

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Coordination Meeting

March 26, 2014

10:00 AM EDT

Include Project Number

Teleconference

Facilitator:	John Williams	Note takers:	John Williams
Attendees:	Representing	Email	
Sandra Kunz	CAC, President	skunz@verizon.net	
Flavio Leo	Massport	fleo@massport.com	
Terry English	FAA, Air Traffic Organization, BLANS Project Manager	Terry.english@faa.gov	
Rob Adams	Independent Consultant	radams@landrum-brown.com	
John Williams	Project Consultant	jwilliams@ricondo.com	

Discussion Points

J. Williams (JW) opened the meeting and said that the purpose was to discuss the status of Phase 3 of the BLANS and to identify next steps. S. Kunz (SK) stated that it is important to get the project moving and to show progress.

T. English (TE) asked about the status of CAC's runway use program framework and progress toward developing details for the program. R. Adams (RA) stated that consensus on the framework of the runway use program had been reached at the CAC meeting in February 2014 and that he was working on more details for the program. He said that he had posed a question to the CAC officers as to how to fill in the details of the program and that to date he had received one comment, that being from Ralph Dormitzer. (He said he received two other comments via email, but those were outside of the context of the runway use program.) RA said that he would like to get specific direction in terms of working toward (a) percentage use of runway use configurations or (b) percentage use of specific runways.

SK asked if the runway use program should be seasonal; RA replied that the potential for a seasonal approach is something that he needed direction on from CAC. SK stated that it has been difficult to define "fair and equitable" regarding the distribution of noise and that CAC would rely on RA's expertise and said that a rotational runway use program had been discussed as having the best potential. RA stated again that the program could be based on achieving overall runway use or runway configuration use percentages, or on developing a program that would set goals for changing configurations to re-distribute noise. F. Leo (FL) stated that basing a program on percentages would set up the program for failure due to fluctuations in weather and other factors affecting runway use. He suggested that the runway use program provide broad guidelines for observing and changing runway use and that metrics be established to measure the performance and success of the program.

RA stated that CAC wants metrics and also wants the ATCT to be more transparent in their decision-making regarding runway use, including when decisions would be made to not change configurations.

FL said that he believes that the ATCT would be willing to provide more information and that most deviations from program goals would be based on weather; but may also be based on the capacities of specific configurations, particularly during peak periods.

SK confirmed that CAC has reached consensus on the basic framework of the runway use program prepared by RA and that work now is to make it specific to BOS. RA said that the framework is already specific to BOS in terms of the timeframes for consideration of runway use changes.

FL suggested that RA, JW, and FAA representatives work to begin developing details for the framework based on the CAC approved basic framework. FL said that if this group came forward and stated that the program would work based on what the CAC has provided, it might carry more credibility with the CAC membership.

TE asked what would be expected of the ATCT representatives and stated that FAA would not be in a position to make recommendations. She also stated that Massport should participate in any small technical meetings. FL said that Massport would participate in a smaller meeting now that CAC has reached consensus on the framework. He also said that the meetings could include SK as well; SK said that she would be willing to attend as an observer.

TE said that she agrees that assignment of percentages would likely not work and that the framework established by RA could be developed to work. ATCT could help in terms stating why certain things may not be doable.

SK said that she believes that the more seasonally based the runway use program is, the more successful it will be.

RA said that we would need for the ATCT to provide a list of what information they can provide regarding runway use decisions and the circumstances under which runway use changes cannot be made.

FL said that the Massport noise office would help in reporting. SK said that the reporting should include information as to why runway use changes or other things did not occur according to the program goals.

JW stated that one of the tasks in Phase 3 would be to model the effects of the runway use program and that it would be difficult to determine parameters to model the anticipated changes associated with the rotational program as part of the modeling protocol. TE asked if it would even be possible to model the effects of the program. RA suggested that there could be a six-month test, followed by interpolation of the results to then model the effects of the program. FL asked about NEPA requirements to implement beyond the test period. RA suggested that a second six-month test of a revised program could be conducted to gain more information for any NEPA processing. FL suggested that Phase 3 could work up to the point of establishing the test(s) and then close down the project for a year and come back and revisit once the tests have been completed. He asked how we would conduct a before and after analysis. JW and RA said that we would have to determine ways in which runway use changed as a result of the program over the test period. FL suggested that runway use percentages could be a good indicator as a metric to measure the changes.

FL said that it would be important to have Boston Tower (Brian Brunelle) at the table with RA, JW, and Massport to save time and effort and that SK and TE should attend as well. TE said that Cully Beasley, or someone from the TRACON would need to participate as well.

FL asked if there was a gameplan to revise the framework. RA said that he does have a gameplan now to revise the framework and to start identifying metrics. TE asked if we would proceed even if no further comments are received from CAC. SK said that the revised framework will be provided to the CAC officers and then upon agreement, forwarded to FAA and Massport. SK said that she will work with the CAC officers and that she supports a rotational runway use program as the easiest and simplest to show improvement and that we just need to keep moving and get this done.

After further discussion, the following gameplan was developed:

- ✓ RA to provide a revised framework to SK on Monday, March 31 (working off of the consensus reached at the February meeting)
- ✓ SK will provide the revised framework to the CAC officers and give them one week to respond
- ✓ SK will tell CAC that, based on the consensus reached at the February meeting, RA is working with FAA, Massport, and the PC to refine the program
- ✓ RA will send Massport, FAA, and JW an invitation to meet in April (date was set for April 23) to obtain assistance in further refining the program based on the CAC framework, both in terms of technical feasibility and the development of metrics. TE reiterated that the purpose of the meeting would be for RA to bring the FAA and Massport to the table to assist in refining the runway use program and that FAA would not make specific recommendations.
- ✓ The refined program would then be presented to CAC by RA. SK stated that there would be no final decision until CAC agrees.

Attachments:

None

Distribution:

13-10-0793
Meeting Attendees
[Read File](#)

c:\users\jwilliams\desktop\jcw files\client files\massport\logan airport noise study\phase 3\phase 3 meeting notes\coordination meeting
03262014\coordination_meeting_03262014_notes_final.docx