

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

March 29, 2016

2:00 p.m. EST

### Teleconference

<b>Facilitator:</b>	John Williams	<b>Note takers:</b>	John Williams/Rick Peloquin
<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Email</b>	
Flavio Leo	Aviation Planning and Strategy, Massport	fleo@massport.com	
Frank Iacovino	Noise Abatement, Massport	fiacovino@massport.com	
Terry English	FAA, Air Traffic Organization, BLANS Program Manager	terry.english@faa.gov	
Gail Lattrell	FAA, Airports Division	gail.lattrell@faa.gov	
Richard Doucette	FAA, Airports Division	richard.doucette@faa.gov	
Darryl Pomicter	President, Logan Airport Community Advisory Committee (CAC)	dpomic@aol.com	
Wig Zamore	Vice President, Logan CAC	wigzamore@gmail.com	
Brian Brunelle	FAA, BOS Tower	brian.brunelle@faa.gov	
Cully Beasley	FAA, TRACON A90	cully.beasley@faa.gov	
Coleman Hartigan	FAA, TRACON A90	coleman.hartigan@faa.gov	
Rob Adams	Independent Consultant (IC)	radams@landrum-brown.com	
John Williams	Project Consultant (PC)	jwilliams@ricondo.com	
Joanne Keith	CAC, Roxbury, Observing		
Maura Zlody	CAC Advisor, City of Boston, Observing	maura.zlody@boston.gov	
Declan Boland	Massport Consultant, Observing	declanboston@gmail.com	

### Discussion Points

---

The following agenda was circulated prior to the meeting.

- Introductions
- Contract Status
- Data Request Status
- Discussion of Runway Use Test #4

Prior to going through the agenda items, D Pomicter (DP) said that newer members of the CAC were asking if the BLANS could focus on the RNAV route changes. He said that he responded that we are proceeding with Option 6 and testing potential runway use changes; review of the RNAV routes is not part of Phase 3 of the BLANS. T English (TE) said that she agreed.

DP said that some CAC members were asking why health and health risk metrics were not being used in the BLANS. He said that he responded that there are no official FAA health and health risk metrics in

place. TE agreed, stating that she has coordinated with the FAA's Office of Environment and Energy (AEE) on the matter and will continue to do so and provide any information that may come available. DP asked F Leo (FL) if there were other metrics that Massport uses. FL responded that they have used DNL to this point, although he was aware of other metrics that are out there and have been used. TE said that there are some supplemental metrics listed in FAA Order 1050.1F<sup>1</sup>. DP said that there could be improvements that would be identified through supplemental metrics without causing a significant change in DNL. J Williams (JW) said that while DNL is the required metric for assessing impact, supplemental metrics have been used in decision making. FL said he generally agreed and that supplemental metrics have been used at Board meetings; however, the conversation has been more focused on the regulatory nature of DNL and that the recommended runway use program that comes out of Phase 3 will be screened using DNL.

DP said that "intruding events" have been considered in developing other programs. TE said that she was not sure that an intruding events metric is included in FAA Order 1050.1F and that she would follow up and coordinate with AEE. FL said he agreed that supplemental metrics can be used to help understand the implications of changes. DP said that intruding events is another factor for consideration in the development of the runway use program for BOS.

#### Contract Status

FL said that the contracts (Massport contract with the PC and the Massport contract with CAC) have been through legal and are in internal review. He hoped to have them completed the week of April 11. TE asked when the IC could start working again. FL responded that CAC needs to be working with the IC so that the contract between the CAC and the IC can be executed as soon as possible after the CAC/Massport contract is executed. DP asked R Adams (RA) to provide a copy of prior contracts so that he could review and be fully prepared.

DP asked FL what the current expected date is for completing the contracts. FL said that Massport received final contract numbers from the PC and IC the week of March 14 and that the expected date for the contracts is the week of April 11.

#### Health Effects Discussion

W Zamore (WZ) said there is ongoing research being conducted regarding the effects of air quality on health considering pollutants such as NO and ultrafine particles, as well as the effects of noise on health risks such as high blood pressure, mortality, and stress. DP said that those discussions would be appropriate for the Massport CAC to consider. WZ said that he wants to learn more and raise awareness to the ongoing research and said that the effects of noise and air quality have not been integrated into epidemiology, but research is ongoing. TE said that would coordinate with AEE to obtain what information they may have on the topic.

---

<sup>1</sup> FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, Effective July 16, 2015.

### Data Requests

DP said that he received a second round of representative graphics regarding the RNAV routes and actual flight paths from Massport. He said that there was good improvement from the first version and that he is still reviewing and will provide additional input to Massport.

