

# Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

## Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

---

DATE: 5/05/09  
TIME: 4:30 p.m. EST

Telephone Conversation  
 Meeting  
 Other

SUBJECT: Phase 2 Bi-Weekly Project Management Call

SUMMARY PREPARED BY: Rick Peloquin

DATE PREPARED: 5/05/09

ATTENDEES (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Steve Smith	PC
Jon Woodward	IC
Terry English	FAA
Flavio Leo	Massport
Jerry Falbo	CAC (Winthrop)
Sandra Kunz	CAC (Braintree)
Richard Doucette	FAA (standing in for Gail Lattrell)
Declan Boland	CAC (Hingham)

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Ron Hardaway	CAC (East Boston)
Bernice Mader	CAC (Quincy)
Will Lyman	CAC (Jamaica Plain)
Maura Zlody	City of Boston

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

Individuals	Files
Project File BLANS Forum CAC BOS/TAC	

---

### I. Attendance:

Steve Smith took attendance.

### II. Approval of 4/28/09 Meeting Notes:

On page three in the second to last sentence of the first paragraph for agenda item VII of the notes, the date for the flight check was changed from "around May 18<sup>th</sup>" to "on May 20<sup>th</sup>". There were also a couple of typos that were corrected. The notes were then finalized.

### III. Mini-Summit Action Items:

- a. **Addendum** –S. Smith recently provided to the CAC the addendum that was drafted by the FAA. He has requested that any comments be sent by tomorrow, if possible, so the addendum can be finalized and disseminated.

# Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

## Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

---

J. Falbo had a concern regarding single engine taxi procedures. The CAC wants this measure which has already been rejected due to safety issues to be modified and resubmitted for Level 2 screening.

J. Woodward mentioned that it was originally presented in February '08 and confirmed that it was rejected due to a safety issue without any further considerations or refinements that would deem the measure safe, such as making it a voluntary measure. He commented that measures should have been looked at as guidance rather than specific direct intent. He said that it could be possible to change the measure to ultimately achieve the benefit, and not assume that it was a mandatory measure.

F. Leo said that Massport will not create incentives for airlines to adopt measures if these measures have safety implications. Massport originally surveyed the airlines and found out that some of them were already using single engine taxi procedures as a general practice. Massport also sent a letter to airlines regarding this topic, which is an attachment to the Level 1 Screening Report. After further discussion between CAC and Massport members regarding the voluntary nature of a single-engine measure, F. Leo agreed that such discussion should continue, but emphasized Massport concerns related to how the measure is described. Ultimately, it is the pilot-in-command who makes the decision to shut down one engine when he/she determines that conditions are safe to do so and any incentive to do so should not influence the pilot's decision to conduct a safe operation.

The CAC requested that J. Woodward write something to present to Massport and the FAA to see if they could get this measure passed to Level 2. Before PMT agreed with this process, S. Smith asked T. English to comment on what was discussed between CAC and Massport.

T. English stated that the original purpose of going over the addendum was to see if the CAC had any issues with or needed any additional clarification regarding it. It was not the purpose to change any decisions that were in the addendum. She also agreed that she is willing to discuss this topic further to see if a modified measure can move forward. S. Smith confirmed that the assumption made by the FAA when evaluating this measure was that it was mandatory.

S. Smith also cautioned PMT that decisions related to measures not be made by the PMT, and discussion should take place where others can participate, primarily during a CAC meeting. S. Smith proposed that the original measure and decision be maintained, with an added statement that the FAA assumed the measure was to be mandatory. At the next CAC meeting, the CAC will review the proposed language drafted by IC (and reviewed by FAA/Massport if requested) and vote to accept the measure. CAC would then forward the measure to FAA and Massport. Either Massport or FAA (depending on the nature of the measure) will conduct a safety assessment and provide a Level 1 determination. This will be treated as a separate measure in the document in order to preserve previous reviews of other measures that were rejected. The PMT agreed with the process.

F. Leo also described three elements with the single-engine taxiing measure:

1. It was perceived as mandatory, but now a refined measure would be proposed to support voluntary application without compromising safety.

# Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

## Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

---

2. Incentivizing this measure to get the airlines to follow the procedure cannot take a form that clouds the pilot's judgment in making safe decisions or pressure the pilot in a manner (via airline policy) to weight the incentive more over safe operation. In summary, an incentive should not influence what goes on in the cockpit (policies and procedures) designed to operate the aircraft in a safe manner.
3. Issues with determining which engine to use during taxi will need to be addressed.

