

**Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS)
PMT/CAC “Mini-Summit”**

MEETING SUMMARY

Date: February 25, 2009
Time: 10:00 AM-1:00 PM
Location: Massport LOC

ATTENDEES (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Terry English	FAA
Gail Lattrel	FAA
Flavio Leo	Massport
Betty Desrosiers	Massport
Jerry Falbo	CAC (Winthrop)
Ralph Dormitzer	CAC (Cohasset)
Wig Zamore	CAC (Somerville)
<u>VIA PHONE</u>	
Stephen Smith	PC (Ricondo & Associates, Inc.)
Jon Woodward	IC (Landrum and Brown)

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

Name	Affiliation
Alan Reed	FAA-Recorder
<u>VIA PHONE:</u>	
Richard Doucette	FAA
Bernice Mader	CAC (Quincy)
Ron Hardaway	CAC (East Boston)
Steve Lathrop	CAC (Hull)
Declan Boland	CAC (Hingham)
Maura Zlody	CAC (Boston)
John Williams	Ricondo & Associates, Inc.

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

Individuals	Files
Attendees	Project File

1. Opening Remarks

Steve Smith began by stating that the meeting would be operated similarly to PMT calls and who would be the active participants:

Stephen Smith	Flavio Leo	Betty Desrosiers
Gail Lattrel	Ralph Dormitzer	Wig Zamore
Jon Woodward	Terry English	Jerry Falbo

Anyone else on the phone would be muted after attendance is taken. There will be an opportunity after the agenda is covered, to ask questions or make comments.

Terry English added that as in previous meetings, the FAA will not comment on current litigation at BOS such as RWY 33L. Steve also announced that this meeting will be recorded-primarily to draft notes. Terry noted that the meeting is being recorded for business reasons, that the recording is considered a draft and not a transcript of the meeting and that this procedure is not intended to be precedent-setting.

2. Agenda (Attachment 1, Final BLANS Phase 2 Mini-Summit Meeting Agenda)

3. Attendance

Attendance was taken by individual verbal announcement with Terry English noting that Alan Reed would be taking notes and he is involved with assisting in all mitigating measures, Boston. Steve noted all phone participants.

4. Overall Project Status

Steve stated he believed it was important for all to understand where we are in the project and referred all to the schedule (handout-**Attachment 2**, BLANS Project Schedule Update). Highlights are: CAC Goals and Objectives Statement (**Attachment 3**, Re: Information Regarding Goal and Objective Statements), complete Level 1 Screening Report (in "red")-April 2009. The red line represents the contract deadline of June 2009 for PC and IC.

Steve pointed out the percentages of tasks completed and deadlines and noted the near completion of Element 5 (anticipate completion of noise and air traffic by the end of the 1st quarter). He noted how close we are to budget limits for FAA coordination. He also noted that scope reassessment will cover some of the tasks that are spent or nearly spent already.

Jon Woodward explained that the IC is about 1/3 done with Project Management (no real action for the past year); Public Coordination and Involvement 50% (involves CAC); Phase 1 Implementation (very little expended), pending PC (RNAV implements) development (will be evaluating effectiveness) of procedures; Development of Conditions-around 95% (due to validity checking, noise modeling, etc); Runway Use/Scope of Services, 5% (been there for quite awhile). Wig inquired whether the schedule had been posted to the website and Steve confirmed that it had not. Terry recommended that the regular (schedule) updates be posted on the file-sharing portion of the website. Flavio concurred that we should forward this to CAC membership after PMT meetings. Steve concurred (**ACTION ITEM**).
Project Status portion of the Agenda complete.

5. Major Project Issues

a. Decision-Making Authority

Terry stated that Ralph and Jerry and other CAC members had requested flexibility in the topics of the agenda-and Terry concurred.

Ralph went on to explain that he believed that the purpose of this meeting was to move forward with those items which allows the study to move forward. He believes the perceptions are: there is a loss of confidence on both sides of the ability to accomplish anything. The Goals and Objectives Statement is a hindrance to progress. The goal today and this meeting are to progress forward.

