

**Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS)  
Continuation of Phase 2 PMT/CAC “Mini-Summit”**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

Date: March 16, 2009  
Time: 10:00 AM-2:00 PM  
Location: Massport LOC

**ATTENDEES (include affiliation):**

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

**OBSERVERS (include affiliation):**

Name	Affiliation
Alan Reed	FAA-Recorder
Patrick Lally	Congressional Aide to Rep. Markey’s Office
John Stewart	CAC (S. Boston)
Sandra Kunz	CAC (Braintree)
Declan Boland	CAC (Boston)
Maura Zlody	CAC (Hingham)
Bernice Mader	CAC (Quincy)

**COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:**

Individuals	Files
Attendees	Project Files

***J. Falbo requested that future meetings be held at night and be limited to three hours in length. The group concurred that would be a good idea and be held at Massport. (ACTION ITEM).***

**I. ATTENDANCE**

Attendees stated their names and positions for the record; S. Smith announced who was on the phone line and noted that all observers on the phone line would be muted and as

new people join the telecon, they would be muted as well, until the line is open at the end of the meeting. T. English commented that A. Reed is recording (as noted in the last meeting) meeting notes and working on all mitigating items and G. Hufnagle may show up at the meeting as an Observer, at which time it would be announced.

## II. PREVIOUS MEETING NOTES APPROVAL

S. Smith looked at the agenda (Attachment 1, Continuation of Phase 2 PMT Mini-Summit Meeting Agenda) and noted the flexibility that can be used in going over it. He noted the first order of business would be to go over the notes from the last meeting. It was sent to BOS/TAC and the CAC membership. He also noted comments received since then, to include B. Mader's. S. Smith opened the floor to comments regarding the notes prior to finalizing.

W. Zamore noted that he didn't think it was that critical to include the discussion on fanning from the last meeting. S. Smith referred all notes from the previous meeting to A. Reed, who explained that meeting notes sent out were meant to be judged on the summary accuracy only and not intended as a transcript. Any discrepancies noted as "critical" should be submitted to him for tape review. It was also noted that the minutes and attachments were received rather late for review, prior to this meeting. J. Woodward made the suggestion that if possible, send at least meeting attachments out in advance of meetings.

J. Falbo wanted clarification regarding T. English's statement from the 2/25/09 notes about "FAA trying to steer CAC now that we're in the planning phase and we don't want the CAC to have false expectations." T. English clarified this for J. Falbo by using "fanning" as an example and elaborated on how the NEPA process works, when all alternatives are analyzed. She wanted to be proactive in alerting the CAC as to how their decision-making now will affect the NEPA process when we get to that point.

J. Falbo was also concerned about what would happen if after Phase 2, conditions change (such as RWY 33) and whatever was implemented as an accepted measure is forced to be changed due to that-what recourse is available? T. English explained:

- 1) At the end of Phase 2, the recommendations are taken to Massport and move to the NEPA phase (Phase 3, which the CAC participates in reviewing the scope for that). (S. Smith added that it's primarily related to doing an EA.)
- 2) T. English further stated there would be something in writing that would cover that and communicated to the CAC.
- 3) When in the NEPA phase, there would be a public comment period and whatever changes had occurred would be in that (NEPA) document with an explanation of why modifications were made from CAC recommendations. Then, there would be an opportunity for the CAC to comment on those modifications.

- 4) A record of decision (ROD) is ultimately released.
- 5) If at a later time, something is changed in the ROD, we have to go back out to “notice”.
- 6) “Post Implementation Monitoring” mirrors expectations listed in the ROD, based on agreements made in the FAA at that time.

***J. Falbo requested a written “process of recourse” to supplement meeting notes to cover actions the CAC could take in the event that 5) above occurs. T. English agreed to supply that (ACTION ITEM).***

W. Zamore elaborated that at the state environmental review level, third parties can file a “project change” form in the planning or operational phase if there is a 10% change in a material aspect of the project. T. English commented that a 10% change doesn’t apply in the FAA-any ROD change requires notice.

***T. English will follow up with what the “process” is after the ROD is signed if something changes (ACTION ITEM).***

S. Smith and R. Dormitzer reflected that this process makes sense. R. Dormitzer and J. Falbo also understood that the CAC would be scoping throughout (with the FAA) to Phase 3.