- b. **Fanned Heading Update** – T. English reported that the information provided in the addendum is the most the FAA can provide without convening a large group of FAA departments, which is required in order to derive even generalized headings from runways. She mentioned that such a meeting requires time to set up and involves substantial funding to get everyone together. Level 2 is where such meetings and discussions are intended to take place. T. English informed the group that there is nothing scheduled to discuss the further refinement of fanning because it would take a long period of time to facilitate a meeting between these groups, and before such a financial commitment is made, the FAA will need to know if CAC goals and objectives are set, because the goals/objectives may eliminate fanned headings all together. She also mentioned that if the CAC establishes goals and objectives, some of these measures, including fanned headings, could be removed from consideration. Therefore, it is not feasible to try to have a meeting before the BOS/TAC meeting on 5/28/09, where the FAA hopes that CAC can provide the FAA an indication on what the goals and objectives are.

J. Woodward brought up measure F-T. The discussion of helicopter complaints is applicable to measure F-U, not F-T. He emphasized that F-T was primarily related to fixed wing aircraft, especially banner tows. S. Smith stated that he will adjust this assuming that the data provided by Massport was specific only to helicopters. If it happens that the only complaints were related to helicopters, and none were recorded for fixed-wing, the complaint count would be applicable for both measures. J. Woodward added that there needs to be clarification related to banner tows and determining if it is safe to raise altitudes. S. Smith stated that further clarification was provided in Version 2, which is why it was not stated in the addendum.

J. Falbo asked for further clarification regarding measure G-C – Centerfield Taxiway. This measure shows as rejected (based on scope criteria), but this measure is currently being used.

J. Woodward agrees with the FAA determination that the proposed measure is similar to Alternative 1 in the Centerfield Taxiway Study, and asked why it cannot be considered completed. T. English explained some FAA concerns that the measure may be interpreted as a mandatory procedure, and would not provide the needed flexibility it was designed to provide now and in the future. J. Woodward agreed that this can't be a mandatory measure because there are always conditions that occur (closed taxiway, etc) to cause reasons for deviation. S. Smith clarified that the rejection is based on a criteria stated in the scope of work that ground measures already evaluated in the Centerfield Taxiway would not be re-evaluated. From this point of view, it was rejected. T. English stated that she would re-visit the decision determination one more time with appropriate FAA staff.

- c. **2007 Noise Update** – This topic was not discussed due to lack of time.

# Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

## Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

---

- Action Items:**
- (1) **J. Woodward to produce modified language as it relates to the measure regarding single engine taxi procedures. This language will be passed to Massport and FAA for review. Massport and FAA have offered to provide input for this write up.**
  - (2) **PC will put a statement in Measure G-B that specifies that the FAA originally interpreted this measure as mandatory.**
  - (3) **CAC will vote on the proposed measure (G-B2) and will forward accepted measure to FAA and Massport.**
  - (4) **FAA or Massport will review measure based on Level 1 criteria and provide decision.**
  - (5) **T. English will re-visit decision related to Measure G-C (change from rejected to completed)**
  - (6) **S. Smith will assess appropriate location of Massport helicopter complaint data (in F-U and/or F-T).**
  - (7) **S. Smith will make adjustments related to helicopter complaints, and finalize addendum to Version 2.**

#### **IV. BOS/TAC Meeting Agenda:**

S. Smith asked PMT to review the preliminary BOS/TAC agenda and provide comments by tomorrow, if possible.

#### **V. Phase 1 BONS RNAV Implementation Process Update:**

This topic was not discussed due to lack of time, although T.English briefly mentioned that she would be meeting with the TRACON and Jon Harris this week to further discuss development of the Runway 22 RNAV procedure.

#### **VIII. Miscellaneous:**

T. English asked Sandra to clarify what should now be sent to the entire CAC in regards to draft notes, draft materials that will be reviewed by PMT, etc. S. Kunz said that it is okay to send the entire CAC everything, including draft notes.

The line was opened to allow observer comments.

B. Mader advised that she is confused with the project and CAC processes and requested simplified steps to explain the decision tree.

**Action Items: (1) S. Smith will provide clarification for these processes mentioned above.**

M. Zlody had to disconnect, so she advised that she will send her concern/question via email.

R. Hardaway had two concerns.

1. Requested that S. Smith not instruct R. Peloquin on actions during the call.
2. Reported that he observed that FAA ATCT still utilizes Taxiway N for Runway 22L departures.

**The next PMT call was not scheduled due to the upcoming CAC meeting on May 21<sup>st</sup>. There may be a PMT call scheduled between May 21<sup>st</sup> and May 27<sup>th</sup>.**