Jerry stated his position as “Temporary Interim President” of the CAC and reflected the partnership with Massport and the FAA. He would like both entities to respect the decision-making role of the CAC, but does understand the FAA’s right and obligation to rule on safety issues. The CAC believes everything else is open to discussion and negotiation. Starting off with the September 12, 2002 letter from the former FAA airports manager, the word “partners” is used three times and in the ROD, the word “jointly” (implying the CAC and FAA role) is used and his understanding is that the FAA’s role is that of “facilitator” between the CAC and Massport. Jerry stated that he and others within the CAC do not believe their roles in the decision-making process of identifying acceptable mitigating measure recommendations, Phase 2 have been honored (in accordance with the ROD).

Jerry also believes the CAC should be able to take advantage of having expert advisors of their choice to participate in meetings, to match the expertise of the FAA and Massport, to level the playing field. He acknowledged the national depth of the study and believes the process has been slowed by trivial protocol, noting that he doesn’t have time to have members of the CAC to come to him directly for matters relating to the study.

Jerry brought up the fact that the majority of the CAC does not approve of fanning. Terry noted fanning can’t arbitrarily be taken off the table without some type of standard to measure it against, leading to the mitigation in process. Jerry believes the standard should be 50 DNL, which he believes would eliminate the fanning issue. Terry could not agree with that without performing a noise analysis. Research does show that fanning can reduce noise but it depends on the demographics. Steve concurred.

Jon understands these fanning concepts but is still concerned about exposing new people to noise at the risk of reduced noise for others in the contour area. Flavio pointed out that this is consistent with Terry’s earlier statement, which Jon concurred with. Terry pointed out that in the planning process, fanning would be considered when in the NEPA process, so it’s better to consider it now along with other alternatives.

Wig didn’t necessarily agree with the analysis: a discussion ensued about RWY 27 and its effect on over 6,000 residents. Terry mentioned that the data was 12 years old and couldn’t be relied upon. Wig and Jerry discussed an analysis that was performed which showed an increase in noise, due to fanning. Steve mentioned that he had never received such an analysis and pointed out that if the analysis was the basis for the CAC’s vote (on

fanning), it was critical and should be shared and the data could be used to support the CAC's conclusions.

Jon believed that the analysis that was being referred to was a demonstration of the relative relationship between single and fanned departure procedures that showed contours for 1) three aircraft on the existing departure route, 2) one each along centerline, fanned to the left, and right fanned over the Chelsea Creek area. This shows how a contour pattern would change if departures were fanned. There was never any quantitative analysis. Ralph recommended proceeding with CAC Goals and Objectives (GAO).

b. CAC Goals and Objectives

Flavio mentioned that he had seen the Goals statement and that the FAA (Terry) thought it was a good start. Ralph said he had to deal with the fanning issue...Flavio reiterated that the NEPA process would demand a fanning discussion and that he wanted to address those details now.

Terry wanted to establish the validity of whether the CAC had voted on the G & O and questioned its origination. Jerry confirmed it was a memo from the IC and that he had several emails suggesting its adoption, but didn't know whether it had been voted on. There was also confusion about the document itself-whether it was supposed to be an "objectives and needs" or "goals and objectives" statement. Jerry believed it was two or three months before this alone was resolved. Terry apologized for the confusion and questioned whether the CAC could vote on the document through email or other means. Jerry acknowledged that March 31 could be a potential voting date with the CAC meeting. Ralph requested to move on with the document review.

Terry suggested going through the G&O, without analyzing each item, while Ralph suggested covering as much as possible. Referring to the italicized top portion of the G & O, Ralph noted that this is as qualitative a statement as the CAC could get. Terry stated that the G&O was submitted to legal, environmental, and ATO for review and the FAA may use it for reference. Gail added, that much like in Phase 1, an informational assessment by the FAA on the G&O statement will help the CAC to tailor their decision-making process in the future, with all agreeing that this process may not be what the CAC wants to hear, but can use the information for further deliberation.

Ralph proceeded to read the Goals statement, which he believed was a very good reflection of the CAC position. Flavio acknowledged the complexity of problems suggested by Ralph, imbedded into the varying objectives and reiterated the FAA's efforts to go beyond normal protocols to assist, especially with the amount of money being spent to help. Being responsible stewards of resources, re-scoping Phase 1 decisions will be wasteful as we proceed. Terry added that the FAA is trying to guide the CAC through a complex process, knowing that we are now in the planning phase and we don't want the CAC to have any false expectations: once the NEPA process begins, the ability to change will not be there. Flavio also noted that "flagged" items can be revisited and fanning may drop out as well.

