

**INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT
NOTES FROM CAC MEETING OF 12/5/06**

Ralph Dormitzer called the meeting to order at approximately 5:50 p.m.

Introduction and roll call – a total of 25 community representatives were present either in person or by proxy and included the following communities:

- | | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Winthrop | 14. Milton |
| 2. Braintree | 15. South End |
| 3. East Boston | 16. Dorchester |
| 4. Chelsea | 17. Beverly |
| 5. Brookline | 18. Quincy |
| 6. Jamaica Plain | 19. Hull |
| 7. Somerville | 20. Cohasset |
| 8. South Boston | 21. Charlestown |
| 9. Beacon Hill | 22. Hingham |
| 10. Malden | 23. Boston |
| 11. Revere | 24. Roslindale |
| 12. Weymouth | 25. Dedham |
| 13. West Roxbury | |

A total of four community representatives were not present either in person or by proxy and included the following:

1. Roxbury
2. Everett
3. Swampscott
4. Nahant

One person participated by phone (M. Zlody)

Ralph Dormitzer asked Gail Lattrell from the FAA to make remarks. She reflected about how long they have been at the study, that FAA is behind it and committed to the process, and that this is something that has never been done before in the U.S.

Gail was followed by Flavio Leo from Massport who made some short remarks regarding how much Massport is behind this process.

Falvio was followed by Ralph Dormitzer one of the CAC Co-Chairs. He mentioned how \$3.1 million has been spent to date over 2 ½ years and they are unprecedented by looking at noise out to 50 dBA SEL and up to 15,000 feet AGL. They have evaluated 53 initial alternatives. The FAA has looked at them with regard to safety and operational requirements. It was been determined that 13 alternatives do not require any further environmental process. These are alternatives that look to place aircraft higher and further out over the ocean. He mentioned how this meeting has been planned for two months and it is a voting meeting to vote on the 13 alternatives. He made a plea to look at each alternative and only postpone a decision to the January meeting if required. By Roberts Rules, a simple majority will pass, although he stated he was not comfortable with that. However, he also stated he was not comfortable or ready to support voting based on a ⅔ majority at this time. He stated that if we can't find a solution here, he doubts whether we should even proceed to Phase 2. He was also concerned with the emails that have been going back and forth since it seemed like things were getting out of control.

Ralph was followed by Jerry Falbo who was going to moderate the event tonight and try to exercise some control. Jerry mentioned recent hostile emails and said that he hoped everyone could respect each others position. He stated we have 29 community representatives in total. A total of 23 were present in person tonight and two were represented by proxy (Dedham & Roslindale). Roxbury, Everett, Swampscott, and Nahant were not present. For voting purposes, a simple majority will be 13. He also noted that each speaker will have three minutes maximum per motion and can speak up to three times. He mentioned that we will adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m. and will have a break at 7:30 p.m. He also mentioned the possibility of a motion to postpone the meeting until January.

Motion #1 was immediately made by the Beacon Hill representative, Darryl Pomicter and seconded. After some discussion and revisions the motion put forward was as follows:

MOTION #1: Move that the Boston Overflight Noise Study include Beacon Hill, Charlestown, Chinatown, Back Bay, Bay Village and the rest of inner city downtown Boston to same degree as surrounding communities to be included in the independent noise consultant review document.

Much discussion followed and focused on the lack of grid points in certain neighborhoods. Major discussion continued for quite a while and focused on including all other areas and neighborhoods in the City of Boston. The consultants mentioned that the grid points were initially selected based on where change was to be expected. Consultants agreed that grid points will be added in the Phase 2 analysis. One comment was that in lieu of extra grid points the CAC would accept the Independent Consultants report mentioning these areas.

A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Motion #2 was put forward to vote on Alternative 9 as follows:

MOTION #2: Shift Alternative 9 to Phase 2 of the Boston Overflight Noise Study.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION #2: Discuss each of the alternatives and vote only on those that have no objections during the discussion.

SECOND AMENDMENT TO MOTION #2: Postpone voting on Alternative 9 until January 17 meeting.

Much discussion was undertaken on this motion and amendments including the change to the wording of the various motions. At first, a suggestion was undertaken to amend the agenda, but this was not accepted by J. Falbo. This started a long and drawn out discussion and/or pleas to continue the discussion on each and every alternative. A long drawn out discussion occurred to either postpone the decision on Alternative 9, or to kill it entirely.

The Quincy representative made a passionate plea to delay a vote until January 17 and to present data in clear and simple terms. The Hull rep liked the grid presentation by Jon Woodward, but had a big problem with the maps. He thought impacts could occur and not show up on the maps. Quincy wanted some sort of cumulative impact before voting on each of the alternatives and a question by the Jamaica Plain representative was put forth as to whether they could have another meeting before January 17, to discuss the pros and cons for each alternative. Jon Woodward answered yes, but it would have to be on the evening before the January 17 meeting.

At some point, the Amendment to Motion #2 was temporarily tabled until Alternative 9 was discussed and settled.

The Brookline rep wanted to have Lexington, Concord, Avon, Bedford and some other western communities present and informed before voting on Alternative 9.

At this point Alternative 9 was discussed in detail by the PC and IC.

As presented - Alternative 9: Remove the 75,000 pound weight restriction on the west downwind to Runways 4R/L.

Steve Smith discussed the alternative and Jon Woodward discussed the noise related impacts. The IC recommended moving Alternative 9 to Phase 2 since an EIS would be required.

Heated discussion continued on Alternative 9, with South Boston not being in favor since they would receive the greatest perceived impact. A vote to close debate was initiated and was carried. The first and second Amendments to Motion #2 were withdrawn.

The committee voted on the original motion and a roll call vote was held and the motion was defeated unanimously. Therefore, Alternative 9, in its present form, was dropped from further consideration.

The discussion began on jet departure alternatives.

At this point a motion was made for Alternative 1/14/15 as follows:

MOTION #3: The Chelsea representative moved to recommend Alternative 1/14/15 to Massport for implementation.

Alternative 1/14/15 was discussed in detail by the PC and IC.

As presented - Alternatives 1/14/15: Initiate RNAV and conventional takeoffs to higher altitude from Runway 4R.

Steve Smith discussed the alternative and Jon Woodward discussed the impacts which were minimal and Jon recommended that this alternative be moved forward for implementation.

Minimal discussion followed. A call was made for a vote and a roll call vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously.

At this point a motion was made for Alternative 2/14/15 as follows:

MOTION #4: Move to recommend Alternative 2/14/15 to Massport for implementation.

At this point Alternatives 2/14/15 were discussed in detail by the PC and IC.

As presented - Alternative 2/14/15: Initiate RNAV and conventional takeoffs to higher altitude from Runway 9.

Steve Smith discussed the alternative and Jon Woodward discussed the impacts which were considered greater than the previous alternative. The IC recommended that this alternative be moved forward for implementation. Major discussion on this alternative occurred including the need for cumulative impacts.

At this point in the evening it was noted that the time allocated was running short.

A new motion was introduced as follows:

MOTION #5: Move to consider Alternatives 2/3/5/7 together at the January 17 meeting.

A vote was held and the motion was carried unanimously by a show of hands.

The meeting adjourned around 9:30 p.m.