

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Overflight Noise Study Logan International Airport

DATE: 11/1/05
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

Telephone Conversation
 Meeting
 Other

SUBJECT: Project Management Call

SUMMARY PREPARED BY: PC

DATE PREPARED: 11/1/2005

PARTICIPANTS (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Gail Lattrell	FAA
Sandra Kunz	CAC
Stephen Smith	R&A
Ralph Dormitzer	CAC
Berta Fernandez	L&B
Greg Wellman	R&A
Flavio Leo	Massport

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

Individuals	Files
_____	_____

SUMMARY OF CONTINUING ACTION ITEMS

Greg Wellman opened the meeting with a discussion on the project schedule changes and stated that the Project Management Team (PMT) needs to make sure that there is time for reviews. Gail Lattrell brought up a discussion that took place in the previous meeting involving accelerating and using the procedure publication slots coming in November. Gail explained that, from a FAA standpoint, if they can cover the potential cumulative and environmental impact later when the package is done, there should be some confirmation that it will not cause an adverse environmental impact. Gail reported that if it is supported by Massport, then FAA does not have a problem pulling a proposed procedure that is ready from the group, and submit for publication. Gail also mentioned that FAA would not evaluate the LNG facility from a security standpoint. Gail explained that it is evaluated in by another Federal agency. Gail explained that, from flight standards, procedures, and air traffic perspective, FAA does evaluate on the basis of physical existence of the structure and electromagnetic interference but would not evaluate it on the basis of security. Flavio Leo explained that a Runway 33L departure is right over existing ship terminals, which is considered compatible land use, in terms of heights, it doesn't seem to be an issue that far out. Gail Lattrell reported that FAA does evaluate whether or not it will be a hazard or no hazard, but they do not do potential explosive analysis. Flavio Leo explained that they would want to optimize the noise procedure and wouldn't want this proposed terminal impact the design and procedure for noise abatement. Gail Lattrell reported that she would find out what agency does the security evaluation and analysis. Flavio Leo suggested that the Project Management Team meet to try to get the information earlier so that if there is a process that a federal agency applies, the Project Management Teams gets an idea of the scope of the facility that will be out there. Flavio explained that the PMT should not be designing a procedure on issues that may or may not happen.

Flavio Leo asked if the publication slot pertains to the Runway 33L visual approach alternative. Steve Smith confirmed that PC or IC has not identified an alternative that can meet the upcoming publication date. Steve Smith explained that there is concern about making sure that alternatives go through a process that was agreed on by BOS/TAC, CAC, and PC/IC review. Steve explained that arrivals to

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Overflight Noise Study Logan International Airport

Runway 27 and Runway 22 directed over DRUNK are two alternative that may take advantage of an early publication date, but needs to be reviewed and accepted by BOS/TAC prior to submitting to the FAA. For the visual approach to Runway 33L, Steve explained that visual reference points still need to be surveyed and identified – meeting November publication date is not possible. Steve confirmed that he has requested that all of the publication dates be sent to him, and would enter them into the project schedule. Gail Lattrell explained that, with over-flying over the DRUNK intersection, the PMT will have to look at the cumulative impact of moving the procedures around so that many of them are utilizing it. Flavio Leo explained that the kind of procedure that qualifies to meet early publication slots would be the 33L visual approach, because it would be putting planes over where no one lives and it would be something easier for Massport to recommend. Steve Smith agreed and explained that anything that is not an RNAV that doesn't have an 18-step process would also be a potential candidate. Flavio agreed that the decision process also needs to be maintained.

Greg Wellman moved on to schedule changes. Steve Smith reported that 6 and 7 are being finalized in terms of the design and awaiting final concurrence from IC before starting operation and noise analysis. Steve explained that the major project schedule change is related to evaluations for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5, which are the RNAV alternatives that are related to the shoreline crossing. Steve explained the work is continuing on and there was a PC/IC coordination call last week about the design on Alternative 5 where everyone on the call concurred with the general design that Robb Varani came up with. Steve reported that Robb Varani is now looking at Runways 4, 9, and 15 and getting an initial review of what he needs to do and whether or not that would have an impact on the Alternative 5 design. Steve explained that there a strong possibility Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 design will impact the design for Alternative 5; therefore PC and IC have agreed that all four alternative designs for two scenarios (within TRACON sectors and outside TRACON sectors) should be completed prior to any operation and noise analysis. Steve mentioned that they are scheduled to proceed with the noise and operational analysis for Alternative 5, but, instead, Robb Varani will commit his resources based on his initial findings to get the designs for 1, 2, and 3 done first. From a budgetary perspective, Steve explained the need to make sure that Alternative 5 is a final design before starting operation and noise analysis. Steve confirmed that he would adjust the schedule on the work effort appropriately.

