

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

DATE: 1/24/2013

TIME: 1:00 P.M. Eastern



Telephone Conversation



Meeting



Other

SUBJECT: Phase 3 Scope of Services

SUMMARY PREPARED 1/24/2013

ATTENDEES (include affiliation):

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
John Williams	PC
Rob Adams (via telephone)	IC
Terry English	FAA
Brian Brunelle	FAA
Andy Hale	FAA
Cully Beasley	FAA
Flavio Leo	Massport
Frank Iacovino	Massport
Sandra Kunz	CAC (Braintree)
Jerry Falbo	CAC (Winthrop)
Wig Zamore	CAC (Somerville)
Darryl Pomicter	CAC (Beacon Hill)
Chris Marchi	CAC (East Boston)
Ron Hardaway (via telephone)	CAC (East Boston)
Jonathan Waltzer (via telephone)	CAC (Marshfield)
Maura Zlody (via telephone)	CAC (City of Boston)
Dick Morrison	CAC (Chelsea)
Michelle Kowalski	Massport
Chris Poreda	FAA

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
-------------	--------------------

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

Individuals

Files

Attendees
Project File
BLANS Forum
PMT

I. Attendance:

Meeting attendees and call participants introduced themselves for the purpose of recording attendance.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

II. Draft Scope of Services for Next Phase:

J. Williams started the discussion by providing a summary of the draft Scope of Services (SOS). He mentioned that the current version of the draft was reviewed by Massport and FAA, and reflected comments from both organizations. He explained that the runway use measures that were identified in Phase 1 would be analyzed in Phase 3. CAC and Massport will work together and receive technical support from FAA. He also explained that the project management portion of this phase will be similar to how it was in previous phases.

J. Williams also briefly described the technical committee as being smaller than the original BOS TAC. The CAC representatives on the technical committee will have primary responsibility for coordinating with the full CAC, but there would be meetings with the full CAC at points during Phase 3. The second briefing for elected officials that was included in the Phase 2 scope will be included in Phase 3. Remaining funding for Phase 2 will be used for the Phase 3 SOS. T. English stated that there would be no additional grant funding from FAA for the BLANS.

J. Williams then described how the majority of the SOS will be focused on runway use measures; particularly the five runway use measures that were identified in Phase 1 and carried through Phase 2. He said that a noise modeling protocol would be established for baseline conditions and that runway use assumptions would be developed in coordination with the FAA for conducting the noise analyses for the various runway use measures. Some key aspects to address in the protocol include:

- Revise 2015 Baseline. This will require the 2015 baseline noise analysis to be rerun to reflect the revised Runway 27 SID and the Runway 33 SID currently under environmental review for FAA; and will be referred to as the revised 2015 baseline conditions.
- As part of developing the revised 2015 Baseline, the team will look at runway use assumptions to ensure they are current and don't reflect anomalies created by runway closures, etc.
- Upgrade Integrated Noise Model (INM) to version 7.0c.
- Updated population centroid data to 2010 census data for the analysis.
- Meet with FAA to review runway use scenarios and establish feasible changes in runway use.
- Calculate noise exposure contours and centroid analyses for each of the measures as required to compare with FAA and CAC criteria used in Phase 2.
- If one or more measures is recommended, run composite contour to ensure that there are no unintended consequences.
- Prepare the draft runway use analysis report and executive summary.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

He said that one difference from prior phases in looking at runway use measures was that the CAC and Massport would review the results of the analyses and jointly recommend a runway use program to FAA.

He also said that the documentation would include a report on the Phase 3 analyses and an executive summary would be included for more public distribution.

J. Williams asked if there were any comments to the SOS.

J. Falbo said that he strongly disagreed with the Scope for Phase 3 and that he wanted to make sure that the project results in an overall noise abatement program, including ground measures, aircraft routing, and runway use measures. He said that this is necessary to meet the requirements of the 2002 ROD.

There was also discussion regarding the SOS limiting analyses of runway use measures to the five identified in Phase 1. Several CAC members said that the ROD states that there is to be an assessment of PRAS and an assessment of ways to replace PRAS.

D. Pomictier stated that the CAC decided to abandon PRAS, and to also replace PRAS—not just “abandon PRAS”. PRAS never achieved the intended results, but the goals—equitable distribution of noise impact by Runway End, while avoiding excessive Dwell and Persistence—remain valid to achieve the intended noise abatement. It is important to include a review of PRAS as part of Phase 3 for replacement.