R. Dormitzer requested that action items and related commentary be reflected in italics in the minutes. S. Smith also requested that they be listed separately from the minutes.

***A. Reed will be distributing the 3/16 Draft meeting notes by 3/20/09 (ACTION ITEM).***

R. Dormitzer noted his focus on “ratifying” alternatives today and the Goals statement on the 31<sup>st</sup> of March, in addition to electing a new president for CAC.

Referencing the agenda items, W. Zamore thought it would be appropriate to cover Updated Baseline Approach with Re-Scoping, rather than being separated by the Level 1 Screening Reports. T. English also noted (to the group) that there is more to the re-coping than the connection to the baseline.

***J. Falbo confirmed that meeting notes from 2/25/09 were considered finalized. A. Reed will finalize them and redistribute (ACTION ITEM).***

W. Zamore reiterated the suggestion of “merging” the Re-Scoping with the Updated Baseline Assessment Approach for the next topic of discussion. No dissention noted.

### **III. UPDATED BASELINE ASSESSMENT APPROACH**

S. Smith referred to the last meeting at the PC's task for modeling and expectations. One method is to take the EDR Report memo (05-06), with no real changes between them and allow the PC to use 2005 as the baseline. W. Zamore believed we should disregard data from 2006. F. Leo explained the purposes for the baseline: running the models and calibrate them to reality. The calibration point should stand as long as it reflects reality. The 2007 changes can be captured in the EDR 2007 (runway use, contour lines, etc.). In summary:

Keep the calibration that was done (2005) and supplement it with 2007 data. F. Leo verified with S. Smith that this can be done (not with another model) parametrically with a small margin of error. F. Leo reasoned with the group how this could be done, without incurring more costs. S. Smith reflected that "future no-action" changes were already planned using 2010 data, which captures the essence of what is being requested for 2007. J. Falbo requested J. Woodward's commentary for this.

J. Woodward explained how new data can be input to year 2008 (such as conventional procedures that changed out of Phase 1) and 2007 using calibrated data from 2005 and be compared using modified percentages of time of configurations using runway usage models. Also, the more information input from 2007, the higher the cost becomes. R. Dormitzer and J. Falbo gave scenarios for J. Woodward to evaluate who noted that new procedures (such as RNAV) would change the baseline anyway. ***F. Leo requested J. Woodward explain in writing how baseline modifications procedures (general metrics) may be updated to the year 2007 from 2005. IC noted that PC would have to absorb costs of getting this out (ACTION ITEM). Delivery of this item would be 3/17/09.***

The group determined that they should maintain the agenda at this point until the PC can better define how Re-Scoping relates to the Baseline Assessment Approach (Re-Scoping will be held until the end).

#### **IV. LEVEL 1 SCREENING REPORT AND FAA DETERMINATIONS UPDATE** (The alphabetic order of these measures is not as the original agenda reflected)

##### **a. CAC Flight Procedure Measures**

S. Smith looked at the Level 1 CAC Screening Report (Note: this will be referred to as **Attachment 2**, however it is too large to email and referred to on the BLANS website as a reference for these minutes). Some participants were unable to access the document over the website. ***S. Smith will re-email password information to CAC members to enter the BLANS website Forum to obtain this and other documents (ACTION ITEM).***

W. Zamore noted that this will be a discussion about the report and any decision-making will remain with the CAC. S. Smith noted that the primary changes in the document were due to FAA decisions. F. Leo noted that no changes by Massport have been made at the 3,000 foot level.

**Measure G-J (Seek a location on the airport for a hold apron/penalty box to park aircraft as they await takeoff queuing onto Taxiway November)**

Decision originally rejected by the FAA. The new condition is specifically related to a new Surface Management System (SMS) and determining whether it can be applied in a useful manner associated with the intent of this measure. F. Leo was concerned about the efficiency of the airport with this measure. S. Smith countered that this provision was made to allow the opportunity to try this technology to see if it could improve efficiency.

Recommended Level 1 Screening Amendment: None

Comment: Massport will evaluate based on available locations.

**Measure F-B: (Move the DRUNK Intersection further east over the ocean, as opposed to remaining over land at Marshfield)**

Originally this was passed to Level 2 without condition-now passed to Level 2 with Conditions after determining that the altitude can go no higher than 8,000 feet.

