

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Overflight Noise Study Logan International Airport

results from noise modeling compared to what is expected via secondary methods. This is intended to ensure that the findings are what are expected. Ralph recommended looking at expected noise levels compared to the square of the distance in altitude, and using it in as an alternative way to look at what the noise differential reveals. This would serve as a way to confirm the INM results.

Steve Smith explained that Alternative 5/14/15 will go through the noise and operational analysis to show results, and if there are outputs questioned by BOS/TAC, then the PC/IC will make necessary modifications and apply them for future noise analysis. Steve explained that the 6, 7, 9, 12 are associated with arrivals and the PC/IC plans to utilize the metrics previously agreed upon by the BOS/TAC. PC/IC intend on sharing output with BOS/TAC to make sure the appropriate level of information is being produced. Ralph Dormitzer suggested that the PC/IC make sure that the intuitive answer matches whatever is derived.

Gail Lattrell asked if what was given out in the June meeting is what is available on the bostac website. Steve confirmed that the information is on the site. Gail also asked about upcoming information and how PC/IC plan to share the results with the BOS/TAC. Steve Smith reported that as results become available, there will be an opportunity to look it over. Berta Fernandez suggested that the website could be a channel and that the notes that are taken from the PC/IC working meetings could be summarized as into a progress update report. Berta explained that it could be a way to keep everyone informed by posting the progress update report and illustrations that are included on the website or have a large email distribution to all of the BOS/TAC members. Berta pointed out that the number of BOS/TAC members, but only 5-7 people is on the meeting calls. It would be better for all of the members to have access to the information. Gail Lattrell agreed and pointed out that the website (bostac.com) would be better than emails because then other FAA staff can have access to the notes as well. Berta suggested to send an email out to everyone letting them know there is something on the website. The Project Management team agreed. Steve Smith pointed out that, after getting the information out on the website, there may be numerous follow-up questions from BOS/TAC members, which led to an idea of providing a web-based forum mentioned by Greg in the past. Steve explained that PC and IC need to have more discussions related to the most efficient and effective way to communicate information to the BOS/TAC and CAC.

Steve Smith moved on to Group A, Alternative 5/14/15, which will be completed this week. Steve reported that as soon as Group A is completed, the noise and operational analysis can begin. Steve reported that the RNAV preliminary design will be started for Alternative 3/14/15. For Group B, Steve explained that 6, 7, 9, 12 will be completed by the end of this week on Friday. Noise and operational analysis will begin as soon as the designs are completed. Ralph asked if the GoToMeeting will continue to be used. Steve confirmed that they plan on using the GoToMeetings when working with the PC/IC.

Steve Smith explained that Alternative 11 is the visual approach to Runway 33L, and is expected to start on the 27th of October, but might start first thing next week depending on Alternative 5/14/15 design completion.

Steve Smith reported that the Alternative 13 preliminary design, which is a late night propeller departure procedure from Runway 22R and 15R is completed. Steve explained that the intent is to route the late night propeller departures from Runway 22R and Runway 15R along the night time jet routes. For Runway 15R-Option 1, Steve pointed to the radar data that was pulled from the 2003 sample set. Steve reported that the operations depicted are no more than 4 a night between the hours of midnight and 6 and the altitudes are filed up to 4,000 or 6,000 ft. all heading southwest. The primary operator is AirNet, a check hauler operator. Steve explained that the intent is to design a procedure that accounts for all GA operators, so transitions to the west, northwest, north and south are depicted. Gail Lattrell expressed concern that you can't climb the props east of the airport because there is a conflict with the right downwind for aircraft landing on Runway 33L. Steve Smith explained that the next step then is to have the FAA go through the operational screening process and identify safety and operational issues associated for each option. Steve explained that, from an environmental perspective, it does depict flights over an area where they don't fly today (South Shore communities). Ralph and Sandra shared their concerns related to Option 1, and would expect public controversy associated with it. Ralph

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Overflight Noise Study Logan International Airport

Dormitzer reported that head to head operation is over Cohasset and Option 1 would add to the existing burden. Steve emphasized that Alternative 13 needs to go through the screening process prior to any further detailed analysis. The next step is to forward this to the FAA for operational screening.

Steve Smith moved on to Option 2. Ralph asked about the south transition route. Steve stated that if there is a late night hour propeller heading south, we need to account for a procedure that follows the intent then proceeds south. Although there are no flights in the radar sample set heading south, the likelihood is that ATC keeps them on a runway heading over Cohasset today. Steve explained the second option related to the turn back west, or tear-drop. Steve explained that these are twin-propeller engines: one is a Beach Baron and the other is a twin engine Navajo that are vectored by ATC. With Option 2, ATC may issue vectors that turn them back over on the shore after the operator climbs to 6,000 feet. This option overlays the radar data, but aircraft altitude will be higher. Ralph Dormitzer asked if, when over Boston, would the aircraft be on a different track and higher. Steve responded that the dispersion is so wide off of 15 that it is built over the radar corridor and the dispersion may be similar when crossing back over the shore. Altitude will be higher. Steve explained that the turn must be made in manner that it is not over flying new areas, such as Winthrop and Pt. Shirley.

