further evaluation. If concluded a measure does not significantly compromise the FAA's mission and goals, the CAC may choose to do a noise screening analysis to determine if the measure will provide some noise benefit and meet their goals and objectives. He then displayed (Slide 10) the L2 Status Update Matrix, which can be used as a project management tool.

D. Pomictier believes the purpose of the study should also be annotated, using the following headline in every instance: "...the purpose of the Boston Logan Airport Noise Study is to **identify and implement measures to reduce noise impacts to communities surrounding** Boston Logan International Airport (BOS)..."

He also commented some confusion with the inconsistent terms of "Scope of Work" and "Scope of Services". T. English acknowledged the use of both terms and will verify the proper terminology with the ROD.

Action Item-T. English to verify use of Scope of Work or Scope of Services, in-accordance with the ROD.

S. Smith went on to discuss the FAA criteria form and highlighted some of the references used by the FAA. (Slide 12)

M. Zlody questioned FAA obligations to look at current state and future (growth). When answering questions, what are the assumptions-today or when? T. English responded that primarily FAA looks at today and a reasonable foreseeable future, keeping in mind that FAA cannot ignore or predict the future. M. Zlody also noted that CDRs have changed.

J. Davies gave a historical perspective and noted:

- none of these things or ideas will add capacity but could improve efficiency
- we have mathematical limitations
- we'll have the conclusions
- no matter how many airplanes we have in the air, FAA is only considering that two airplanes stay apart and this is a qualitative (safety) perspective.

D. Pomicter countered that when talking about capacity, the FAA mandate is clearly to increase operations towards the maximum, theoretical capacity. He stated that procedures are to get off and land, as quickly as possible, including small airplanes. He said operations go on for 16 hours a day and (Massport and FAA) want to get more airplanes in the nooks and crannies (of the airspace) and operate longer hours. Also, better noise consideration and procedures were necessary to decrease the resulting noise increases. He then noted five things he would like to see in the (screening) criteria:

- The purpose of BLANS: “To **identify and implement measures to reduce noise impacts to communities surrounding Boston Logan International Airport**”
- FAA values statement included with their Mission and Goals of Safety and Efficiency—from the same “We do the right thing, even when no one is looking... We treat people as we want to be treated”.
- A basic definition of significance, such as: important; of consequence.
- How each measure would affect current conditions
- A professional opinion or suggestion to obtain noise benefits that could be achieved under the measure and/or to better balance with operations (under “Other”).

J. Davies commented that the second paragraph on the first page of the worksheet addresses how the FAA will determine significance. He also clarified that FAA reserves the right to decide something other than the conclusions have stated, without necessarily having the conclusion based on safety.

F. Leo questioned if there could be a scenario where significance can be based on a cumulative impact from each criteria. In other words, each criterion in of itself may not be considered significant, but the overall impact can be. J. Davies responded that this is

possible, as S. Smith concurred with the current language of the criteria which does not ask for significance conclusion only. It also asks if there is any impact. If the question only asked about significance, additional information related to impact would be missing. This would be needed if the cumulative impact is concluded to be significant. J. Davies also pointed out that the Independent Consultant (IC), S. Matthews, and B. Borgioli will all understand the reasoning behind all answers, whether they agree with them or not. F. Leo emphasized that he does not want any false expectations from any findings and would be concerned about putting qualifications about the degree of significance (threshold) of safety with the criteria.

B. Mader requested check boxes and categories for significant language, suggesting using numbers at the end of each measure for common problems (using the logic of why it's there). J. Woodward stated he would rather see more specifics than generalities (wanting a full explanation). J. Davies added that he wanted measure-specific commentary. D. Pomicter commented that he would rather not try to decipher categories, as he reflected former professor's writings on the topic (Edward Tufte). J. Woodward commented that if the result of the measure is unacceptable, FAA should note how it could be acceptable, with some documentation that was considered, and recommendations for a conclusion. S. Smith noted that the intent is to come out with a clean document with insights. If not acceptable, PC would try to adjust the measure to mitigate the impact and still meet the intent; then give to the FAA for an additional evaluation. This allows for clean tracking of each measure. The forms should focus only on the definition provided.

R. Doucette commented that significance might subliminally affect people (in the context of the term itself). He also noted that a Yes typically is associated with a positive and No a negative. J. Davies responded that if FAA did this, the statement to start the paper would start out negatively-this was a consideration when the worksheet was put together.

