

## **Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS)**

### **BOS/TAC Meeting**

### **Massport Logan Office Center Corporate Room**

#### **MEETING SUMMARY**

9:30 a.m. - 12 noon

June 6, 2011

---

#### **ATTENDANCE**

##### **Boston Technical Advisory Committee (BOS/TAC) Members:**

**Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)**-Terry English, Brian Brunelle

**Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport)**-Betty Desrosiers, Flavio Leo

**Community Advisory Committee (CAC)**-Sandra Kunz (Braintree), Jerry Falbo (Winthrop), Bob Driscoll (Alt-Winthrop), Darryl Pomicter (Beacon Hill)

##### **VIA TELEPHONE**

**FAA**-Barbara Travers-Wright, Deborah James, Mike Nelson, Gail Lattrell, Richard Doucette

**CAC**-Ron Hardaway (East Boston), Maura Zlody (City of Boston)

**Independent Consultant (IC)**-Jon Woodward (Landrum & Brown, Inc.),

**Project Consultant (PC)**-Stephen Smith (Ricondo & Associates, Inc.)

#### **OBSERVERS**

**FAA**- Alan Reed-Recorder

**Massport**-Frank Iacovino

---

#### **Attendance:**

All participants on the phone and at the Massport offices identified themselves, for the record.

#### **Meeting Purpose:**

F. Leo opened the meeting for a discussion of the BLANS ground noise measures and reminded all that FAA was invited to help answer questions associated with the measures and Massport initiatives. He turned the discussion over to J. Falbo.

J. Falbo stated that he wanted to cover four ground noise measures and wished to make a statement. He said that despite the pleasant relationship that has developed (with the FAA and Massport) during the (BLANS) project, he believes they have strictly followed formal procedures, while failing to be creative and have been unwilling to consider minor decreases in efficiency for CAC proposed noise abatement measures. He senses a fear to give more (work) to air traffic control. He does not believe (FAA and Massport) have a partnership with the CAC and remarked that the CAC is not mentioned in the Level 2 Screening document after three pages dedicated to the FAA.

The issues are:

1. Single engine (SE) taxi, including engines away from community. He is throwing it in because it is a big issue. He believes the problem is, to what extent does Massport and FAA follow the Record of Decision (ROD)? He believes that all agree that Massport should seek airline input (on the issue).

2. Second part of SE taxi:

He wants to see Massport put posters in pilot's lounges and not to rely on airlines to do so. Although the ROD does not mention "posters in pilot lounges", he believes that this is one method of implementation of a single engine taxi program, mandated per the ROD and the Mass Section of the DEP.

3. He also wants to see more action in NextGen (FAA's Next Generation Implementation Plan) research to optimize (the practice of) airfield side towing of aircraft. He believes that with NextGen there is a proven, reliable means to do this from the terminal and a more active program to implement what is safe to do.

4. He would like to see the results of pilot surveys, which he believes should be included in Massport's EDR and a noise abatement committee established.

S. Kunz noted that after the BLANS, the CAC membership will likely change and become smaller again and would like to know if there are members who could become members of such a committee.

F. Leo stated that Massport will continue to make itself available and would accept a subcommittee, but it would be up to the CAC to form it.

D. Pomicter stated that the current BOSTAC subcommittee of BLANS/BONS (Boston Overflight Noise Study) from 2003 and the previous technical subcommittee of the Logan Airside Review Committee from 1995 are appropriate models to follow.

F. Leo added that for a noise subcommittee, he would recommend members come from all (cardinal) directions surrounding the airport. Massport and the CAC discussed ways to institute a committee and all agreed the relationship between CAC and Massport has improved.

D. Pomicter believes it is extremely important for the CAC, Massport, and FAA to develop a normal ongoing relationship working together and that the several measures including monitoring and reporting to improve compliance require that, to be successful.

J. Falbo continued, saying that the single engine taxiing program must be incorporated in the BLANS environmental ROD, along with post-collaboration and in the EDR- otherwise, it means nothing. He then referenced the 2002 ROD on page 67, issue #34 Single-Engine Taxi Procedures and then page 47, Issue #7 General Monitoring and Enforcement of Mitigation Commitments, bullet 8 as examples of what he believes are binding issues for Massport's SE program in FAA's ROD.

D. Pomictier continued, quoting Section VIII Mitigation Measures and I. Introduction. He concurred that the lack of a program to fulfill the current requirement for emissions emphasizes the need for a stronger future requirement.

The group continued with their discussion on ROD requirements and interpretations of what programs are applicable. After listening to CAC concerns that a formal (noise) program be implemented to inform, track and improve compliance, monitor, report, and enforce their requested actions, B. Desrosiers and F. Leo proceeded to address these actions.