DP said that he had received new runway use data from FL on March 29. FL said that there are two separate worksheets in the file; one with runway use by runway direction and a second with runway use by runway end. The data for 2007 – 2012 is jets only. FL said that they are finished with the 2015 runway use data and have 2015 as jets only.

DP asked how difficult it would be to get non-jets by month and asks where the data come from for the noise abatement reports. F Iacovino (FI) said that the reports are based on radar flights and that prior to 2014 flight tracks for non-jet aircraft were fragmented in the files and not reliable. Since then, HMMH has better capability to obtain flight tracks for non-jet aircraft.

DP said the he would add the last 5 years, including 2015 for historic baseline and review.

FL said that Massport would try to have noise by runway end using 2013/2014 data in time for the upcoming CAC meeting on April 13. DP said that the sooner they could have the data the better. FL responded that they would provide the data as soon as they could.

DP also asked if the information could be provided in KMZ files allowing it to be used with the Google map tools. FL said that he would check, but did not want to delay HMMH from providing the requested noise data. DP agreed that this was not a priority, but something to consider for the future.

TE said that FAA and Massport also need to complete the list of runway use restrictions, including source justifications and how the restrictions might be changed.

### Runway Use Test #4

JW said that a first draft of Test #4 had been provided for review. DP said that it was a good start but there were more questions and areas to be completed; the intention of Test #4 was to test whether a more equitable distribution of noise impacts could be achieved. The questions are what a more equitable distribution means and what are the correct metrics to consider. After the opening of Runway 14-32, there was a shift to more departures on Runway 33L. DP said that the split between Runway 27 departures and Runway 33 departures will not be 50/50, but will be based on achieving an equitable distribution of noise impacts. DP said they would like to see a more balanced split in the morning and the afternoon so that Runway 27 would not be used as predominantly in the morning and Runway 33 in the afternoon. Also consider splits in the afternoons and at night.

DP said Runways 4L and 4R arrivals represent the greatest noise impact and it is anticipated that the new RNAV to Runway 4L could result in an overall increase in Runway 4L arrivals. The second piece of the test

should look at an overall reduction in the use of Runways 4L and 4R for arrivals, with a shift to other runways (not specified).

B Brunelle (BB) said that they would prefer specific percentages to use as targets, but they should represent daily goals rather than meeting the goals in both the morning and afternoon/evening periods. The morning peak represents a departure peak and Runway 27 is used more for departures. The afternoon/evening peak is an arrival peak and Runway 33 is used more for departures, with arrivals on Runway 27 and Runway 32 (if available, considering wind/weather restriction).

DP referred back to the morning peak period, stating that Runway 33L is the primary arrival runway and Runway 27 the primary departure runway during the period. BB said that although Runway 27 is the primary departure runway during the morning peak, Runway 33L is also used for departures as it is a longer runway and it can be used to split departure flows. BB said that a "wag" would be that the split between Runway 27 departures and Runway 33L departures is approximately 75%/25%. DP asked if the goal was a 50/50 split, could more departures go to Runway 33L. BB said that 33L is used for arrivals.

DP asked if the morning could be moved toward a 60%/40% split between Runway 27 and Runway 33L and if Runway 32 could be better utilized. BB said that if Runway 27 and 32 are being used for arrivals, it creates a different operational scenario because of the Runway 27/Runway 33L intersection and because Runways 27 and 32, although not intersecting, converge and are subject to the new spacing rules.

DP stated that superseding PRAS would allow for a review of relaxing or eliminating the restrictions on the use of Runway 14-32 and that he could possibly get approval from CAC to remove the restriction at least for the test period. BB said that removing the restriction would provide controllers with more flexibility and could make it easier to achieve runway use goals in both the morning and afternoon periods.

TE and FL said that they would need to check with FAA legal and Massport legal, respectively to see if there would be any legal concern related to relaxing the Runway 14-32 restriction for the test. FL said that although the restriction is part of the FAA Record of Decision, the Massport would have to request the test and the removal of the restriction as part of the test. DP said that he believes the test would be more successful with the restriction removed.

TE asked BB if it would require more training to include the relaxation of the restriction. BB said that it would not. R Doucette (RD) said the he did not see anything that would prevent the restriction from being removed for the test, but said that he would want to check with John Donnelly and get his opinion.

DP asked if there were any more questions. BB stated again that the goal should be more toward a daily overall balance rather than a specific morning and evening period balance. Considering three overall periods: morning, evening, and night, DP asked what would be manageable in terms of working toward a balance. DP suggested that the balancing occur after the peak periods and recognized that there would be tradeoffs. For example, for Runway 27, although getting more than half of the departures in the morning period that they may end up with fewer departures in the morning and potentially more in the afternoon than they would now. BB stated again that relaxing the Runway 14-32 restriction would help both the morning and the evening period by giving controllers more flexibility.

