

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS) Project Management Team Teleconference

October 28, 2016

11:00 a.m. EST

Teleconference

Facilitator:	John Williams	Note takers:	John Williams/Terry English
Attendees:	Representing	Email	
Flavio Leo	Aviation Planning and Strategy, Massport	fleo@massport.com	
Terry English	FAA, Air Traffic Organization, BLANS Program Manager	terry.english@faa.gov	
Darryl Pomicter	President, Logan Airport Community Advisory Committee (LCAC), Boston- Beacon Hill	dpomic@aol.com	
Jerry Falbo	Vice President, LCAC, Winthrop	winthropesq.com	
Chris Sandfoss	Independent Consultant (IC)	csandfoss@landrum- brown.com	
Rob Adams	IC	radams@landrum-brown.com	
John Williams	Project Consultant (PC)	jwilliams@ricondo.com	

Discussion Points

J Williams (JW) opened the meeting and said the intent was to update status since the October 21, 2016, meeting. He referred to the agenda and materials that were sent the previous evening. JW acknowledged that the materials being prepared by the IC would be referred to as the Noise Abatement Report, Levels 1, 2, and 3. D Pomicter (DP) acknowledged that the 2015 has now been updated to reflect new procedures and that the PC has now added the expanded grid analysis beyond that provided in the EDR. He also asked if it would be useful to update to a 2016 baseline. T English said that there would be no new updates of the noise analysis using the Integrated Noise Model (INM); all new updates will have to be done using the AEDT [Aviation Environmental Design Tool] that is now required for use by FAA and there is no time or budget to do this in the BLANS.

C Sandfoss (CS) said that the IC provided sample tables on October 21 to meet requests for persistence by month (based on more than 30 operations on a runway on a given day) and will update those tables and forward to CAC today [October 28]. In order for a runway to count towards an hour of dwell, it must have more than two operations an hour. DP said that in a conversation with CS on Monday [October 24] no new table formats were discussed, but the definition of persistence had not reflected what had been asked. CS said that the tables to be provided on Friday, October 28 would match the format of Table 3-3 in the set. DP asked CS to update all tables to match the table of contents and the format as agreed.

DP said that the definition of persistence was based on the days of use/month and that consecutive days of use are weighted. For dwell, one runway that has more than 2 operations in a given hour is counted as an hour of use. For persistence, more than 30 operations per day on a given runway is counted as a day of

[DRAFT]

use. The use of 30 operations is based on the use of more than 2 operations in a given hour being counted as an hour of use for dwell over the 15-hour day period. The average hours per day (night-weighted), with the number of periods with greater than 7 hours per day (night-weighted) in the month defines persistence. CS asked to confirm that night-weighting for dwell is that one operation at night is counted as 10 operations. DP said that the weighting is applied to the number of hours; 1 hour with more than 2 operations during the nighttime hours would be counted as 10 hours in the determination of persistence.

FL said that to the extent the reporting is ongoing, we need to look at what Massport can do and what the frequency of reporting is. FL said that it is critical that the final reporting has to be something that Massport can produce on a regular basis. DP said that he is trying to make it all simpler.

CS confirmed that the next package would be sent to DP later that day [Friday, October 28].

DP said that some of the maps showing use by runway end are not consistent with the tables and will need to be updated. DP said that the arrivals percentages by runway end need to add to 100%; the same is true for departures and for combined arrivals and departures. CS acknowledged this and that he would update the tables.

DP said that the last piece for Level 1 is a graph of historic runway use, similar to one produced earlier by Scott Carpenter for a 2008 LCAC presentation. The graphs depicted runway use over the years and also showed 3 years of runway use on individual charts and at the time were prepared based on information in Chapter 6 of the 2006 EDR. DP to send CS examples of what was provided and copy, JW, FL and TE

FL asked if there was enough to confirm a November 3 LCAC meeting. DP said that he understand that CS will update the Tower Guidelines and will update Tables 3-9 with data covering October 2015 through September 2016 and runway use for the same period and would include Tower input.

JW summarized the status of the noise analysis, including the time it is taking to calculate DNL values for each of the census block centroids in the study area which includes over 50,000 grid points. DP said that perhaps we could calculate those for centroids known to be exposed to DNL 45 or DNL 40 and higher. FL said that LCAC needs to articulate the areas to be included; the thinking is to capture level-weighted population for communities with noise of DNL 45 and above. JW said that the goal is to have the grid point analysis completed by 11/2.