He added, an overall noise abatement program is the goal, including the intended new FAA approved and implemented Runway Use Program and a Massport agreed and implemented Ground Measures Program, consolidating their commitments. He noted the FAA’s regulations for Runway Use Programs. He also said that a NEPA analysis may be required for changes in runway use that come from Phase 3. J. Williams said that the scope states that any additional NEPA analysis and processing would be part of a separate study.

T. English mentioned that measures beyond runway use were not intended to be included as part of Phase 3.

F. Leo said that the main focus of Phase 3 is the runway use measures. He said he that agrees that there are other issues that will need to be discussed, but these items should be discussed in separate conversations with the Noise Abatement Committee (NAC). He assured participants that these conversations can run in parallel with the current phase.

D. Pomictier said that the Massport letters regarding noise abatement commitments need to be consolidated into a Ground Measures Program, agreed and implemented by Massport. And, included together with the Runway Use Program, approved and implemented by the FAA, as a Logan Airport Noise Abatement Program. The NAC, CAC and Public require a single, consolidated Logan Airport Noise Abatement Program. It now seems common at many airports, with Los Angeles as one example, easily viewable online.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

F. Leo said that all the pieces are there, but semantics are getting in the way. He stated that ground noise and airspace measures have already been studied and that now is the time to look at runway use.

J. Falbo said that he has an issue with F. Leo's comments regarding ground noise and airspace. He still hasn't seen a detailed program on how ground measures will be implemented.

C. Marchi asked how one separates ground noise versus runway usage and that this should be incorporated.

F. Leo responded by stating that this was an 8-year process, with accomplishments in both Phase 1 and Phase 2. The assessment of runway use was deferred until everything else was in place regarding ground noise and airspace. He reiterated that other conversations regarding non-runway use concerns can be done in parallel with the NAC.

D. Pomictor said that he doesn't want to have separate pieces from the various phases as an end result. He wants everything incorporated into one noise abatement program for the airport.

J. Williams mentioned that all of the results from all the phases could be included in the final document and executive summary. The group agreed that this would be the right approach and that it should be written into the SOS.

D. Pomictor stated that lack of compliance is the greatest problem, and that recurring complaints and documentation do not address the problems. He said that implementation, including monitoring, reporting, refinement as necessary, and enforcement for compliance are absolutely necessary to achieve the intended noise abatement. Remedies should be stated in the program. And, the process should start now, together, and not wait until after BLANS.

F. Leo reiterated J. Williams' comments about the final document encompassing summaries from all project phases and summarizing the measures identified and recommended in each of the phases.

J. Williams said that if CAC determines that it would like to consider other measures beyond the five that were carried over, it is very important that these be determined expeditiously.

F. Leo suggested that it would be ideal to start big with the approach of identifying the opportunities to balance out the runway use activity. D. Pomictor supported that, starting big to address the basic problem overall.

J. Williams added to F. Leo's comment by suggesting that CAC start by determining its goals in terms of effects on the contours and what it's trying to accomplish. Once this is done, then CAC can try to find any measures that could help meet these goals. If measures are identified, they will be reviewed by FAA for operational and safety procedures.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

F. Leo opined that the original goals that were set for PRAS were too complicated. He suggested that CAC be careful of not doing the same during this process and advised that simple programs are successful. He also agreed to change the language in the SOS to state that there is no limitation of just five runway use measures.

D. Pomicter responded that, considering the failure of PRAS and the difficulties of FAA decimating CAC proposals in Phase 1 and Phase 2, we should start with Massport and FAA advice and recommendations, including what restrictions are appropriate, to achieve the basic goal of more equitable distribution of noise impacts. The SOS should state the basic goal of equitable distribution of noise impacts to the surrounding communities.

T. English responded by saying that the goal of this entire project is to achieve a reduction in the overall noise – not to increase it, which could happen if the goal is to try and equally distribute noise effects. D. Pomicter responded that reducing noise is certainly part of the goal, but equitably distributing it should be more effective to reduce noise impacts to surrounding communities, the stated purpose. He added that Phase 2 had shown the value of including population-weighting (noise-change x population) and noise-level-weighting (noise-change x population x noise-level) to more easily make better evaluations, comparisons, and decisions.

W. Zamore said that he believes there is a lot of overlap and that it is important to focus the effort on achieving certain things as best we can.

J. Williams said that in order to revise the SOS, he would need an idea of the level of effort that will be needed for this task. He then asked R. Adams for his overall thoughts on the SOS. J. Falbo asked why budget was a limitation. T English reiterated that FAA would not be providing any additional funding for the BLANS. She said that if any additional funding would be needed for environmental processing, Massport would need to request a grant for funding, if necessary.