FL asked who would provide the runway percentage information. DP said that it would come out of the 2013/2014 noise analysis results. He also asked if intruding events (N70, number of events over 70 dB) could be calculated. He said that he wants to show the people concerned about the RNAVs that their concerns are being considered.

In the description of the second part of the test, concerning Runways 4L and 4R arrivals, FL asked why Runways 22L and 22R departures are also listed as a consideration. DP said it was because of noise by runway end and that is considered, and that Runway 4L arrivals may increase as a result of the new RNAV procedure.

DP said that he would review the runway use data to start thinking about which runway(s) that Runways 4L and 4R arrivals could be sent to. FL said that he thought that would be left to the FAA to determine. He also said that the 2104 EDR contains an assessment of changing runway use that resulted in increases in DNL west of the Airport and is concerned about the implications for this test.

BB said that it would be easier to break up the Runway 27/Runway 33L departure test and the Runways 4L and 4R arrivals test. TE and DP said that there isn't time to do two separate tests. BB said they could be done simultaneously, but to just break them up as two separate descriptions.

DP asked which test is easier. BB replied that the Runway 27/Runway 33L departure test is easier. BB asked what the Runways 4R and 4L arrivals test would be compared against. DP said that we would compare against the 5-year average. JW said that we may need to compare against the same months over the last 5 years to ensure there are no seasonal differences that could skew results. DP said that in looking at the data, he didn't think there would be that much difference, but would check further.

DP asked if one test could start a month later than the other. BB said no, they should start at the same time. After additional discussion, it was agreed to break the descriptions up as separate tests, referred to as 4A and 4B, although the tests would go forward simultaneously.

Regarding Test 4A, BB asked what times the runway shifts could occur; most controller shifts are from 6 a.m. to 2 p.m. and from 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. He also asked who would provide the results data – Massport would need to report daily runway use. FI said that they could break down the information any way it was wanted. FL asked about workload; FI replied that once the reporting is defined, it wouldn't be a workload problem.

BB noted that testing during the summer months would show lower overall use of Runways 27 and 33L for departures compared with other times of the year.

FL said that Massport would work with BB to see what data they need for feedback and with CAC to get to a more standard report.

DP asked BB to describe the required training and why it takes 30 days. BB said that all staff – supervisors, controllers, traffic managers – must be briefed. Due to scheduling and work rules, briefings are during

regular shifts and can only brief 1 or 2 at a time; with briefings lasting 1 to 2 hours. It takes a month to get all the briefings completed.

DP asked about the possibility of allowing CAC members to visit the Tower. BB said they could host 2 to 3 people at a time for about 2 hours per visit. DP said that he would get a list of CAC members interested in visiting the Tower and coordinate with BB.

The next step is to add reporting to the test definitions and have a version ready for further review and hopefully CAC acceptance at the CAC meeting scheduled for April 13. DP asked that BB attend that meeting as well to help explain why there are some limitations to what can be done.

FL noted that Runway 4L will be on a hard close for approximately a month beginning in mid-September, so it would be necessary to complete Test 4B before then. Test 4A, regarding the balance of Runways 27 and 33L departures could continue during the closure if necessary. The goal is to conduct the tests from May 15, 2016 through August 15, 2016.

### **Action Items**

- ✓ TE to follow up with FAA Office of Environment and Energy regarding the use of supplemental metrics, in particular "intruding events"
- ✓ RA to provide DP with a copy of prior CAC/IC contracts
- ✓ Massport to provide noise information by runway end and community in advance of the April 13, 2016 CAC meeting
- ✓ FL to check with HMMH to see if KMZ files of contours can be produced to use with Google Earth
- ✓ TE and JW to complete list of runway use restrictions and fill in source/justification and requirements for removing or changing the restrictions
- ✓ Massport and FAA to review legal aspects related to relaxing the wind restrictions on Runway 14-32 during Test Period #4
- ✓ CAC to review results of noise analysis to identify target percentages for Runway 27/Runway 33L departure splits
- ✓ CAC to review results of runway use averages and provide thoughts on where to send Runway 4L/4R arrivals
- ✓ JW to provide next draft of Test #4 information to Darryl for further discussion, including addition of reporting and monitoring
- ✓ DP to provide list of CAC members interested in getting a tour of the BOS Tower
- ✓ JW to review BLANS project website and make the necessary adjustments/authorizations to enable the LOGAN CAC to access and download project data files from the website's non-Public, Project Team section; or to explore other means for sharing large files.

**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

20160329\pmt\_meeting\_20160329\_notes\_final.docx