Steve Smith explained that one element in designing RNAV procedures is to find a way to establish common routes for all runways, which is how the FAA would like them published. Steve explained that there are some issues with Runway 9 being tied with Runway 15R. Another issue would be the shoreline crossing altitude. Robb's initial review has found potential issues with Runway 9 and Runway 15R and the difficulty of getting the routes to share the same altitude applied for Alternative 5. Ralph Dormitzer explained that there shouldn't be a reduction in over-flight heights in order to accommodate a common route. Greg Wellman explained the departure plate may note that the altitude is "at or above" for a particular waypoint. If Runway 15R has the lower altitude and is shared by other runways, this would be considered as the minimum altitude, but departures off of the other runways would be higher. Ralph Dormitzer explained that it is important not to compromise the intent of the shoreline crossing alternatives to accommodate Runway 15R or maintain "commonality." Greg Wellman stated that it would not compromise the Runway 22 departures; it would just be how the procedure would be plated. Greg Wellman suggested that the PMT sort out the procedures of design before doing the noise and operational analysis so that the risk of repeating operations and noise analysis is limited. Ralph Dormitzer suggested that if the objective is to have a common plate for both Runway 9, 15R, and 22, then that may not be the right objective. Steve Smith emphasized that it is not the primary objective. Steve explained that the key issue is the common altitude and to get them all at an altitude that is desired. Flavio Leo explained that if there is a better chance of pilots requesting the procedures because a commonality among runways, then it should be looked at carefully.

Berta Fernandez explained that there are other operational issues to take into consideration if there are different plates. Berta reported that the IC concurs with the PC and suggested to wait and see what issues will take place and see if they are worth looking at independently. Berta explained that she is not suggesting that they change Runway 22, but completing design for 1, 2 and 3 is worth doing prior to any

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Overflight Noise Study Logan International Airport

operations or noise analysis to sort out these issues. Greg Wellman explained that the PMT will receive more details as soon as the designs take shape.

Greg Wellman moved on to information sharing. Greg explained that the PC wants to go forward with establishing a platform of sharing information on the web. Greg discussed putting out project updates to BOS/TAC and sending out a general project status report that could also go out to CAC. Greg reminded the PMT that individuals can provide feedback, such as questions, comments, and information on these outputs using PC's recommended web forum. Greg explained that this would also provide documentation of information shared. Flavio Leo suggested sending out technical information as well. Greg Wellman reported that Berta Fernandez, along with PC input, would have the progress report update drafted by Wednesday night for PMT comments. Sandra Kunz suggested telling the BOS/TAC members where to get the information and have it to refer to the location. Flavio Leo asked if the public website will be updated. When asked about the project, Massport and others refer individuals to the public website. Greg Wellman reported that the forum page is intended mainly for BOS/TAC, and public-shared information would be reserved for more final products. Flavio Leo suggested that it would be helpful to have a status update and mentioned that the information should be more global and less detailed as the information sent to BOS/TAC or CAC. Flavio suggested that if anyone has trouble understanding any of the information provided, they could contact their CAC representative for further information. Overall, Flavio emphasized updating the public website when appropriate.

Greg Wellman explained that in terms of the BOS/TAC meeting format, it is desired to try the meeting as using web-based conferencing capability. Flavio Leo asked if everyone involved with BOS/TAC has access to the web and Greg Wellman explained that if they do not have access and need the information, then there will be a conference line and a hard copy for their reference. Sandra will speak to the members to find out who does not have access to a computer and the web. Greg Wellman confirmed that there can still be a December BOS/TAC conference call to go over all of the information that was obtained, but the work required to meet the initial agenda is not expected to be completed as planned per previous discussion (see discussion related to Alternative 1, 2, 3 and 5 RNAV design above). An option is to move the planned date into January.