Betty asked Jerry whether there had been any CAC discussion about where procedural impacts would be highest and lowest, noting the controversial nature of the subject. Jon went on to talk about how different noise levels can be derived from taking various “slices” of contour lines or decibel areas to measure effects. Betty noted the level of sophistication now available in measuring noise, that wasn’t available when this study began and believes the ability to “slice and dice” the data will be helpful when addressing the communities and impacts.

Steve wanted to clarify that meeting the objectives (or steps) of the G&O, would in effect accomplish the goals of the CAC, with the data (among other things) given. Ralph asked Steve for an example. Terry interjected clarification of the term “objective” as used by Steve-annotated as “resolutions” (page 4) is the operative term. Jon also wanted to clarify that “potential resolutions” was the preferred IC and CAC term over “recommendations”. Steve announced he would use the term “suggestions”, provided by IC in the intro to the memo. Steve gave an example (potential resolution number 5) of how one of the objectives could be accomplished and asked if he was correct in his assumption.

Terry asked again whether or not the CAC had adopted these potential resolutions and how the FAA would assess them as a metric. Jerry and Ralph reiterated the process used to get the G&O and what statements reflected the CAC’s qualitative objectives. Flavio reflected on the previous screening process used and how Massport and the FAA will have to decide the best courses of action to allocate resources based on CAC preferences and available alternatives.

Wig mentioned that a third critical area to address is the baseline, considering population and noise. Terry mentioned that safety would come prior to base-lining. Steve expects noise results to be completed by the end of March, with the report available in April, as the schedule reflects (which will include a detailed population analysis) (ACTION ITEM). The baseline will be based on 2005 information (future year, no action) and current protocol. Wig and Flavio noted the importance of including supplemental data, based on recent activity. Steve clarified that the meaning of “future year, no action” and Level 2 screening: 1) define the measures and 2) quantify the measures. Level 3 would cover a detailed assessment/analysis.

Flavio questioned Steve whether the order in which operations are performed could be re-scoped. Steve confirmed this noting the two year lapse in which it was written. Ralph pointed out that the number of alternatives exceeds what is budgeted for with the introduction of alternatives suggested by the elected officials. Flavio and Ralph discussed how the alternatives would be filtered through the screening process, with the CAC receiving a memo with changes (added or subtracted from Level 1).

Betty added that a full re-scoping discussion is inappropriate at this time and that the baseline population and noise impact analysis should reflect current utilization of RWY 33, RWY 27. Without this, a valid judgment about noise impacts is irrelevant. Wig

noted that a comparison of 2005 activity with current activity would be the only way a valid analysis could be completed. Betty concurred and requested that the PC and IC accelerate to Level 3, the population and noise analysis based on data from 2005 and current levels (with possible 2008-2010 data [determined by the consulting team as cost effective and representing reliable current levels], supplemented by Massport), which is consistent with re-scoping protocols. This will reflect activity in the northwest and include RNAV procedures (ACTION ITEM-April '09).

The group discussed scheduling to go over the G&O statement. Terry motioned that the G&O statement could be used in conjunction with the Level 1 screening final draft report. Flavio reviewed **Action Items**:

- Consulting team will develop a strategy to get baseline and budget with an April deadline
- FAA will provide feedback to the CAC for the G&O statement
- revisit alternatives
- Steve mentioned this would require a scope re-assessment (understanding the need to stay within the budget).
- the 8-10 alternatives suggested by the CAC and 10 recommendations from elected officials-CAC to vote on them.

Referencing a “30 foot wall”, Flavio wanted to highlight whether some of the more impractical recommendations would be considered (the wall requiring an environmental assessment) in an attempt to filter out items realistically being considered, during the CAC’s deliberations for alternatives. The group decided to include the PC and IC as part of a projected March 16, 2009, 10 AM-2 PM, PMT/CAC Telecon to discuss the G&O-Level 1 Screening and the elected officials recommendations (ACTION ITEM). Items to include for agenda:

- Updated Level 1 Screening Report-w/FAA responses to IC comments, from the May meeting
- FAA/PC written comments on the G&O
- FAA determinations on elected officials’ recommendations

Betty noted that fanning needs to be included (despite initial rejection by the CAC) as part of the screening process. Jerry asked Jon whether shifting to other noise levels (such as baseline 50 DNL, 55 DNL, etc.) to try to eliminate any consideration of fanning, would help. Jon explained that without specific criteria to be analyzed, this question cannot be qualitatively answered.

c. Communication Protocol
(Established with the above discussion)

IV. Level 1 Screening Report

The group agreed that the March 16 meeting will cover this.