Recommended Level 1 Screening Amendment: None

Comment: Max crossing altitude at current DRUNK intersection is 8'000 ft.

**Measure F-C (Raise the arrival crossing altitude at the DRUNK Intersection from 6,000 feet to 7,000 or 8,000 feet)**

Following on the same idea of raising the altitude of DRUNK over Marshfield (currently at 6,000 feet), all agreed this was positive.

Recommended Level 1 Screening Amendment: None

Comment: See Measure F-B.

**Measure F-H (When Runway 32 is used for arrivals in conjunction with Runway 27 arrivals, [if an over harbor approach is not used per Concept F-F or F-G] leave Runway 32 arrivals where they are indicated by the Runway 14/32 EIS [approximately 4,000 feet west of the Runway 33L approach course] when used in conjunction with Runway 33L arrivals):**

Originally rejected, but passed to Level 2 with conditions-that the pilot accepts a charted visual approach (ground reference points).

Recommended Level 1 Screening Amendment: None

**Measure F-M (Phase 1 Carry Over Measure 4-Runway 14 Departures: develop departure procedures to increase altitudes of aircraft over land by establishing course guidance to route traffic north of Hull when used in conjunction with Runway 27 arrivals):**

Originally, it was Pass to Level 2 (with a conventional approach). The RNAV hasn't been designed yet. After a discussion about merging the conventional approach with the undefined RNAV approach, the group concurred that the conventional approach would be Completed and the RNAV would Pass to Level 2.

Recommended Level 1 Screening Amendment: None

**Measure F-U (Establish required [adhere to] helicopter routings within downtown area airspace for all users, including hospitals, businesses, and media):**

Changed to Completed. Reasoning: there are published voluntary routing procedures that are out there that pilots normally comply with. J. Falbo took issue that the term “voluntary” implied that this is not regulated and should be within the jurisdiction of the FAA to make it so. T. English elaborated that much discussion with flight standards had taken place about the uniqueness of helicopters. J. Woodward brought up issues about CAC’s concern with both fixing-wing and rotary-wing helicopters flying too low, to include fear and noise. S. Smith highlighted that low flying aircraft were addressed in **Measure F-T (Establish altitude floor to increase altitudes over downtown area for local VFR traffic under BOS Tower control that are not on approach or initial climb)**. The group tried to distinguish the intent of Measures F-T and F-U as to whether the helicopters were included in both, since **F-T** notes “VFR” traffic (which by default includes helicopters and fixed-wing) and also (as F. Leo pointed out) helicopters are mentioned in the Comments second paragraph. W. Zamore noted there was great concern about this within the CAC and wondered about similar problems present in other parts of the country.

At the request of the IC and CAC members, S. Smith correlated the comments in the measures as they related to safety and efficiency concerns by noting that these are a by-product of the complaint process, due to violations. The group examined and discussed the 16 complaints commented on it **F-T**. There was then a question about the number of complaints reported and their origins. *Massport (F. Leo ) will provide an update of complaints reported to supplement those noted in this report (ACTION ITEM)*

B. Desrosiers questioned compliancy of the voluntary helicopter routing, recommending that the consultants conduct an analysis of how helicopter activity is monitored around the country, and suggested Passing to Level 2 with Conditions (**Measure F-U**). *T. English reminded everyone that this measure was rejected based on safety issues and while it was suggested the consultants perform some background research on best practices around the country, the FAA could be more aggressive in encouraging the operators stick to the voluntary procedures. She recommended adding a new measure. W. Zamore concurred in accepting the rejected measure while adding a measure (to include fixed-wing). (ACTION ITEM-subject to CAC voting).*

To clarify:

Recommended Level 1 Screening Amendment, F-T: None

Recommended Level 1 Screening Amendment, F-U: None, with new verbiage reflecting continued pilot education regarding voluntary procedures.

Action: Introduce a measure reflecting the above, regarding voluntary procedures.

This concludes measures that have changed with respect to this document. The group took a short break.

**b. CAC Ground Noise Measures**

R. Dormitzer noted the Measures to be discussed: G-A, G-B, G-C, F-L, and fanning. He wanted to highlight the four discussed that have been “taken off the table.”