Ralph Dormitzer reported that there is a proposal to place a LNG liquefied natural gas terminal (LNG tanker terminal – one to two a week) proposed by AES Battery Rock at Outer Brewster Island. Hull is opposing the LNG terminal due to its close proximity to the proposed site. Ralph asked whether it was considered for obstruction and security reasons in the Alternative 13 design. Steve Smith reported that he was not aware of it; therefore not considered. Ralph Dormitzer explained that having the route over the proposed site of the terminal might be an issue. The proposed LNG terminal is a serious issue now before the legislator and thinks that it might happen. Ralph Dormitzer explained that if it is a problem, then the distance might have to be split between the Hull Peninsula and the nearest island and bring it out further east and bring it back around because the aircraft may not be allowed to cross any tankers on the island. Ralph explained that the terminal might also be a national security issue. The outer radius of the teardrop will avoid it and the inner one will cross over where the tankers will be. Steve stated that they are not at that point yet, but he will make a minor modification and stretch them out east if the FAA deems it necessary in their operational screening review. Steve explained that if they are trying to meet a tight corridor, he would have to move the backbone down and it would be too close to Hull. For propeller general aviation aircraft, RNAV navigation is not available. Steve explained his concerns related to Hull overflights if the route is moved closer to Hull. Steve Smith stated that the PC/IC should reserve Ralph's concern for the FAA. Gail Lattrell confirmed that one would have to file a project near the airport with the FAA. The FAA will give the determination of hazard or no hazard. Berta Fernandez reported that airports that have proximity to the river have all kinds of operational restrictions of when to operate when a tanker is in the water. Gail confirmed that no such project has been filed with the FAA. If this is the case, the FAA will most likely not assess this during their operational screening review, because it is not on file. Concerns related to tanker movement during late night hours and height obstruction requirements will be reviewed as part of the FAA's screening analysis. Ralph and Sandra are also concerned how this proposed LNG terminal may impact other alternatives.

Sandra Kunz stated that the Option 1 is not favorable to anyone on the South Shore. Ralph Dormitzer explained that the main reason is that the current tower orders put all jets over at the South Shore and that adding any more is unrealistic. Ralph explained that Option 2 avoids having them going over South Shore communities. If Option 2 gets through operational and environmental screening, then the next step is to discuss this procedure with AirNet in order to identify any potential user issues (primarily operating over water). If they can't fly over water, Steve explained, then it is a flawed alternative. Ralph Dormitzer asked if there was a specified distance from the shore that aircraft can operate over water without required equipment. Berta explained that Bud Riebel checked this out and found that it has to be 5-10 miles away from the coastline before over-water equipment is required. Berta explained that they would have to check with the carrier because the carrier might have specific requirements and stated that if it is over the coast it is not considered flying over water.

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Overflight Noise Study Logan International Airport

Steve Smith moved on to the topic of project schedule issues and stated that there is nothing to report. Sandra Kunz asked about the December 15th BOS/TAC meeting. Steve confirmed that December 15th is still planned. Steve explained that they are on schedule with Alternative 5/14/15, which is required in order to maintain the proposed meeting date. Gail Lattrell asked how and when PC will submit Alternative 13 for operational screening. Steve responded that he would have to discuss that with Denis Burke, who will be back on Thursday of this week. Berta Fernandez mentioned that they talked on Friday about using GoToMeeting web-conferencing in lieu of a face-to-face meeting, but there were no conclusions made and wanted to know if it could be done for the December 15th meeting. Berta explained that it is inconvenient and expensive for everyone to travel to Boston and suggested that a net meeting would be better. The Project Management team agreed. Steve Smith mentioned that they would have to make sure that the members of BOS/TAC have access to a computer. Steve mentioned that PC and IC will discuss this further, and provide a recommendation for the next PMT call.

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Overflight Noise Study Logan International Airport

Topic/Discussion	Action Item/Responsibility
BOS/TAC and CAC information sharing and review. Develop Progress Summary Package; upload and notify BOS/TAC members of recent files to review	PC/IC to discuss and make recommendation to PMT for next call.
Alternative 13 operational screening	PC will submit slides to FAA for operational screening analysis.
Use of GoToMeeting to conduct BOS/TAC Meeting	PC/IC to discuss and make recommendation to PMT for next call.