

# DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

## Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

---

DATE: 03/13/07  
TIME: 12:00 p.m. EDT

Telephone Conversation  
 Meeting  
 Other

SUBJECT: Phase 2 Bi-Weekly Project Management Call

SUMMARY PREPARED BY: Chris Jones

DATE PREPARED: 03/13/07

PMT INVITEES (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Steve Smith	PC
Jon Woodward	IC
Gail Lattrell	FAA
Steve Kelly	FAA
Tina Gatewood	FAA
Flavio Leo	Massport
Sandra Kunz	Co-chair CAC
Jerry Falbo	Co-chair CAC

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Pat Reilly	FAA Airspace Redesign
Pete Nelson	FAA
Joe Davies	FAA BOS TRACON
Blossom Hoag	CAC (East Boston)
Marianne McCabe	CAC (Marshfield)
Steve Lathrop	CAC (Hull)
Declan Boland	CAC (Hingham)
Ralph Dormitzer	CAC (Cohasset)
Maura Zlody	City of Boston

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

Individuals	Files
Full BOS/TAC and CAC membership	

---

### **Introduction and Roll Call:**

Steve Smith made a preliminary roll call and briefly introduced the purpose and need for the Project Management Team (PMT) call and explained how the teleconference system works. He will issue a PMT call schedule prior to the next bi-weekly call.

### **Phase 2 Bi-Weekly PMT Teleconference Protocol:**

S. Smith stated that he will circulate a draft copy of the teleconference protocol to the PMT for their review following the call. He went on to explain that this will be a teleconference to address project management issues and that will not be conducted for the purpose of overall project related decision making. Steve explained what the PMT is and who the members are and explained that due to previously voiced concerns regarding project transparency, it was decided that the PMT call should

# DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

## Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

---

be opened up to members of the CAC and BOS/TAC for purposes of observation. He went on to explain the difference between meeting leaders and observers, the kind of items that will be covered. He then explained that if time permits, the floor will be opened following project management group discussions to provide observers an opportunity to comment should they so wish. The Project Consultant (PC) will be developing the call agenda; it will be distributed prior to the call, and will generally cover what has happened during the prior two weeks and what is planned to happen in the following two weeks. Call management is under the authority of the PC and silent mode, whereby observers will be muted while the project management team discusses items on the agenda. If there are any presentations to be given, call participants will be directed to a website, GoToMeeting.com that will be used for that purpose. This website is accessible to both PC and Mac users provided they have active internet connections. A one week notice will be provided prior to the first web presentation and the call may be started early in order to address any technical difficulties. The call times will be every other Tuesday at 12:00 p.m. Eastern Time and last for only one hour.

### **Project Status:**

Minimal work has thus far been completed on Phase 2 activities as contracts were delayed. S. Smith explained that the project status report attached to the agenda is only for PC activities. Independent Consultant (IC) activities will be combined with PC activities and included in the next project status report provided with the agenda for the next call that follows a completed month. The project status report will be issued only once a month.

### **Project Tasks Underway:**

S. Smith discussed each item on the progress report. The first item addressed was Task 1.1. He explained that the PC is currently creating new internal controls to ensure that work is being completed efficiently.

The second item addressed was Task 1.2, FAA coordination. S. Smith explained that the PMT call is covered under this task, as well as the preparation of exhibits at FAA request.

The third item covered was Task 1.3. S. Smith explained that work is being done to ensure assembly of a better document record. Record keeping is being undertaken diligently and will primarily be maintained electronically.

The fourth item covered was Task 5.2, fast time traffic simulation. S. Smith explained that existing conditions above Boston are being modeled using TAAM. He then went on to discuss several of the bullet points underlying this task in the progress report.

### **Anticipated Project Progress:**

Discussion then turned to anticipated project progress for the next two weeks.

### **Noise Modeling Protocol:**

S. Smith introduced discussion on the noise modeling protocol. The PC is in the process of drafting an internal protocol, which upon completion will go to the IC for review, and then to the BOS/TAC.

Jon Woodward then described the IC draft protocol as well as the process that lead to its development in detail. He hopes to call a meeting with the BOS/TAC to discuss the protocol and to finalize noise monitoring sites for Phase 2.

# DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

## Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

---

Marianne McCabe, CAC representative from Marshfield, asked whether the draft protocol is available for review and the IC agreed to send her a copy. The PC will continue to work on the noise modeling protocol, and anticipates having it completed for review by the time of the next PMT call.