F. Leo reflected on Massport's previous actions, including an initial internal MPA outreach to airlines in 2006 showing that airlines were looking at and were already supportive and implementing SE taxiing at Boston Logan. This finding was further collaborated by an MIT survey conducted in December 2009. Massport's March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2011 memo to the CAC provides and commits to a more structured program.

D. Pomictier responded that the Massport proposal and Section 61 requirement is: "to develop and implement a program to encourage the use of single-engine taxi procedures by all tenant airlines, consistent with safety requirements, pilot judgment, and the requirements of federal law." A single letter after five years and a voluntary survey after three more years is not a program (as has been noted in MEPA and Boston responses to Massport's EDR) and incomplete and anecdotal evidence from a voluntary survey is insufficient to consider further action unnecessary and the requirement completed. A program is a plan to be followed to accomplish a specific goal. Even simply collecting and distributing information from all airlines, communicating most-active and least-active airline views, and tracking change over years would get greater results more quickly—and more clearly show what is attainable and what is not.

F. Leo responded that Massport's goal is to move forward and work with the CAC. In summary, B. Desrosiers outlined Massport's planned program as follows:

### **Program Elements**

If feasible, Massport will recommend to the airlines that (during single engine operations) the engine off be directed towards the community.

#### **A. Inform**

1. Place Posters in Pilot Lounges reviewing Logan's "fly quiet" noise abatement procedures and incorporating single engine taxiing goals
2. Send letters to Chief Pilots about single engine taxiing goals twice per year. (Note: consistent with Massport's March 21, 2011 memo to CAC, Massport will conduct this outreach in 2011, 2012 and 2013 and reassess the need for further outreach.) Letter will include statement on local preference to shut down the engine closest to the communities.
3. Massport will participate in FAA regularly scheduled users meeting that

typically include Chief Pilots to discuss Logan over noise abatement goals and include support for use of single engine taxiing goals and utilization.

B. Track and Improve

1. Conduct an annual outreach to air carriers to track airline policy and approach to single engine taxiing. (NOTE: consistent with Massport's March 21, 2011 memo to CAC, Massport will conduct this outreach in 2011, 2012 and 2013 and reassess the need for further outreach.)
2. Share with airlines- through letters (item A2 above) any identified best practices as applied to Logan and solicit their input.
3. As part of the annual outreach, Massport will seek to get feedback from airlines on application of single engine taxiing at Logan such as runway, air carrier and arrival/departure operation.

C. Report

Provide summary of activity in the Annual Environmental Data Reports.

J. Falbo requested that all Ground Noise Measures should become incorporated in any ROD that may be required during Phase 3. D. Pomicter also acknowledged that there may be limits to what can be attained with respect to the ROD. F. Leo further iterated that the outreach will be conducted by Massport staff and will be Logan specific with chief pilots of the major airlines serving Logan.

F. Leo again stated that due to engine manufacturer limitations (e.g. aircraft critical functions tied to one specific engine or required engine warm up/warm down period) there will be limited effectiveness of SE immediately before or after takeoff. These limitations would provide few benefits to communities such as Bayswater and/or Court Road located near runway ends.

D. Pomicter offered that, if airlines want single engine operation and alternating to balance operating time/wear/maintenance—to save money—he thought manufacturers would respond with the extra switching for systems between engines, realizing it may take a few years.

The group continued with a discussion about putting posters up in pilot lounges, deciding that only one (“fly quiet” poster) is needed at Logan and F. Leo would get feedback from pilots. He also reviewed Massport's commitment to addressing letters to pilots on SE taxiing.

D. Pomicter noted that this should be Measure G-B (v2), not the new G-N—for consistency and continuity with the present and past,

The group discussion shifted to elements of the ROD.

F. Leo stated that Massport believes the ground measures program, which is a Massport voluntary goal, is not (destined) for the ROD, which is a federal document. J. Falbo countered that he wanted a program in the ROD, where it would be guaranteed attention

and the potential of a new (Massport) administration (could not pose a threat to its elimination).

T. English concurred with Massport and said that their voluntary encouragement programs are not federal actions and national policies differ from those of the airport. It's also premature for FAA to commit to have something in a ROD now, prior to any NEPA process and FAA doesn't even know if there will be a ROD for the BLANS. First CAC/Massport would have to recommend something for implementation and then FAA would determine what type of NEPA document is appropriate. She explained that per NEPA regulations, RODs are required for Environmental Impact Statements and not for Environmental Assessments or Categorical Exclusions; however, FAA may opt to have a ROD if they anticipate litigation, as was done with the Phase 1 CATEX/ROD. She said that even if there was a ROD, it could be two years down the road, and Massport has already committed to CAC to begin implementation of the programs now.

