

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

DATE: 11/29/11

TIME: 4:30 p.m. Eastern



Telephone Conversation



Meeting



Other

SUBJECT: Phase 2 Bi-Weekly Project Management Call

SUMMARY PREPARED 11/29/2011

ATTENDEES (include affiliation):

| Name | Affiliation |
|---------------|------------------|
| Steve Smith | PC |
| Jon Woodward | IC |
| Terry English | FAA |
| Flavio Leo | Massport |
| Sandra Kunz | CAC (Braintree) |
| Jerry Falbo | CAC (Winthrop) |
| Wig Zamore | CAC (Somerville) |

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

| Name | Affiliation |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Ron Hardaway | CAC (East Boston) |
| Darryl Pomicter | CAC (Boston, Beacon Hill) |
| Alan Reed | FAA |

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

| Individuals | Files |
|--------------|-------|
| Project File | |
| BLANS Forum | |
| CAC | |
| BOS/TAC | |

I. Attendance:

Steve Smith took attendance.

II. Level 2 Report/Elected Representative Update Letters:

S. Smith advised that some headers were missing in the Level 2 report attachments and the incorrect memorandum regarding INM modeling ground measures was attached to the Level 2 report. The issues have been fixed and an email will be sent once the update is posted on the BLANS forum and on the public website.

T. English also advised that letters to elected representatives should be sent in mid-December.

III. Level 3 Process:

T. English voiced her concerns regarding Level 3 and wants to avoid any hurdles (e.g. political or NEPA compliance issues) going forward. She explained that her concerns are related to perception and digression. Regarding perception, she mentioned the potential for CAC selective non-acceptance of INM results. Regarding digressions, she mentioned that certain CAC decisions need to be consistent with goals and objectives (G&O) of CAC. In order to avoid hurdles during this process,

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

she would like to have the CAC provide clear documentation as to why a certain measure doesn't meet the goals and objectives of CAC or if the CAC determines something is inaccurate. Essentially, a consistent application of the goals and objectives should be used when voting.

J. Woodward said that his understanding of the CAC's decision in January 2012 is to consolidate some, if not all measures, not to decide on what to recommend for implementation. It will be the cumulative alternative that will go through the NEPA process.

S. Smith reiterated that any decisions that are made by CAC should be well-documented and point back to the G&O. There are two key decision points in Level 3: what measures to include in a cumulative alternative and decision to recommend it for implementation.

F. Leo suggested that CAC use a checklist of the protocol that should be used when making decisions.

W. Zamore said that there are "large cracks" in the NEPA, because concerns (i.e. cumulative effects) have not been addressed.

S. Kunz said that there are not many questions regarding the noise analysis among CAC members, but the problem is more about whether to apply certain measures. A specific measure could help a small amount of people and hurt many more. She said that the CAC would likely have issues with F-HH, RNAV tracks, etc. S. Kunz asked what would happen if CAC decided not to select F-HH if FAA ultimately wants to implement an RNAV for Runway 33L.

T. English said that if F-HH is not accepted, it would be separate project with an operational purpose and need instead of a noise reduction if FAA determined to implement an RNAV for Runway 33L.

IV. Measures F-HHv3 and F-R FAA Investigation:

In response to requests from CAC, J. Harris has created several designs modifications to F-HHv3, which have been sent to TRACON and the tower. A telecon is scheduled for December 6, 2011 to determine if these new designs are operationally feasible and/or meet the RNAV criteria. If these designs are subsequently accepted by the CAC, it will take approximately 4-5 weeks to noise model.

W. Zamore requested that T. English send the conceptual designs after they are approved operationally, but before they are actually modeled. T. English said that she would do this as part of the standard coordination process..

S. Smith mentioned that the expenditures for Level 3 have already reached 75% of the total budget. He will review the scope to see if other budgets can be reallocated in order to fund the additional noise modeling related to the modified measures.

V. Schedule:

S. Smith briefly discussed Element 6 of the provided quarterly schedule update and reminded folks that the contract expires at the end of the year.

F. Leo informed call participants that Massport is in the process of extending contracts with PC and CAC until June 2012. He also mentioned that it is only a term extension and there will not be any budget increases. If the contract expires before the extension is in place, he said that work should still be performed.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

T. English provided an update on the high performance jet issue related to Runway 15R and 22L/R RNAV. It was expected the issue may be addressed by December 2011. FAA is now estimating an evaluation of the procedure will take place mid-January.

There was discussion about PRAS. J. Woodward said that there are mixed opinions regarding PRAS amongst the CAC. The sentiment during the call was that PRAS would likely not be favored by CAC and that those funds could possibly be freed up to be used for other measures. S. Smith informed that the budget for PRAS is minimal and wouldn't be significant if reallocated. He said that a determination of whether or not CAC will consider PRAS is needed. He also thinks that it would benefit the CAC to hold a meeting to make its determination on PRAS. J. Woodward said that an internet vote would be sufficient to decide on whether or not to use PRAS, but should not take place at the same time CAC is deciding on which measures to recommend for implementation.

W. Zamore suggested that we get through Level 3 and then have a runway allocation discussion afterwards.

Regarding D. Pomicter's request for the CAB regulation, T. English said that she would provide the CAB regulation to D. Pomicter and S. Kunz as soon as she receives a copy.

VI. Misc.:

Because there was some time leftover, S. Smith opened the phone lines to the observers.

R. Hardaway had two comments.

1. He would like to hear from the Tower to determine if any changes are being made. He would like to know if there are any new plans on how to allocate runways. T. English responded by saying that there aren't any changes ongoing at this time.
2. Ground noise and how it's settled is a local issue. F. Leo said that a letter issued under Massport's CEO will be sent to J. Falbo and S. Kunz. This letter will describe the commitment to move forward on the encouragement measures discussed in Level 2.

D. Pomicter had the following comments:

1. He disagreed with T. English's earlier comment regarding the approved noise modeling results. The CAC is reviewing the Level 3 Noise Modeling results, but has not "approved" or accepted those results. He also said more discussion is needed to better understand the census centroid basis of population counts and to refine several measures to decrease negative noise contour shift counts, and to consider population-weighted analysis
2. He said that PRAS was an earlier agreed attempt which failed because of non-implementation and non-compliance and that Massport, FAA, and CAC reporting and enforcement and compliance efforts are necessary to supersede PRAS, as BLANS enters Phase II, Level 3 and beyond BLANS.
3. He agreed with T. English's concern regarding the potential for some BLANS decisions to be inconsistent or influenced by individual concerns. He added that the four revised Departure Measures are all subject to individual concerns internally and externally, and went into detail about each measure.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

He concluded by stating that we must refine the Measures and Noise Modeling analysis and presentation of these Measures to improve results, relevant understanding, and decision making. It requires further balancing for positive Level 3 results, acceptance, and implementation.

The call was adjourned.