#### Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

DATE: 8/18/ TIME: 4:30 p		Telephone Conversation Meeting Other
SUBJECT: Phase 2 Bi-Weekly Project Management Call		
SUMMARY PREPARED BY: Rick Peloquin		
DATE PREPARED: 7/29/08		
ATTENDEES (include affiliation):		
	Name	Affiliation
	Steve Smith	PC
	Jon Woodward	IC
	Terry English	FAA
	Gail Lattrell	FAA
	Bernice Mader	CAC (Quincy)
	Jerry Falbo	CAC (Winthrop)
	Flavio Leo	Massport
OBSERVERS (include affiliation):		
	Name	Affiliation
	Ron Hardaway	CAC (East Boston)
	Maura Zlody	City of Boston
	Ben Leone	Revere
	Ron Hardaway	East Boston
	Jean LoGiudice	FAA
COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:		
	Individuals	Files
	Project File BLANS Forum	

#### I. Attendance:

Steve Smith took attendance.

#### **II.** Approval of 7/28/08 Meeting Notes:

There were two changes to the 7/28/08 notes. Jean LoGiudice participated on last week's call, but her name was not on the list of attendees; her name was added. At the bottom of page two, the heading PC May 2008 Budget/Schedule Status was updated to PC June 2008 Budget/Schedule Status. The notes were then approved.

#### III. FAA BLANS Status Letter:

T. English sent a letter to B. Mader/CAC on 8/13/08 which outlined the status of the BLANS (regarding budget, schedule, etc.) and the position of the FAA, which was coordinated with all other businesses of the FAA. Therefore, the letter reflects the agencies position. This letter also stated that the FAA would like the CAC to consider some additional measures for Level 1

#### Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

screening that were identified as a result of the elected officials meeting. B. Mader indicated that CAC is drafting a response letter to FAA.

There was discussion about the project schedule and CAC concerns related to the causes for the slippage. B. Mader asked PC about the effect of Wyle's delay and was this accounted. S. Smith clarified that there has been no delay on Wyle's part for Phase 2, and no technical work has impacted the Phase 2 schedule; the delay incurred by Wyle occurred in Phase 1. S. Smith reiterated that it is not the fault of one single party. The project is complex, and every attempt should be made by PMT to find ways to adjust project scope in order to reduce schedule delay. One of the critical items needed to move forward in a more efficient manner is a set of clear goals and objectives for this project. B. Mader stated that some public officials have the impression that the delay in schedule is because of the CAC.

J. Falbo mentioned his concern about the statement in the letter related to complying with FAA policies. His interpretation of this statement is that application of such policies will hinder this project's ability to evaluate measures that may be deemed "out of the box." He is concerned that application of such policies, as what occurred in the past, will prevent new ideas from being evaluated. T. English emphasized that it was not the FAA's intention in the statement made. The FAA will adhere to those policies that relate to safety, efficiency and NEPA process; as well as the statements made in the Record of Decision. In no way does this inhibit the ability to look over and discuss new ideas.

There was also discussion about the function and responsibilities of BOS/TAC. B. Mader advised the PMT that the role of the committee was never explained to the CAC. S. Smith clarified that BOS/TAC was established to provide technical advice and does not make any decisions; the final recommendations for implementation are the responsibility of the CAC. The BOS/TAC was originally put together for FAA, Massport and available CAC members to meet and discuss technical details. Information discussed was then to be shared with other members of the specific organization. At the end of Phase 1, CAC members who were not members of BOS/TAC were concerned about their ability to attend and observe conversations. As a result, the BOS/TAC meeting was reduced from 8 hours to 4 hours and is scheduled during evening hours. Over time, the BOS/TAC meetings became more of an informational meeting than a technical working group.

The primary goal of the project was also discussed during this topic. The primary goal as stated in the ROD is to reduce noise around BOS. The CAC feels that the process has been too loose and without definition. B. Mader specifically stated her concerns related to an undefined process for the project. S. Smith advised and sent B. Mader a copy of the Project Plan that may perhaps address her concerns. This was handed out to BOS/TAC and CAC members at the beginning of Phase 2. F. Leo disagreed with "loose process" opinion and said that they have been trying to stay on schedule and under budget via a clear process involving key decision milestones. G. Lattrell also disagreed with the "loose process" statement.

Action Items: (1) T. English to send out some documents to the CAC to help describe what a Purpose and Need statement entails.

#### **IV.** Phase 1 Implementation Monitoring:

#### Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

The CAC inquired about the Phase 1 measures that were implemented on February 14, 2008 and wanted to know if these flights were being monitored to ensure they were abiding by the new guidelines. S. Smith advised that no monitoring was taking place, but is scoped under Task 3.2 where IC is to work with CAC to derive informative reports that may be developed from the Massport's operations monitoring system data. F. Leo said that Massport could provide data to the consultants that would help determine if these guidelines were being followed, but would not do any of the analysis. Massport already provides reports such as that for the Runway 27 RNAV departure review. S. Smith reported that the intention of the reports is to summarize the data in a manner that CAC can assess and arrive to quick conclusions without the need for detailed analysis. J. Woodward stated his concern with starting this task until all Phase 1 measures are implemented, and that doing so may be premature. B. Mader would like to see an evaluation of the airspace to see the results of all of the proposed measures implemented. T. English asked B. Mader about sending the response to the CAC's August 4<sup>th</sup> letter regarding monitoring; B. Mader instructed FAA to hold from sending the response until further notice.

## V. Status Update:

## a. Action Item Status:

S. Smith provided updates on the action items from the prior meeting. All action items were addressed as follows:

#### i. <u>Level 1 Screening Report</u>

Level 1 screening is currently on hold based on reasons outlined in FAA letter to CAC.

### ii. Purpose and Need Topical Paper

The CAC is still working on determining its goals and objectives as they relate to the Purpose and Need topical paper. The FAA needs this information before moving forward with Level 1 screening.

#### iii. Elected Officials Meeting

The Hynes letter and the list of attendees have been posted to the website and distributed to CAC members. As mentioned before, FAA requested that CAC consider the additional measures proposed by elected officials.

#### iv. <u>2005 Noise Mo</u>deling

In process/moving forward to the next step of profile assessment.

#### v. <u>2005 TAAM Modeling</u>

The calibration is complete and the baseline review has been started.

#### vi. 6/25 CAC Meeting Notes

These notes are being reviewed by CAC. Currently, S. Smith has not received any comments on the meeting notes and has asked B. Mader to check with the members to see if there will be any submitted.

#### VI. BOS/TAC Meeting Schedule:

This topic was not discussed due to the call running longer the allocated time.

#### VII. Public Inquiry Protocol:

This topic was not discussed due to the call running longer the allocated time.

## Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

# VIII. Miscellaneous:

There were no miscellaneous items discussed due to the call running longer the allocated time.

The next PMT call is scheduled on 9/2/08 at 4:30 pm Eastern.