

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

DATE: 12/01/09
TIME: 4:30 p.m. EST

Telephone Conversation
 Meeting
 Other

SUBJECT: Phase 2 Bi-Weekly Project Management Call

SUMMARY PREPARED 12/01/09

ATTENDEES (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Steve Smith	PC
Jon Woodward	IC
Terry English	FAA
Jon Harris	FAA
Flavio Leo	Massport
Jerry Falbo	CAC (Winthrop)
Sandra Kunz	CAC (Braintree)
Declan Boland	CAC (Hingham)

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Alan Reed	FAA
Richard Doucette	FAA
Ron Hardaway	CAC (East Boston)
Maura Zlody	City of Boston

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

Individuals	Files
Project File BLANS Forum CAC BOS/TAC	

I. Attendance:

Steve Smith took attendance.

II. Approval of 10/13/09 Meeting Notes:

In the last paragraph on page two, there was clarification of Level 2 Screening criteria related to the reassessed scope of work. There was also a word in paragraph three on page three that was changed from “three” to “all” – in reference to responses from the communities.

On the last page, the number list following the first paragraph was edited. The notes were then approved.

III Project Status Update:

- a. **2007 Update Noise Analysis** - IC completed its review of the air traffic portion and is now reviewing ground traffic; Wyle is still working on the noise portion. S. Smith said information is still on track to be shared at the next BOSTAC meeting in January '10.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

- b. **Outreach Letters** - S. Smith said that all of the letters have been sent out and posted on public website. T. English advised that the media release was published on 11/10/09 and noted that an article on the BLANS was published in the Airport Noise Report on 11/13/09 in response to the media release.
- c. **Website** - S. Smith is posting material to the website as items are finalized.
- d. **Scope Reassessment** - PC just finished its portion two days ago and turned it into FAA. IC has delivered its budget to CAC for review. S. Kunz doesn't recollect seeing anything concerning, but wants to make sure that she sent it out to all CAC members. S. Smith asked F. Leo if he would like to receive IC and PC budgets together when they are ready to be sent to Massport. PC and IC will send budgets separately to Massport for review. F. Leo agreed.

Action Items: (1) T. English to post notes from the Outreach Telcon.
(2) S. Smith and S. Kunz to send budgets to F. Leo when ready.

IV Level 2 Process Update:

- a. **Development of Level 2 FAA Criteria** - S. Smith advised that this was talked about at the recent BOS/TAC meeting. He also said that the FAA is on track to come up with a series of criteria to share with BOS/TAC at the next meeting in January. T. English added that she hopes to have a draft document to all (PC, IC, CAC, etc) by 1/8/10 for further discussion and input at the next BOSTAC meeting.
- b. **Definition of Measures** – S. Smith said that PC is trying to help FAA put general corridors on a map, but nothing is final. He said that Level 2 measures need to be more clearly defined in order for the FAA to make any Level 2 determinations. FAA is working towards a set of criteria related to “significant compromise of FAA mission and goals.” T. English said that four meetings with FAA Air Traffic Evaluation team have been dedicated to determining criteria for this project and initial review of each measure. S. Smith said that the information is being gathered as the meetings take place and will help the FAA make its decisions in a more objective and consistent manner.
- c. **Status of measures** – S. Smith said that most of the measures are in the definition phase. Some are straight forward and will most likely screen through FAA criteria, since some procedures exist today that are similar (visual approach to Runway 33L). S. Smith also inquired about defining the noise wall measures and the probability that it can be implemented. For this measure, it comes down to noise reduction and height of a wall (e.g. how tall should walls be to reduce noise for how many residents, etc) J. Woodward explained the relevance between height and noise reduction, and issues associated with residents located on terrain. S. Smith questioned if any of the noise wall measures can actually be acceptable to residents with views of the harbor and will the reduction provide enough benefit to outweigh the costs. J. Woodward recommended that we continue to define what the potential heights can be and the estimated benefit, and decide based on the screening assessment. J. Woodward thinks this can be discussed at next CAC meeting. He said that if a wall is built on the north shore, it would have to be about 24 ft. high at the west side of Bayswater Rd. to provide an effective noise reduction benefit (due to 3-story high homes). He doesn't think that the wall would prove effective, except for first few houses. J. Falbo requested a drawing of these proposals and doesn't think that the wall ideas should be abandoned until further review. S. Smith replied to J. Falbo

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

by telling him that the idea isn't being abandoned, it just needs to be defined (size of wall, etc). J. Woodward is proposing qualitative data to people to help them make decisions. T. English agrees with the items discussed. She said that it is important for the NEPA phase to identify what if any noise benefits the wall measures could provide. If any measures are eliminated, the reasons for rejection will be necessary. S. Smith recapped by saying that IC will do a qualitative assessment for the two walls before making a conclusion. S. Smith reminded F. Leo of PC's request for the airport layout plan (ALP). F. Leo advised that the current ALP will not be approved until January, but has a general version that should meet PC's needs. F. Leo will provide S. Smith with information which will show latest improvements, but it will not be an official ALP.

T. English then informed PMT of a new and separate FAA initiative that is related to Measure F-A. (CDA approaches). FAA has been evaluating the potential of implementing RNAV overlay procedures for the existing conventional arrivals or Standard Terminal Approach Routes (STAR) into Boston-Logan. Included in this process is the evaluation and possible addition of Optimal Profile Descents (OPD) in with the RNAV STARS. These actions are independent of the BLANS project. She then turned it over to J. Harris so that he could provide an update about this new initiative.