S. Kunz asked if a legally binding document from Massport could be created, saying 'this is the program'. J. Falbo queried J. Woodward on whether anything in stage (Level) 3 in regards to the ROD would be seen. J. Woodward replied that an EA is a likely possibility based on what is currently passed to Level 3.

J. Falbo stated that with an EIS, he would want something binding from Massport and he would like a legal opinion from the FAA of why it could not be in the ROD. T. English said that she would relay this to Chris Poreda (FAA, Chief Counsel). **FAA ACTION ITEM.**

B. Desrosiers noted that Massport can look into whether or not there could be some other mechanism between the CAC and Massport to address J. Falbo's concern and not include the FAA regarding their ground noise measure programs. **MASSPORT ACTION ITEM.**

The group shifted focus to the topic of hold pads.

B. Driscoll remarked about keeping the planes at the gates (hold pads).

A question was asked about the JFK "metering program." F. Leo shared an update that the JFK metering program was the result of a major runway closure. He said the runway closure resulted in a loss of capacity for the airport and airlines had to reduce schedules. He said this is not the case at Logan, where during normal conditions, Logan has enough capacity to handle airline schedules. The MIT ground taxi test done at Logan last year showed a lot of potential as part of an FAA NextGen, which is a longer term FAA solution. Massport supports this FAA effort and has offered Logan again for further testing/work. The FAA is also looking to get more data from other airports.

T. English elaborated further with discussion about surface (STMS) traffic management, which is a tool mentioned in the Level 1 Screening Report. She noted that FAA had researched this as another option for the hold pad measure, but were advised by FAA

System Operations that the program is still very much in the developmental stages and therefore, it would not be a viable option at this time. D. James added that MIT is coming back this summer for more data, but she has no time frame on their arrival.

J. Falbo noted that this (tool) saves fuel, noise, and pollution. S. Smith added that FAA is going through a pilot program and various software is under evaluation with different airports. He also reiterated that there is no national program, but there may be a local software tool to get results. In addition, he mentioned the pilot programs are also identifying collaboration issues among FAA, airlines, and the airport. He stated that it is not yet clear which direction FAA may go regarding STMS.

The group discussed the desire to obtain such a system, however acknowledging that the process is not a national procedure supported by criteria and guidance yet, as confirmed by B. Brunelle and S. Smith. F. Leo offered that Logan would love to have this tool and offer Logan as a test bed.

J. Falbo requested that T. English have the FAA Office of the Environment get MIT to come out to Boston. T. English noted that she does not have the authority to dictate this and that a request of this type would have to come from the tower. She said, however, that she could work with D. James (if needed) to provide some language related to the BLANS as an additional incentive for MIT to come back to Logan. B. Driscoll added that everything (the CAC) is proposing (seems to be) a problem (at Logan), but is being done at other airports. He feels the centerfield taxiway issue is similar issue.

While F. Leo stated that Massport continues to think about what is doable and respond to the community with a sense that it is trying to work with them, J. Falbo countered that people are giving up making calls because they don't see results.

The group moved to the ground run-up measure. CAC members inquired about Massport's ability to record more information related to ground run ups, such as duration and thrust levels. The intent of collecting this additional data as part of the run-up logging system is to provide Massport the ability to model, via INM, more accurate, actual run-ups that occurred in a calendar year.

F. Leo assumed this is an IOU. He said the current run-up log does not give us this information, but as suggested by J. Woodward, Massport will look at getting carrier/aircraft specific information, if available, on aircraft conducting run-ups at Logan.  
**MASSPORT ACTION ITEM**

B. Desrosiers stated that her understanding was that the CAC is asking Massport to monitor the effectiveness of minimizing run-ups. F. Leo added that to his knowledge, (Logan) has not had an engine run-up outside the noise rule restriction since he has been at Logan (about 15 years). Massport's Noise Office has the ability to look at complaints and see if any incidents were outside of Logan's noise rule timeframe. F. Leo also added that the FAA Tower has been very effective at holding aircraft impacted by a ground-

stops/delay to other airports at the south end of the airfield away from Bayswater and Court Road. J. Falbo requests that perhaps the CAC can get an evaluation (from HMMH).

J. Falbo wished to cover the continuous descent measure (F-A). He stated that he could coordinate this with the IC.

S. Smith remarked that the remaining issue was Idle Reverse Thrust. J. Falbo stated that he will not support this (Measure) unless he sees airline involvement and discussions. S. Smith observed that this is similar to single-engine taxiing and include it in the single-engine "encouragement program." J. Falbo indicated that the points he made regarding the single-engine measure apply to this measure as well.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 AM.