Steve Smith moved on to Alternative 13 and advised that a memorandum requesting FAA operational screening is drafted and ready to be submitted. Steve asked Gail if PC should submit to her or Joe Davies. Gail requested it be sent to Joe and copied to her for records.

Steve Smith moved on to the current work efforts and discussed Alternative 5/14/15's final design. Steve explained issues related to Vector to RNAV route and the Vector to the Altitude (VA) leg options. PC and IC held a meeting to discuss the issues, and concluded that the design will continue with the Vector to the Altitude leg. Steve explained that there is nothing in the vector to RNAV route criteria that allows mitigating the 7-mile gap between the established vector turn and the first waypoint—new criteria would be required. The PC and IC agreed with the need to meet with FAA RNP Washington office to discuss the issues with the Vector to the Altitude (non-comm and non-radar contact) land Vector to RNAV route (7 mile gap) legs.

Steve Smith moved on to Group B – Alternative 6 and 7 Final Draft Design, which was completed today. Steve reported that the design graphics were sent to the PC/IC air traffic group for final concurrence. As soon as we receive all input, PC will begin noise and operational evaluations. Steve explained that PC is still waiting on getting everyone's comments back and requested Berta to assist in getting IC air traffic members response. Berta committed to getting responses to PC today.

Steve moved on to discuss Group B – Alternative 9, 12a, 12b, and 12c. Alternatives 12b and 12c should be ready by today for PC/IC final concurrence. Steve explained that Alternatives 9 and 12a are related to the left downwind to Runway 4L/R, and awaiting the FAA RAPTOR review. Steve explained that they need to know the distribution and how many operations will be on that downwind pattern—the RAPTOR analysis will provide that information. Steve reported that real-time traffic is loaded on to a training scope, and a FAA ATC Traffic Coordinator will identify flights that could have been directed to the left downwind

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Overflight Noise Study Logan International Airport

pattern to Runway 04L/R. Flavio Leo asked about the assumed distribution to the DRUNK intersection. Steve Smith explained PC's use of existing radar to address expected dispersion. Traffic from the Providence (PVD) VOR will be directed to DRUNK. This is a point-to-point means of navigation, similar to the GARDNER STAR. PC reviewed the existing radar dispersion for GARDNER and found the width to be approximately 2 nmi. PC expects the dispersion between PVD and DRUNK will be the same. IC agreed. Steve explained that dispersion assumptions is a key variable for design, and is discussed during PC/IC design calls. Flavio Leo suggested making sure that dispersion assumptions are as realistic as possible, and explained that if the dispersion is too narrow, then it might skew the results. Steve Smith responded that design graphics will provide notes as necessary regarding key assumptions such as dispersion.

Steve Smith moved on to discuss Alternative 11. Steve explained that the preliminary design is scheduled for this week and it is proposed that the start date will be delayed until Group A procedure definitions are completed. Steve confirmed that they will not get on Alternative 11 until December, because staff resources will be primarily focused on Alternative 1, 2, 3 and 5 design.

Greg Wellman moved on to any other issues that the PMT may have. Flavio Leo asked about Phase 2 scoping: where does PC stand in getting a draft scope out to BOS/TAC some time soon. Greg Wellman responded that there has not been substantial progress on this task. Greg explained the need to have Jon Woodward available for Phase 2 scoping efforts. Gail Lattrell suggested putting it on the agenda for the next two calls. Gail confirmed that they are on schedule for funding. Flavio Leo explained that the critical path is for stakeholders to come up with a solid work scope. Greg committed to getting the Phase 2 scope task moving forward.

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Overflight Noise Study Logan International Airport

Topic/Discussion	Action Item/Responsibility
Progress Update Report.	IC first draft, PC provide comments. Send to PMT by Wed evening.
Phase 2 scope of work.	Add to PMT meeting agenda. PC to make progress on task.
BOS/TAC Meeting Format (web-based).	Sandra will check BOS/TAC member computer/internet capability.
Alternative 13- FAA operational screening	PC to submit screening request today.