J. Harris started by explaining that this new measure involves furthering FAA RNAV and NextGen objectives. He said that facilities like the BOS Center and BOS TRACON are required to optimize airspace, using more recent RNAV technology. The FAA is working with certain airlines (e.g. American, Jet Blue, Comair, etc) to develop overlay RNAV STAR procedures. There was a formal RNAV 18 Step Kickoff meeting held on 11/18 in which some initial design concepts were available. The FAA's RNAV Office considers including OPDs in new RNAV procedures a high priority. However a separate FAA office is responsible to design CDAs, and they are not involved in this initiative at this time. He explained that FAA Headquarters enlists expert help from Georgia Tech specialists who evaluate OPD feasibility and optimum flight profiles taking into account both arriving and departing aircraft. Arriving aircraft may need to be blended and sequenced further out, still well within the enroute environment, in order to achieve an optimal arrival descent. The target date for publishing is 9/23/10, depending on the quality and timeframe for evaluation of descent profiles. He said that this initiative would require an independent environmental review and noise modeling analysis by FAA offices.

As an example, J. Harris said that in order to really measure the benefits of and implement an OPD for aircraft arriving from the west, aircraft must begin to be blended as far out as Albany New York to make it work (en-route), and continue through TRACON airspace to the runway environment without interrupting other flights in the area and maintaining safe separation. A successful RNAV OPD procedure will reduce some of the workload for TRACON controllers. Pending a successful evaluation of OPD's by the RNAV work group team, the local RNAV office plans to initiate these RNAV arrival procedures starting with the easiest arrival configurations first, such as having aircraft arriving from the south over Providence going to RWY 4L/R, then adding others where possible. He described the three procedures as follows:

1. West arrival aircraft over Gardner

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

2. East arrival aircraft over SCUPP
3. South arrival aircraft Over Providence

F. Leo asked what parameters are being used for this initiative.

J. Harris said that they are using vast information and resources. More technical discussion about this ensued. J. Harris added that the whole process involved with arrival/departure flows is focused during high density peak traffic periods. It would not be optimal to perform these during lighter traffic.

Declan asked about direct vs. non-direct procedures. Will this allow for continued descents. J. Harris said that the FAA's priority is to focus where the aircraft is still within the enroute facility (above 14,000 ft.) and include OPDs when they can be designed. He also mentioned that an OPD's continual descent provides for a huge savings in carbon emissions and noise.

S. Smith added that they (OPDs) are optimized where the pilot can do it, but may not be able to do it the whole time.

Declan asked J. Harris to clarify from what standpoint these descents would be optimized. J. Harris said that the FAA is looking from a broad perspective. The benefits of OPD would be experienced by ATC, airlines, and communities.

S. Smith added that the key parameter is that the FAA is looking at current procedures as they are today. Looking at overlaying from existing procedures laterally, but also looking at optimizing the descent approach where possible.

J. Harris said that they are overlaying current arrival tracks and procedures.

T. English mentioned that she is plugged into the FAA's 18-Step process, so she can help answer questions, etc. She said that J. Harris can eventually give a presentation and that this initiative is on an accelerated schedule. She reiterated that this is a separate initiative, but it has a lot of similar goals as BLANS (related to Measure F-A).

F. Leo asked if J. Harris would notify the group if the findings in the OPDs impact Phase 2 alternatives.

J. Harris said that he would. He also said that he is in the same office as Terry and will keep her in the loop. They have already talked about communicating and providing information to the CAC.

F. Leo said that in designing procedures, CDA or OPD (something that has to do with the last segment of flight) it sounds like the procedure must start beyond TRACON to get full operational benefit out of it. J. Harris said that this is accurate and that there are greater benefits by doing it further out. F. Leo would like to capture all the benefits from these procedures even if they are further out than TRACON.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

S. Smith said that Measure F-A has very long schedule and if this project (BLANS) went through the same level of analysis, there would be challenges obtaining funding. This project could benefit a lot from outcome of the FAA STAR RNAV Procedure analysis. After completion of analysis, the benefits can be determined and group concurrence sought.

J. Harris estimates that he can have the information for the group to determine viability by February or March 2010. S. Smith would like to have a status update by May (BOSTAC meeting).

F. Leo asked J. Harris if the FAA will publish RNAV arrival procedures that reflect an OPD component. J. Harris said that they are on track to have TRACON RNAV overlay routes into BOS completed by a September 2010 publishing date, however, if the enroute portion is not able to be completed by that time, full OPD's may not be included at that time.

D. Boland asked for the position of the FAA in relation to RNP. J. Harris explained it as a threefold component – having FAA publish RNAV procedures, RNP equipment in cockpit, and pilot RNP certification. At the present time, the FAA cannot direct an airline to purchase RNP equipment. The certification aspect falls back to FAA flight inspectors to ensure that pilots are proficient with RNP equipment and procedures.

D. Boland said that RNP is coming up fast and that BOS would be an ideal location for this. He asked if the FAA is looking at it seriously and if Phases 2 and 3 are flexible to change direction fundamentally as technology changes.

J. Harris – Southwest is one airline that can do RNP because they have the capability, i.e.; equipment and pilot certifications, however all airlines are not at the same level of equipage. He said that changes to Phases 2 and 3 can be made to accommodate technology changes if necessary.

S. Smith said that since Phase 1, the goal is to capture the lowest common denominator. Right now, from PC perspective, RNP is out there, but there are not enough users to gain enough noise reduction benefit.

F. Leo mentioned that based on press reports there was a request for federal stimulus money to be used for airlines to become equipped/trained in RNP, but Congress had said no and that the airlines are responsible financially.

J. Falbo requested a brief summary with bill number in relation to the stimulus fund request and any information he can get from the FAA related to RNP and NextGen.

Action Items: (1) F. Leo to provide S. Smith with requested ALP data.
(2) T. English to provide J. Falbo information on RNP and NextGen.