V. Scope Reassessment

Steve reported that in June, 2009, the contract expires. PC will adjust baseline scope, reallocate budget to meet known variables, coordinate with FAA (based on project priorities), coordinate with IC, forward back to FAA for review, provide preliminary draft to PMT, send adjustments out to BOS/TAC and CAC membership for review, conference call for changes, and then finalize. We would have a final adjusted scope, budget, and schedule to submit to Massport by May 1, 2009 (ACTION ITEM-PC). Any required amendments would be made by June, 2009. Contract amendments referred are those between: FAA/Massport, CAC/Massport, Ricondo/Massport, IC/CAC.

Massport will work with the PC on the quick baseline turnaround addendum (budget).

Terry and Steve identified tasks that will be delegated (ACTION ITEMS):

- FAA (Alan Reed) will maintain the Document Record
- FAA (Jon Harris) will design **new** RNAV procedures

Ralph wanted to ensure that comparisons between expected and actual RNAV procedures would be recorded. Terry stated that FAA would provide the PC/IC with any adjustments in RNAV designs, as soon as everything is finalized. She said that the FAA had to reevaluate the RNAV designs initially submitted to the IC for review as a result of new national criteria applicable to the entire country-independent of this study. This caused about a three week delay in processing. Terry gave an update of currently considered procedures and noted that we are still in the window of acceptance. Jon indicated that this assessment is incorporated into the existing IC scope under Task 3.2.

VI. Summarize Action Items, Responsibility, and Deadlines

Meeting notes should be completed by March 6-Alan (ACTION ITEM). Alan just wanted to make it clear that the draft would be judged by accuracy only. Distribution would ultimately be to FAA, Massport, and CAC membership. Minutes will be finalized around March 10 (ACTION ITEM).

FAA will circulate packets of alternatives prior to March 16 (ACTION ITEM).

PC Scope Reassessment-May 1, IC scope reassessment shortly after (ACTION ITEM).

VII. Observer Comments/Questions

Flavio:

Respects the CAC membership and appreciates the volunteerism. He explained his perspective about attendance and protocols that must be followed to give meetings order. The teleconference was open to all the CAC membership. Terry, Bernice, and Flavio were involved in setting the meeting up at the request of the CAC.

Gail:

Concurred with Flavio's assessment above. Also, she believed that those in a leadership position should be seated at the table and it has worked well in the past. This is a partnership of collaboration, unlike any other in the country. Gail recognizes the feeling of inequity experienced by the CAC membership but wants to reassure them that the

FAA will do its best, with such a large group, to work with them. She noted that meetings such as this are far more effective in solving issues than answering emails in a random fashion.

Jerry:

Jerry wasn't initially aware of the communications protocol. He noted the difficulty in coming into his current position, conflict within the CAC, and the lack of communication. He would like his position to be temporary. He would like to be able to bring in his advisors with a level of expertise matching that of FAA and Massport.

Terry:

Noted that the FAA agreed to send notes out on this call to CAC members-this wasn't done in the past. Also, the website is available and being monitored for questions. Terry agreed to help Jerry in answering emails (ACTION ITEM).

Steve opened up the phone line for additional comments:

Bernice Mader:

She was confused about the admission of external advisors to the meetings and challenged the PMT to allow them access to them. She said that she asked for this meeting and she did not ask for this to be a PMT meeting. She feels as though the CAC is under-represented by experts as compared to the organizational charts of the PMT. She feels inequity, as defined by the partnership. She acknowledges that safety should be the primary consideration of all decisions. She asked for clarification on previous CAC voting: Jerry and Flavio discussed this with Bernice, who said she would send Flavio the documents in question (ACTION ITEM). Bernice reflected on her efforts as the CAC President. Terry, Flavio, and Gail addressed Bernice's concerns about meeting protocols and go-forward strategies. Bernice also said she only had three items on the agenda when we started (and) that (it) was meant to be (a) process issue meeting only. Bernie said she would have suggested that a certain amount of hours a week be set aside by Massport and FAA individuals to take phone calls.