**Measure G-B (Single Engine Taxi Away from Community):**

J. Woodward made note that the FAA rejected this because they couldn't require it (single-engine taxi) but wouldn't object to it if somebody did it, consistent with safety. He recommended inserting the word “Encourage” in front of “Single engine taxi” in the Measure Description. F. Leo shared content of the letter written to airlines (in the back of the Level 1 CAC Screening Report) to the group. He also talked about the inherent pressure assumed by the pilot to make safety decisions (based on internal discussions about suggested incentives) and perform single engine taxi, as part of a noise reduction program.

The group understood the reasoning behind the letter and agreed it satisfied safety concerns while encouraging single engine taxi consistent with airline procedures and policies.

F. Leo and J. Woodward each talked about pilot actions during engine run-up, taxi, and proximity to the terminal and take-off points, noting the direction of the engines during this process, and the feasibility of being able to direct noise away from near communities. There is also the matter of pilot attention during taxi/runway crossings while referring to checklists and tower instruction. These actions, considered along with traffic load and queuing, can reduce or increase the amount of time a pilot could use in delaying additional engine starts en-route to the runway. B. Desrosiers equated these actions to multi-tasking in car traffic. As J. Woodward concurred, the noise outcome could result in spreading out the noise during taxi or result as more of a blast of noise prior to entering the active runway, due to an estimated three minutes of engine run-up time for three or more (or less) engines. B. Desrosiers further stated that she believed the FAA would not recommend engine startups to occur just prior to takeoff, for safety reasons and that Massport would maintain and update the current letter to the pilot community regarding the single engine taxi procedure.

J. Woodward requested if the FAA discourages single engine taxi. T. English answered no.

Recommended Level 1 Screening Amendment: Passed to Level 2 with Conditions:  
Massport will maintain and update the current letter to the pilot community regarding the single engine taxi procedure.

There was a discussion about continuing the meeting based on the time remaining and then scheduling the next meeting as a continuation to this one.

**Measure G-A (Tow aircraft to the runway ends before takeoff):**

J. Falbo asked about seeing towing addressed to other runways before the measure is rejected. S. Smith referred to Comments in red in the measure. T. English further stated that the measure would be based on towing to any runway: it remains a safety issue. J. Woodward concurred with the assessment. J. Falbo further raised the question of

whether there was towing going on with any other airfield. J. Woodward answered yes. S. Smith interjected that there was an article published in reference to an evaluation of a Virgin Atlantic/Boeing towing test in Europe, using a 747-400, using a “starting lane” (a lot of pavement) and concluding that it placed a great deal of stress on the aircraft (a large potential for damage). The test was ended because of this. Additionally, the procedure creates a great amount of communication with the tow operator, other airfield operations, and the tower, hence another safety risk. T. English re-emphasized that the runway safety office also rejected the measure. ***J. Falbo requested a copy of the article from S. Smith (ACTION ITEM).***

F. Leo pointed out that if an aircraft was towed to the end of a runway nearest the local community (using Court Road and Bayswater Street as examples) and started-rather than back at the middle of the airport and then taxi-those neighborhoods would experience engine startups close to their homes with a greater noise and safety impact Aircraft can spend several minutes with startup checks with noise thresholds closer to the terminal (as done now) or be towed closer to neighborhoods and create more safety problems. J. Falbo stated that that wasn't his intent, but he would like to see it tested and have more information on towing. G. Lattrell added that the IC could satisfy the request for more information about what is going on in Europe, but he concurs with the FAA, which is not willing to move the measure forward to Level 2.

W. Zamore acknowledged his understanding of the reasoning used (to reject the measure), but requested that J. Falbo take more time to review available data. ***J. Woodward assumed the task of looking into various taxi/tow situations but admitted he may not find much. S. Smith recommended that the IC look at where this practice is happening in Europe, with a focus on the geometry of this (Logan) airport and understanding a risk assessment of creating of many crossings on a runway (ACTION ITEM).*** In the event that the IC makes a determination that there is an alternative to the rejection of the measure in this task, the FAA could submit the new information to the safety office, however, the FAA retains 51% of the vote on safety. J. Falbo understood and agreed that this was an acceptable process.  
Recommended Level 1 Screening Amendment: None.

