

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study
Logan International Airport

DATE: 1/24/2012

TIME: 4:30 p.m. Eastern



Telephone Conversation



Meeting



Other

SUBJECT: Phase 2 Bi-Weekly Project Management Call

SUMMARY PREPARED 1/26/2012

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)
Richard Doucette	FAA

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Ron Hardaway	CAC (East Boston)
Darryl Pomicter	CAC (Boston)
Alan Reed	FAA
Frank Saulsberry	FAA
Will Lyman	CAC (Jamaica Plain)
Maura Zlody	City of Boston
Bill Deignan	CAC (Cambridge Alternate)

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

Individuals	Files
Project File BLANS Forum CAC BOS/TAC	

I. Attendance & Approval of Notes:

Steve Smith took attendance. There were minor changes made to the previous call notes. The changes have been made and the notes were resent to PMT.

II. Level 3 Noise Measure Analysis: Centroid Investigation:

S. Smith mentioned that PC has sent the findings of the centroid investigation to IC. Overall, he said that out of the 11 centroids, PC only recommended that one be considered. J. Woodward concurred with these conclusions.

J. Falbo asked what the purpose is of moving the contour line. S. Smith responded by stating that there was no proposal to move anything. J. Falbo then asked about F-HH(v4). He wanted to

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

know where the changes occur, should this measure go into effect. S. Smith explained the changes in the procedure and said that downtown Boston would see the most relief from this measure and that there would be no effect on Winthrop.

Referring to measure F-Vv2, S. Kunz asked if it would help downtown or Beacon Hill. Steve explained that the intent of the measure was to help Beacon Hill, but it doesn't in terms of DNL. J. Woodward added that using the DNL, alone, to determine relief is too general because it may not show other benefits. He said that there are benefits of reducing the number of overflights over certain decibel levels. He also mentioned that the number of people exposed in the 45-50 DNL would be increased west and northwest of downtown. S. Smith said that from a DNL perspective, there is no benefit to downtown Boston and causes an increase of newly impacted areas elsewhere, so an imbalance exists.

F. Leo asked if analysis shows no DNL change in downtown, but a change in the newly exposed areas. S. Smith clarified. Essentially there was no registered DNL change in the positive, but a DNL change (albeit slight) was registered in the negative. There was more discussion regarding certain DNL levels. Since this topic was discussed at length, S. Smith had to interrupt to get the call back to the agenda.

III. Level 3 Schedule and Action Items:

a. Noise Model F-HH(v3) and F-R(v-2)

S. Smith mentioned that PC will be modeling the F-HH(v3) and F-R(v2). He also said that F-HH has actually been modified by the FAA, so technically, it would be version four that is modeled (F-HH[v4]).

W. Zamore asked if there is flexibility with the way point for the measure. S. Smith said that there probably wasn't.

b. CAC Decision Related to Measures to Select

S. Kunz said that the CAC is struggling over different issues with different various measures, so it can't make a decision at this time. She said that she isn't getting the feedback that she needs and has requested. Before a decision is made, she wants to have all the information available (benefits, disadvantages, understanding), so a sound decision can be made.

J. Woodward explained earlier in the call that the CAC cannot be expected to make a decision to move forward until it has the results from the other measures.

c. Schedule

S. Smith said that without the CAC decision, it would be difficult to plan the schedule. He mentioned that the PC's budget is already 80% spent and there wouldn't be anything left after June when the contract expires.

J. Woodward advised that IC's budget has been 92% spent.

S. Kunz asked what happens when the money runs out. F. Leo stated that he doesn't feel that the money is the issue. A lot of work has been done and it is now time for

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

the CAC to make its decision. If PC and IC agree on the data/results, it is up to CAC to hash out the details and make its decision.

T. English added that FAA is deferring to PC and IC for noise and centroid analysis expertise. She also mentioned that the funding for Alan Reed's position expires next Friday.

S. Smith said that he received the approval last week to start the noise modeling and hopes to have it done in about two weeks. Once completed, it will be sent to IC for review.

IV. Miscellaneous:

T. English advised that she is working with Alan before he leaves to get the BOS/TAC notes finalized from the October 21st meeting.

S. Smith opened up the call for comments.

D. Pomictier had several comments. A very brief summary is listed below.

He agreed with repeated earlier comments that the Noise Model results and analysis are not being understood by the CAC, and clarifications are necessary for understanding before decisions can be made. He added that he had gained confidence in the underlying Noise Model, but the presentation of results and analysis is insufficient—unclear, incomplete, distorted, and misleading. He felt that prompt actions to clarify can enable decisions to proceed expeditiously

1. Documents have become unwieldy, in great part due to the gratuitous use of color, which makes it difficult to distribute the bloated size, difficult to read the text and tables reversed in a dark field, and difficult and expensive to print legibly.
2. The CAC Goals and Objectives, from May 2009, are being quoted inaccurately.
3. The 2009 Noise Model Results, the actual basis for the 2015 forecast Noise Model baseline results, need to be shown.
4. The footnote has been omitted from the Noise Modeling Results Tables: Airplanes not arriving or departing Logan and all helicopters are not included in the noise model results.
5. For F-V(v2), it is understood that the 260 heading would be maintained to 2,000 MSL, but the modeled location of takeoff turn from 220 to 260 is not stated—what distance/altitude is it?
6. The FAA and IC recommending the CAC ignore the small changes in Noise Contour Lines Noise Model results remain wrong.
7. The CAC wishes to also consider the effects on population between noise contours. This can be done by weighting the changes by population and noise level, using the population associated with each grid point times the noise change at the grid point.

R. Hardaway suggested that the overlays in the exhibits be reduced to one page, so comparing and understanding them would be easier. He also mentioned that one item was left off the list. The effect of the center taxi was omitted.

M. Zlody said that the CAC needs to decide what it's going to do on any measures in which it disagrees with the conclusions.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

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

W. Lyman – J. Falbo, J. Woodward, and D. Pomicter discussed having a phone meeting earlier in the call. W. Lyman expressed interest in being on that call, if it happens. B. Deignan also expressed the same interest.

The call was adjourned.