Steve reminded everyone that others wanted an opportunity to speak and that he needed to move on to the next individual.

Declan Boland:

Thought the meeting was very productive. He believes the CAC is building a consensus with recent developments. He directed a question to Jon re: Phase 1. Terry addressed the question and Declan was satisfied he could read about it in the minutes.

Maura Zlody:

Thought the meeting was very productive. She did not have an agenda and would like to be on the distribution list for the agenda, attachments that go with it, and draft minutes. The group agreed to distribute these items prior to meetings (ACTION ITEM).

Ron Hardaway:

Gave an explanation for the standing 30 foot wall, discussed earlier and commented about how well the meeting went. Flavio commented that the wall is still part of the CAC recommendations. (JMW note: The CAC's suggested measure is not for a 30 foot high wall, but rather for a wall that reduces noise. There are several such barrier suggestions among the CAC's measures).

Steve Lathrop:

Steve questioned the type of meeting that was supposed to take place here today. He commented on the current GAO and his impression of its intent. Jerry provided an explanation. Steve commented about the EIS and voiced concern about baseline issues. He also believed it was important that the FAA share differences in any "new" criteria for RNAV development. Steve, Jerry, and Flavio discussed CAC meeting schedules.

Richard Doucette:

Requested that Gail or Terry forward copies of letters Jerry referred to, (perhaps from Vince Scarano), indicating the concept of a partnership and working together.

Steve closed the phone lines.

There was a short discussion within the group about the conduct of the meeting.

Adjournment was at 1:20 PM.

ACTION ITEMS:

1) Terry recommended that the regular (schedule) updates be posted on the file-sharing portion of the website. Flavio concurred that we should forward this to CAC membership after PMT meetings. Steve concurred.

2) Steve expects noise results to be completed by the end of March, with the report available in April, as the schedule reflects (which will include a detailed population analysis

3) Betty concurred and requested that the PC and IC accelerate to Level 3, the population and noise analysis based on data from 2005 and current levels (with possible 2008-2010 data [determined by the consulting team as cost effective and representing reliable current levels], supplemented by Massport), which is consistent with re-scoping protocols. This will reflect activity in the northwest and include RNAV procedures -April '09.

4) Terry motioned that the G&O statement could be used in conjunction with the Level 1 screening final draft report. Flavio reviewed Action Items:

- ***Consulting team will develop a strategy to get baseline and budget with an April deadline***
- ***FAA will provide feedback to the CAC for the G&O statement***
- ***revisit alternatives***

- *Steve mentioned this would require a scope re-assessment (understanding the need to stay within the budget).*
 - *the 8-10 alternatives suggested by the CAC and 10 recommendations from elected officials-CAC to vote on them.*
- 5) The group decided to include the PC and IC as part of a projected March 16, 2009, 10 AM-2 PM, PMT/CAC Telecon to discuss the G&O-Level 1 Screening and the elected officials recommendations*
- 6) We would have a final adjusted scope, budget, and schedule to submit to Massport by May 1, 2009*
- 7) Terry and Steve identified tasks that will be delegated:*
- *FAA (Alan Reed) will maintain the Document Record*
 - *FAA (Jon Harris) will design new RNAV procedures*
- 8) Meeting notes should be completed by March 6-Alan. Minutes will be finalized around March 10.*
- 9) PC Scope Reassessment-May 1, IC scope reassessment shortly after.*
- 10) Terry agreed to help Jerry in answering emails from CAC members.*
- 11) Bernice asked for clarification on previous CAC voting: Jerry and Flavio discussed this with Bernice, who said she would send Flavio the documents in question.*
- 12) Maura did not have an agenda and would like to be on the distribution list for the agenda, attachments that go with it, and draft minutes. The group agreed to distribute these items prior to meetings*

Attachments:

- 1, Final BLANS Phase 2 Mini-Summit Meeting Agenda
- 2, BLANS Project Schedule Update
- 3, Re: Information Regarding Goal and Objective Statements