**Measure G-C (Use Taxiway November for 22R traffic, use the Centerfield Taxiway for 22L traffic)**

S. Smith read the “Intent” portion of the measure. There was a discussion about using the taxiway under certain conditions only and whether mandatory use is implied under certain conditions. R. Dormitzer and W. Zamore agreed it would be helpful to correct the language used. J. Woodward responded to J. Falbo's question as to whether voluntary or mandatory language should be used in the measure-voluntary being the preferred alternative, which could carry it over to the next level. B. Desrosiers described some of the different ways the tower is currently using the centerfield taxiway. W. Zamore explained to J. Falbo the reason for rejection was the required condition of use of the taxiway as opposed to the voluntary use of it, at the discretion of the tower. The rejection, in effect, was the mandatory use of it.

F. Leo continued with describing different scenarios where the taxiway is being used. A conversation followed with J. Woodward describing the noise effects and B. Desrosiers followed that the noise and safety analysis conducted, confirmed the tower's current operations using the taxiway from a safety and efficiency standpoint. B. Desrosiers made the point that relative to the reasons the measure is not being carried forward: 1) FAA has its position that anything having to do with centerfield taxiway is not going to be re-looked, 2) the centerfield taxiway is currently being used in this fashion.

F. Leo reiterated more scenarios about tower preference and CAC's intent on the taxiway usage. J. Falbo reasoned that he continues to fail to see any safety or efficiency benefits and he believes it should continue to Level 2, even if the same conclusion is found. G. Lattrell reminded J. Falbo of that federal resources have already been spent for this study for operational and environmental implications of using it this way. F. Leo pointed out that this is an accomplished alternative and questioned the reasoning of further study.

***T. English reasoned that the FAA could look back at the study to satisfy J. Falbo's reservations as to why this can't pass to Level 2, after consulting with FAA technical specialists and looking at simulated models in the Centerfield Taxiway Study (ACTION ITEM).***

Recommended Level 1 Screening Amendment: Passed to Level 2 with conditions  
FAA will relook at current practice.

**Measure F-L (Seek improvements of compliance with 1996 EIS goals for Runway 27 departure procedure through the application of all available technology.**

As the ROD is written up, this is Rejected because the FAA continues to try to improve the compliance with this measure. S. Smith suggested that rather than have the word "Completed" considered, use of the word "Implemented" be used to reflect this ongoing process. T. English clarified the use of language in carrying forward to Level 2-it wouldn't be carried forward because we're already doing it. In this case, the term Completed can be construed as being synonymous with Rejected. The group agreed that the term Rejected would be replaced with Completed, with an explanation.

Recommend Level 1 Screening Amendment: Completed  
FAA will provide an explanation under Comments.

The group determined at this point to cease discussion and plan for continuation of agenda item at the next meeting. ***The action items would be emailed in advance of the meeting notes (ACTION ITEM).***

Continuation of today's meeting is scheduled for 4/8/09 at Massport (Logan Office Center), 6-9 PM. Same call number and pass code as today.

## **VIII. OBSERVER COMMENTS/QUESTIONS**

S. Smith opened the phone to observers:

M. Zlody:  
No comments.

J Stewart:

J. Stewart questioned the efficiency of the process taking place with all the meetings. R. Dormitzer and T. English answered J. Stewart's questions about the NEPA process and S. Smith explained how packaging alternatives works for this project:

1. Start out with individual (i.e. Several departures, arrivals) measures
2. CAC decides which ones to put together as an alternative (or at most two alternatives)-the alternative(s) consisting of a series of measures
3. This alternative is what the FAA will evaluate in the NEPA process, (the alternative(s) are defined as a cumulative noise measure).

J. Stewart felt this meeting had information that all the CAC should be hearing.

B. Mader :

She wanted to make sure that her (2/25/09) comments were received. A. Reed confirmed he received them. She also wanted to know whether the FAA would be open to "office hours" to field CAC questions. She also questioned CAC voting on Measure F-O. S. Smith directed the voting question to the CAC. S. Smith also answered her question regarding Measure G-C. She was concerned also about the substance of today's meeting. W. Zamore noted the "hybrid" nature of these meetings in an effort to move forward.

***S. Smith noted an action item pertaining to office hours suggested by B. Mader. T. English acknowledged that the idea would be considered (ACTION ITEM).***

The meeting was adjourned at 2:16 PM.