D. Pomicter reflected that it would be good to have a positive spin on the answers (for the criteria). S. Kunz commented that she understood D. Pomicter's stance, but doesn't want it to be more complicated. She doesn't think this (criteria worksheet) needs to be changed, but would accept the (five) changes that he suggested. F. Leo was OK with this, as long as the details of points are made.

J. Davies noted the feedback on categories and questions are reasonable for FAA to be doing-if not, he asked CAC members what specifically they recommend to change? He reiterated that the FAA Evaluation Team is trying to evaluate, based on FAA's mission and we think these are a good start. T. English also noted that the FAA Evaluation Team will have two, three day breakout sessions prior to May to look at the measures.

The group took a break and resumed discussions at 4:36 PM.

FAA Level 2 Screening Criteria-continued

J. Davies thought it was reasonable for (CAC) feedback from the documents (ECDP and Worksheet Criteria), but would like it prior to the Eval Team meetings scheduled in

March. T. English added that the team would like to be able to use the documents as soon as possible. S. Smith asked S. Kunz if she could provide a consolidated list of recommendations. While D. Pomicter recommended FAA make changes to the document and send it out, S. Smith suggested that FAA revise based on today's discussions, set a two week time frame to get comments back, and would be able to get back out by Feb 5th. BOS/TAC agreed that any follow up questions/comments on the version discussed today will be provided no later than February 3rd. Based on the comments received today and by February 3rd, the FAA will consider the comments and revise the form accordingly by February 5th and send a second version out to everyone. The deadline for final comments would be provided no later than February 19th. She then asked S. Kunz if a telecon would be appropriate or simply emails. S. Kunz chose the latter.

M. Zlody wanted to thank S. Smith for getting the capacity and efficiency documents out so quickly as the CAC needed ample time to review them. J. Davies questioned the group again on whether they believe the FAA is on the right track for screening. The general consensus was that the document was too long: an executive summary at the beginning of the document would have been appropriate. Although the CAC had anticipated a more precise definition, it is now understood that the ECDP is a reference for the research conducted to find such definitions. While the paper is rather exhaustive in its efforts to seek more precise definitions, the CAC feels that such items as their Goals and Objectives were not addressed as part of those definitions and the broad scope of the document gives the FAA greater flexibility in refining the definitions to suit its own goals.

J. Davies commented that the PC also saw the potential for confusion in the paper and shared its concerns with the FAA, despite the fact that the FAA could be using the paper as a tool to define worksheet questions. He stated that the intent of the ECDP to define worksheet definitions was met and questioned J. Woodward as to whether S. Matthews and Buddy Borgioli had been consulted for their collective concurrencies on the criteria worksheet. J. Woodward responded, yes. D. Pomicter commented that with (CAC) suggested adjustments, the worksheet would reflect more balanced language.

T. English acknowledged that the paper was lengthier than what FAA had originally expected, but acceptable to capture the source references and research conducted by the PC. She noted PC did recommend two concise definitions of efficiency and capacity for FAA to consider in the BLANS. She directed all to pages 3 and 4 of the report and asked for IC/CAC feedback on these. Others noted that the definitions were also on page 20. S. Smith equated capacity to space. D. Pomicter disputed the term (capacity) and thought it was more, the ability to yield throughput rather than to hold and equated it as a number of flying passengers and which airplane has priority, based on size. He stated that capacity here is how many operations. J. Davies clarified to state that we're talking about a volume of airspace. D. Pomicter countered that he looks at capacity as how much you fill (the airspace). J. Davies went on to explain capacity definitions in two parts, from the ECDP-one is physical useable space on the ground, the other as defined airspace.

B. Mader mentioned there was capacity for 110 runway operations. J. Woodward believed that number was too high. J. Davies stated that the enroute environment has some these capacity numbers. D. Pomicter described his perception of getting airplanes up and down and now understanding the movement in the airspace; also gating throughput.

While J. Davies reviewed the question and answer type of format the worksheet entailed, J. Falbo questioned if it was possible to insert environment in the efficiency definition. S. Smith reiterated that the ECDP is specifically geared towards efficiency and capacity. These are two important terms associated with the FAA's mission and goals. The group discussed the lack of applicability of environmental definitions that could be applied to the paper, based on the ROD and any qualitative assessments that FAA can make at this time. F. Leo further stated that his understanding that this paper is the roadmap FAA will use and the CAC can evaluate from that point.