DP said that the scope and budget have not included dwell and persistence as noted by CS. Dwell and persistence are needed to inform the Runway Use Program (RUP). He said that the \$30,000 originally in Task 3.9 should remain as is and that the additional funds shifted from other tasks and the left over from the IC estimate through February 29 (a bit over \$4,000) should be in Task 3.7 rather than 3.9 to cover Noise Abatement Reports Levels 1, 2, and 3.

[DRAFT]

JW discussed the schedule and said that at this point, the only change from last week was to move the next LCAC meeting from October 27 to November 3. DP said that there would be a follow up to that meeting on November 10 or November 17.

JW said that the Noise Abatement Reports would need to be finalized soon so that the IC could move on to the Test 1 and Test 2 reports. DP said that the Noise Abatement Reports are the first priority and then the Test 1 and Test 2 reports. DP said that Massport reported runway use during the test periods. FL suggested that we start with the Test 1 report that was already drafted by the IC as a starting point and to add the additional information. DP said that there is no report for Test 2 and that the Test 1 report didn't include runway use; he suggested reporting runway use and configuration by month in a format similar to the Noise Abatement Report tables.

RA said that there is limited time and that he is concerned about completing all of the required tasks and that if they cannot start on the Test 1 and Test 2 reports soon, they will not be able to complete. JW said that to get invoices to Massport by December 15, the work of IC and PC must be completed by December 9. RA said that a clear definition of the Test 1 and Test 2 reports is needed quickly and that the work on the Noise Abatement Reports must end soon so that the Test 1 and Test 2 work can proceed. A separate discussion is needed between DP and CS to define the reports and the work on Level 1, 2, and 3 must come to an end so the IC can move on to the next process.

DP said that with limited time, use the format that is in the Noise Abatement Reports for the prior 12 months to report runway use during the test periods; fit the reporting during the test periods to an existing format.

TE asked CS and RA how long it would take to prepare reports for Test 1 and Test 2, each of which were 6 months in duration, based on the same format included in the Noise Abatement Reports. RA said that he did not know as the report has not been touched for over a year; the bigger and more important question is when they can start on the reports. TE said the Level 1, 2, and 3 need to be complete before starting Test 1 and Test 2 reporting and asked what the breaking point date is to begin working on those reports. DP said that Level 1, 2 and 3 reporting is critical and Test 1 and Test 2 secondary. RA said that even at the beginning of the call there was back and forth regarding report formats. He said that he guessed that about 3 weeks would be needed considering the back and forth needed to complete the reports.

TE asked DP if the Test 1 and Test 2 reports are critical to the development of the RUP. DP said it is helpful, but not critical. FL again suggested going back to the draft Test 1 report and seeing what was done in more detail to see if any of that would be helpful. DP said to look both at the prior draft report and the new formats.

DP asked about looking at noise sensitivity analysis after the RUP is defined and referred to the October 21 meeting during which potential percentage changes in runway use were discussed. JW said that as discussed in the October 21 meeting, we can do several sensitivity analyses if we can just change the percentage use of the various configurations and re-annualize the noise analysis. If we have to change runway use within an individual configuration we would need additional INM runs and just one scenario

[DRAFT]

could be tested for noise. Once the RUP is identified, we will establish the protocol for the noise analysis for the RUP.

DP asked about the status of the EDR. FL said that there are still problems with the AEDT which is required by FAA for the analysis. They have been working closely with FAA to resolve the problems. AEDT is required for use for the EDR, because the EDR noise exposure maps are used for the soundproofing program at BOS. He said that December 15, 2016, is now the target date for filing the EDR.

FL then said that Massport would hold the HR training room for LCAC meetings on November 3, 10, and 17. DP said that there is a 90% chance for the 11/3 meeting; 50% for 11/10; and 80% for 11/17.

DP said they are also still waiting for the August flight track report. FL said that the noise office has been inundated with calls and that they are still down staff members, but will get the reports done as soon as possible.

The meeting was adjourned and it was agreed to conduct another PMT update meeting on Friday, November 4, 2016.

Action Items

- ✓ CS and DP to discuss formats for Test 1 and Test 2 reports.
- ✓ JW to update scope and budgets to reflect shifting of work from 3.9 to 3.7.

Distribution:

16-06-0930

Meeting Attendees

c:\users\jwilliams\desktop\jcw files\client files\bos\01 - blans phase 3\01.02 - faa coordination\02 - pmt meeting materials and notes\pmt meeting
20161028\pmt_meeting_20161028_notes_v03.docx