ACTION ITEMS:

***1) J. Falbo requested that future meetings be held at night and be limited to three hours in length. The group concurred that would be a good idea and be held at Massport.***

***Action: Meetings involving the CAC will be held henceforth during evening hours.***

***Assigned to: PMT***

***Deadline: Ongoing***

***2) J. Falbo requested a written "process of recourse" to supplement meeting notes to cover actions the CAC could take in the event that 5) above occurs. T. English agreed to supply that.***

***Action: Written "process of recourse" as it relates to the Record of Decision (ROD)***

***Assigned to: Terry English, FAA***

***Deadline: Upon finalizing 3/16/09 Meeting Notes***

3) *A. Reed will be distributing Draft meeting notes by 3/20/09.*

Action: *First draft of meeting notes forwarded to CAC President.*

Assigned to: *Alan Reed, FAA*

Deadline: *March 20, 2009*

4) *J. Falbo confirmed that meeting notes from 2/25/09 were considered finalized. A. Reed will finalize them and redistribute.*

Action: *Finalize 2/25/09 notes and redistribute to PMT*

Assigned to: *Alan Reed, FAA*

Deadline: *March 16, 2009*

5) *F. Leo requested J. Woodward explain in writing how baseline modifications procedures (general metrics) may be updated to the year 2007 from 2005. IC noted that PC would have to absorb costs of getting this out.*

Action: *PC will review process and provide a cost estimate*

Assigned to: *Steve Smith, Ricondo & Associates*

Deadline: *April 8, 2009*

6) *S. Smith will re-email password information to CAC members to enter the BLANS website Forum to obtain this and other documents.*

Action: *PC to email password information to CAC membership.*

Assigned to: *Steve Smith (PC), Ricondo & Associates*

Deadline: *ASAP*

7) *Massport (F. Leo ) will provide an update of complaints reported to supplement those noted in this report.*

Action: *Massport to forward a list of noise complaints to CAC.*

Assigned to: *Flavio Leo, Massport*

Deadline: *None*

8) *Measure F-U: T. English, reminded everyone that this measure was rejected based on safety issues and while it was suggested the consultants perform some background research on best practices around the country, the FAA could be more aggressive in encouraging the operators to use the voluntary procedures when practicable. She recommended adding a new measure. W. Zamore concurred in accepting the rejected measure while adding a measure (to include fixed-wing), with new verbiage; to develop a pilot outreach and/or educational program to remind them of the voluntary helicopter routes, subject to CAC voting*

Action: *CAC needs to discuss this and put it to a vote.*

Assigned to: *Sandra Kunz, CAC*

Deadline: *May (tentative)-*

9) *J. Falbo requested a copy of the article from S. Smith-reference to aircraft towing.*

Action: *PC to forward a copy of an article by Virgin Airlines-reference aircraft towing.*

Assigned to: *Steve Smith (PC), Ricondo & Associates*

Deadline: *None*

*10) J. Woodward (IC) was to provide a list of airports in Europe that conduct towing for departures. Information was not made available to FAA or Massport.*

**Action:** *CAC to forward information provided by IC.*

**Assigned to:** *Sandra Kunz, CAC*

**Deadline:** *April 16, 2009*

*11) T. English reasoned that the FAA could look back at the study to satisfy J. Falbo's reservations as to why this can't pass to Level 2, after consulting with FAA technical specialists and looking at simulated models in the Centerfield Taxiway Study.*

**Action:** *FAA to consult with FAA technical specialists about reconsideration of Measure ID G-C (Level 1 Screening Findings currently indeterminant) and report back to CAC.*

**Assigned to:** *Terry English, FAA*

**Deadline:** *None*

*12) The action items would be emailed in advance of the meeting notes.*

**Action:** *Forward action items (as applicable) to PMT in advance of draft meeting notes.*

**Assigned to:** *Alan Reed, FAA*

**Deadline:** *As required.*

*13) S. Smith noted an action item pertaining to office hours suggested by B. Mader. T. English acknowledged that the idea would be considered.*

**Action:** *FAA to consider office hours, based on availability to field CAC questions, in-accordance-with established protocols.*

**Assigned to:** *Terry English, FAA*

**Deadline:** *None*

**Attachments:**

1. Continuation of Phase 2 PMT Mini-Summit Meeting Agenda-March 16, 2009
2. Level 1 CAC Screening Report