D. Pomicter commented that the draft Phase 1 screening document appeared to be final when the CAC received it and wanted assurances that the Phase 2 screening draft would be more of a collaboration process until complete. T. English assured the group that FAA Eval Team deliberations will be shared with the CAC, while S. Smith clarified that all draft documents have always been intended to be evaluated and reviewed by all before they are finalized and released to the public, as was the case for Level 1. R. Doucette also assured the CAC that FAA would consider any noise benefit (that could be gained) while considering safety impacts and that FAA will carefully scrutinize all considerations, during Phase 2 screening.

BLANS Measures-Level 2 Status (Reference 3)

T. English introduced J. Harris as the RNAV lead on the ongoing FAA's RNAV STAR initiatives for Logan. She said that he had previously explained the initiative on the December 1st PMT call, but some CAC members had expressed a concern that the RNAV STAR initiative was technical in nature (not process related) and the entire CAC should be afforded an opportunity to hear it and ask questions. She also said that the December 1st PMT notes contained detailed information about the RNAV STARs initiative and could be found on the BLANS website.

J. Harris proceeded to elaborate on T. English's comments and explain activities that have taken place since the December 1st PMT call with air traffic control, TRACON, Georgia Tech, MITRE Corporation, and HTNB regarding the three arrival routes that are being evaluated from as far away as Albany, NY. (Slide 3, 4). As stated in the Dec 1 call, in order to successfully blend RNAV procedures into the Boston area, the procedures must start in the en-route airspace. He outlined the many benefits available using these procedures (as they relate to the BLANS) and working partners who are helping with simulations of the procedures (US Air, Delta airlines) and assistance by MITRE and other partners.

J. Harris also stated that the next round of RNAV procedures are pending a September 2010 publishing date, but also noted the complexities of internal (air traffic) adjustments to be made, including controllers union, current workload, and the environmental considerations. T. English further stated that because these procedures are “overlays”, the expectation is that they will qualify for a categorical exclusion (CATEX): FAA is trying to avoid environmental assessment (EA) “triggers” which would take longer and could delay the process. HTNB will be conducting the noise analysis, and will use the same INM studies utilized by BLANS for consistency. J. Harris also shared that these efforts are being supplemented by flight procedures (FAA) in Oklahoma City since this is recognized as Next Generation (NextGen) operations—thus saving money for the users. Also of note will be a reduction of carbon emissions and noise. S. Smith commented that HTNB will also be using the same noise modeling protocols applied for BLANS.

Next Steps/BOSTAC Meeting Schedule

D. Pomicter wished to make a few comments:

- grateful that the 2005/2007 Noise Study includes larger scale maps with the neighborhood planning boundaries within the City of Boston
- website is still a problem, although it has improved:
 - we (CAC) want it to work for us (for accessing documents to review), not against us
 - would like to get more specific locations (of documents) with the public Document Library, including all public documents and the Project Team password side, including all drafts and non-public documents and better visibility of both sides to ease moving between, looking in the right place, and finding.
 - there are redundancies to the structure (of the website). Both sides need to be better organized, complete (current more quickly), and without duplication on each side or between sides. A map/tree diagram of all pages and URLs would be useful to refine structure—and understand it.
 - would like reporting on page visits and downloads—who is using what, by group (not individual)
 - would like to get internet connection for meetings. A separate open server may be necessary to satisfy security with “public” use.
 - would be helpful to do this in this (Massport) training room
 - would like it so the teams can help each other—CAC and BOSTAC

S. Smith requested specific suggestions to be submitted in accomplishing website improvements while noting the limited budget that the website has for improvement. While noting the challenges faced in accessing draft (team access) documents vs. final (public access) documents, he reiterated that those documents still in draft form remain on the team forum, while the rest are available on the website. Meanwhile, in responding to D. Pomicter’s reference to surveying website downloads, T. English and A. Reed will work with PC to find out if this is possible.

Action Item-T. English and A. Reed will look into feasibility of obtaining a download survey from the BLANS website.

The next BOSTAC meeting will be held (tentative) May 20, 2010, 2-6 PM at Massport.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM.

Action Items

1. T. English to verify use of Scope of Work or Scope of Services, in-accordance with the ROD.

2. T. English and A. Reed will look into feasibility of obtaining a download survey from the BLANS website.