Steve Lathrop, CAC representative from Hull, asked about quality of radar data used for noise modeling. S. Smith explained the process for evaluating the data and addressed several of Mr. Lathrop's questions on noise modeling. It was explained to Mr. Lathrop that the PC and IC will present the final findings to the BOS/TAC and there can be further discussion on the noise modeling protocol at that time. S. Smith told Mr. Lathrop that if he has any further concerns, he can address those to the IC prior to their review of PC's proposed protocol.

M. McCabe asked about the noise measurement study area selected by the IC, explaining her dissatisfaction with the area described. She stated that there are significant impacts outside this area and does not understand why they are not being included. Steve Kelly attempted to explain to Ms. McCabe that under Phase 1 there are no significant impacts in the area she described and that for purposes of federal law "significant impact" is a specific term of art. M. McCabe expressed disagreement with this characterization.

J. Woodward asked that CAC members send e-mail inquiries to their co-chairs for purposes of coordination. Discussion turned to coordination of requests for information. Jerry Falbo stated that he would like an opportunity to discuss the project in detail with the consultants so he can gain enough information to answer questions from CAC members. Allowing for this, should he get questions after that he is unable to answer, he can forward them on to the appropriate consultant team. Gail Lattrell explained that the co-chairs may also be able to refer some questions to the FAA or to Massport. There was further discussion on the budgetary impacts of requests for information. S. Smith reiterated that the CAC co-chairs should be the conduit through which further information is sought.

M. McCabe asked whether it was possible for a community with specific concerns to pay the consultant directly to specially address those issues. There was extensive discussion on this topic. Tina Gatewood explained that if a CAC represented community wants to pursue additional work that was not funded by the federal government under the scope they should go to the CAC to make their request. Funding would be worked out between the CAC and the community. Flavio Leo explained that the PC is under contract with Massport and there may be conflict issues were the town to attempt to contract separately with the PC.

J. Woodward stated that he does not anticipate a situation requiring special individuated analysis will arise as during Phase 1 a lot of specific work was conducted on behalf of the various communities depending upon the alternatives being analyzed. He offered Hull and Cohasset as examples.

Discussion turned to modification of the project scope to address the above described issue. Sandra Kunz suggested that if there is a potential conflict the community might choose to find its own consultant to do an independent evaluation. J. Woodward agreed that this was an option.

S. Lathrop expressed concern that the project budget was insufficient to complete all the necessary work. There was some discussion on this topic. G. Lattrell pointed out that the Phase 2 scope was drafted taking into consideration the experiences of Phase 1 and that both the scope and funding provided are more than adequate.

# DRAFT Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

## Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

---

S. Lathrop mentioned that as of yet the CAC has no meeting schedule. S. Kunz explained that she is currently developing a meeting schedule. There was some discussion on this topic before S. Smith explained that the CAC meeting schedule is a CAC matter and that it can either be added to the next meeting agenda or Mr. Lathrop can take it up with the CAC co-chairs after the call.

### **General Agenda for the BOS/TAC Meeting:**

This item was not addressed.

### **BOS/TAC Communication Protocol:**

This item was not addressed.

### **Proposed Agenda Items for Next Call:**

S. Smith requested that the PMT leaders suggest agenda items for the next PMT call. S. Kunz said the issue regarding individualized study for particular concerns as discussed needs to be addressed and reconciled.

J. Falbo stated that he has attempted to set up a meeting with the FAA to discuss the scope in greater detail. G. Lattrell will follow up with S. Kelly on this issue.

S. Lathrop asked that agenda items that will address communications, record keeping, and a CAC member forum be added to the agenda. S. Smith described the decision making protocol for BOS/TAC and welcomed Mr. Lathrop to review the scope of work in regards to what elements will be addressed in the protocol, which will require BOS/TAC consensus.

G. Lattrell requested that participants look at the scope of work prior to the next call.

Topic/Discussion	Action Item/Responsibility
As noted above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• G. Lattrell will follow up with S. Kelly on setting up a meeting between the FAA and J. Falbo.</li><li>• S. Smith will circulate a draft copy of the teleconference protocol to the PMT for their review.</li><li>• J. Woodward will send M. McCabe a copy of the draft noise modeling protocol.</li></ul>