R. Adams responded by stating that it may be better to describe the runway use measures as goals because there may be more than one way to accomplish a goal. He also said that the SOS should reflect that it is not limited to the five runs as currently described, but could include other measures.

J. Williams said that the number of measures would be limited by the budget and the cost to model each measure, rather than a fixed limit of five measures could be developed. He said that the budget for the items that were fixed in price be developed and that an estimated cost per measure could be developed and compared with the remaining available budget to determine how many runway use scenarios could be assessed. D. Pomicter said that this was a good approach.

F. Leo added that technical runs do not need to be performed for each measure, if CAC doesn't think that the measure would be practical.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

J. Williams stated that there would not be simulations using TAAMS (Total Airport and Airspace Modeler) to assess operational effects would be included in Phase 3, but that such assessments would be provided qualitatively by FAA. J. Falbo said that it was not acceptable to rely on opinion as to why measures could or couldn't be implemented. Further discussion regarding how some quantification would be helpful in describing the assessments.

R. Adams commented that the qualitative analysis in the introduction to Task 3 mentions an assessment, but is silent on what level of assessment will be performed. IC will likely need more than thoughts and opinions and will likely request data from FAA to support the qualitative assessments. He said that spreadsheet models should suffice and doesn't believe that full-blown TAAMS analyses would be necessary.

J. Williams suggested that the means for describing the operational assessments be included in the modeling protocol mentioned earlier in the meeting.

B. Brunelle said that in reference to every measure, safety is the first concern over everything else. He said that it's hard to quantify, but in the end result, they will do the best they can to articulate the results of the operational assessments of each of the measures. D. Pomicter responded that the current standard operating procedure of Early Turns of turboprops and piston props, as soon as practicable after liftoff, even below 400 feet, to fly very low over already heavily impacted East Boston neighborhoods, incurring non-compliance with Minimum Safe Altitudes, is counter to the stated safety first.

T.English suggested one option would be to use the worksheets as was done in the Phase 2, Level 2 Screening, which included some quantification.

W. Zamore stated that there needs to be accountability and remedy, and that the outcome of the measures may not meet the original intention on why it was created. He said that the results of the BLANS should include remedies to address these circumstances.

F. Leo agreed and said that regular meetings with NAC could be used to keep discussion about these items current.

R. Hardaway stated that the pollution content hadn't been mentioned and thought that there was an agreement with Massport that the centerfield taxiway operation would be considered in the ground measures.

F. Leo responded by saying that he was not aware of a formal agreement and recommended using the meetings with NAC as a tool to discuss and try to remedy these types of issues.

R. Hardaway strongly recommended on it being listed because there are times when planes stack up and sit for long periods on the November Taxiway and the pollution is clearly visible. He said that dispersion should be standard operation instead of requiring a Complaint Report being phoned in by an observing citizen of the unusual holding aircraft congestion and accumulation.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

W. Zamore had to leave a few minutes before the meeting ended but wanted to remind that the populations from the 2010 Census be checked for information needed for environmental justice considerations. He also said that the qualitative considerations should be the same for the community as it is for FAA and Massport. He said to count everybody equally and to avoid double standards.

M. Zlody asked a question about where funding would come from if a NEPA process was needed to address any proposed changes.

J. Williams said that he would cross that bridge if and when necessary, but that there was consideration for setting aside funds in case they are needed. He also said that depending on the number of measures that are assessed using noise modeling, it was not clear how much funding would be available for NEPA analyses.

T. English reminded everyone that they should be conscientious about spending funds. Massport may have to request a grant for NEPA work, because a change in runway use for noise abatement purposes would ultimately be agreed upon between CAC and Massport. Massport would then be in the position of preparing the NEPA documentation.

T. English also asked whether airlines should be involved in Phase 3. After some discussion, it was determined that while the airlines may have some interest in the study, the best approach may be to contact chief pilots if needed..

III. Next Steps:

J. Williams said that he would have the SOS revision done within the next week and that it will be sent to CAC and the IC for review and feedback. He also said that the CAC will have to determine how to get to the point of identifying what it would like to accomplish and potential measures to do so. As a reminder, the revised SOS will contain a specified amount of scenarios up to which could be assessed under the given budget.

S. Kunz said that once she receives the revised SOS, she will work on getting comments from CAC members.

The call/meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM