

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston **Logan Airport Noise Study**
Logan International Airport

DATE: 10/03/06
TIME: 10:00 a.m. EDT

Telephone Conversation
 Meeting
 Other

SUBJECT: Project Management Call

SUMMARY PREPARED BY: Chris Jones

DATE PREPARED: 10/03/06

PARTICIPANTS (include affiliation):

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Stephen Smith	PC
Greg Wellman	PC
Jon Woodward	IC
Gail Lattrell	FAA
Sandra Kunz	CAC
Ralph Dormitzer	CAC

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

<u>Individuals</u>	<u>Files</u>
Administrative file	

- **Draft Hull Petition Response Update:**

Gail Lattrell drafted a response and requested that Steve Kelly look it over before it is sent out. It was agreed that the response is to be shared with the entire group. Steve Smith mentioned that it may be a good idea to reference the website on the response drafted by the FAA. G. Lattrell agreed and noted that it has been done.

This will be added to next week's agenda.

- **Hull Petition:**

Ralph Dormitzer gathered more information on the petition circulating in Hull. He found an article by Steve Lathrop, copied it, and sent it to G. Lattrell. The article is a response to criticism in Hull that money spent on the study is indefensible. The article was generally positive.

R. Dormitzer also spoke with a Hull woman who lives in Port Allerton. She told him that she is getting a lot of overflights above her residence. She assumed that some of the alternative routes have already been implemented. This indicates that a lot of misinformation has been disseminated.

R. Dormitzer also spoke with Hull officials and stated that they are open to rational discussion.

S. Smith stated that he looked at the signatory interests and that the majority of the signatures from residents of Port Allerton.

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston **Logan Airport Noise Study**
Logan International Airport

- **RNAV Live Testing:**

Steve Kelly stated that this is a very sensitive issue and that the answer is “it depends”. If the purpose is testing the procedure to determine operational viability, the FAA would typically favor a live test. If solely based on noise abatement, the FAA typically does not conduct live testing. Alternative 5 RNAV design does seem to have some operational issues that may be addressed via a live test. However, to move aircraft just to see if there is a reaction to the noise, is a different issue and does not typically involve the use of real aircraft testing.

R. Dormitzer stated that it is important to know what happens at the first waypoint over Hull. It was stated that modeling will be unable to adequately reveal that. A pilot will not engage RNAV until he has been released to do so by ATC and that this will impact modeling because times engagement times will vary. The human factor makes modeling difficult. Further discussion was had on the testing issue.

S. Kelly stated that procedural testing of the procedure can occur in a live test format as long as FAA procedures are followed. Sandra Kunz asked whether the FAA will track any calls they receive during testing. S. Kelly said he would have a problem because FAA is unwilling to move airplanes around until a place is found where there are no noise impacts. It could be a portion of what is looked at but really the focus is on testing of procedures and validation. S. Kunz stated that if there are a number of calls, it is possible that someone may take the issue to court claiming that routes have been changed. S. Kelly responded that this is an issue that needs to be evaluated during the decision making process.

PC inquired whether based on the information on the RNAV and based on the RAPT process, will Massport be required to submit it as a procedure to be evaluated. S. Kelly responded that he did not know but that there may be a way to short cut that. S. Smith said that CAC needs to consider whether this is a recommendation with an attached qualifier that testing be required.

S. Kelly stated that he thinks that in the 18-step process, shortcutting may be a way to test the process. He said that if something needs to be changed because the RNAV process changes the impacts of the procedure, it will require further evaluation

- **Distribution Package:**

Alternative 11 should be going to the IC tomorrow or next week. Wyle is conduct quality assurance checks. This is the last Alternative to be evaluated.

Discussion turned to including the IC’s information in the distribution package. S. Smith asked whether Ralph and IC are comfortable sharing the information to PC. R. Dormitzer said that the question is how to present the material. Expressing how noise is disseminated equally across the board and the manner in which to express that is currently being decided between IC and CAC leadership. A possible issue is whether flagging those communities with more noise will draw more attention and lead to discarding those alternatives, and not pay attention to the overall benefit.

Jon Woodward talked about thresholds, what they mean. G. Lattrell asked whether fairness is still an objective and mentioned that this is a good place to start the discussion. Some discussion was had on

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston **Logan Airport Noise Study** **Logan International Airport**

the importance of presenting the data in a reasonable manner, emphasizing fairness. It was pointed out that it is difficult for people to remain objective when the results are presented first and fairness is discussed later. It was agreed that fairness should be discussed at the same time results are provided. PC asked whether fairness has been discussed in the CAC, Sandra said yes and discussed the issue as relates to the CAC.

S. Smith asked how the IC is evaluating fairness. The IC is emphasizing that whether there are 10 overflights or less, it will not be seen as a “notable increase” statistically.

S. Kunz stated that some communities may not notice increased flights, depending upon altitude. Areas of potential increase and impacts were then discussed. Alternative 9 may have to be moved to Phase 2 because of the significant impacts associated with the alternative.

S. Smith stated that the BOS/TAC distribution package (PC noise results flash and grid tables; IC/CAC grid analysis and interpretation) information is being worked on independently of each other and that it is hoped that the PC can look at the IC information. The PC materials will be provided in Flash as seen on the website. As it is very labor intensive to move between formats it was suggested that it would be easier to do it all in Flash. The IC’s information can be added after the fact, but if combined with the PC’s information it can be immediately posted. G. Lattrell asked whether the IC materials will be reviewed prior to the BOS/TAC meeting. J. Woodward said that when R. Dormitzer and S. Kunz are comfortable with it, he will provide it to anyone on PMT to review.

J. Woodward stated that the material he provided to Sandra Kunz and R. Dormitzer will be significantly revised. R. Dormitzer needs to read and flag a few things for clarity.

J. Woodward described the format by which the IC is presenting its information. Specific areas within each community are identified. He also stated that he does not see how it can be put into a Flash format and that it should be included as an attachment.

J. Woodward asked whether we want to incorporate them as part of the package. S. Kunz thinks they should be distributed separately. Greg Wellman stated that there may be a problem in that some people will complain about whether they got all the information. S. Kunz stated that as long as the information from IC is separated and emphasized as coming from the CAC, she does not anticipate a problem.

It was mentioned that if this is going on CD, everything should be included and the size of the document was discussed. J. Woodward said that the best way to look at it is on computer.

It was mentioned that the distribution package may be an issue for people without access to technology.

J. Woodward said that when it is finalized, they will print them, at 11 x 17 to get them to a point where people can read them. The complexity of the document was discussed. S. Smith suggested that it can be uploaded to the web with an Excel reader.

Steve said distribution can be discussed next week. It was also mentioned that the information should be uploaded to the web to satisfy administrative record requirements. Discussion on this will continue in the future.

DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston **Logan Airport Noise Study**
Logan International Airport

J. Woodward, R. Dormitzer, and S. Kunz will discuss the document further to determine whether changes or modifications must be made.

- **Meeting Date:**

The BOS/TAC meeting will happen in November. The BOS/TAC will require at least 3 weeks to evaluate the information. Discussion was had on the meeting format. There will be a CAC meeting followed by a BOS/TAC meeting. The BOS/TAC meeting will be for presentation of the information, followed three weeks later by a decision making meeting.

Suggested meeting dates include November 9 for CAC, November 8 for BOS/TAC, a CAC meeting first week of December, either December 4 or 5 for decision making purposes.

G. Lattrell provided an update on notice to proceed for Phase 2. Massport will meet on October 19 and notice to proceed should follow.

Topic/Discussion	Action Item/Responsibility
As noted above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The IC will provide the PC with his data when R. Dormitzer has given the go ahead.• Flash file – one alternative will be completed for everyone to look at next week.• S Smith would like to propose the noise measurement element as an item for next week.