

## **Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS)**

### **BOS/TAC Meeting #12**

### **Massport Logan Office Center Training Room**

#### **MEETING SUMMARY**

10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

October 21, 2011

---

#### **ATTENDANCE**

##### **Boston Technical Advisory Committee (BOS/TAC) Members:**

**Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)**- Barbara Travers-Wright, Sandra Bogosian, Terry English, Brian Brunelle (Alt), Gail Lattrell

**Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport)**-Flavio Leo

**Community Advisory Committee (CAC)**-Sandra Kunz (Braintree), Jerry Falbo (Winthrop), Darryl Pomicter (Beacon Hill), Ralph Dormitzer (Cohasset), Wig Zamore (Somerville), Dick Morrison (Chelsea), Leo White (Beverly), Bob Driscoll (Winthrop), Bob D'Amico (Mayor of Boston/Nahant)

**Independent Consultant (IC)**-Jon Woodward (Landrum & Brown, Inc.), Rob Adams (Landrum & Brown, Inc.), Stan Matthews (Crown Consulting, Inc.)

**Project Consultant (PC)**-Stephen Smith (Ricondo & Associates, Inc.), John Williams (Ricondo & Associates, Inc.), Fabio Grandi (Wyle)

#### **VIA TELEPHONE**

**FAA**- Mike Nelson (Alt), Debbie James, Jon Harris

**CAC**-Judy Kennedy (Milton), John Stewart (South End), Ron Hardaway (East Boston),

#### **OBSERVERS**

**FAA**- Ron Mochi, George Yardley, Alan Reed-Recorder

**Citizen**-Joe Davies

#### **VIA TELEPHONE**

**FAA**-Bryon Rakoff

---

#### **Attachments:**

(Available from the BLANS website: <http://www.bostonoverflight.com/index.aspx>)

- PC Level 3 Noise Model Results PowerPoint Presentation:  
BLANS\_Level3\_MeasureNoiseAnalysis\_Results\_RASSmith\_111021\_FAA\_110930\_v3\_updatedFHHv3slides.pdf  
<http://forum.bostonoverflight.com/webx/.ef5bd33>
- IC Level 3 Noise Model Results PowerPoint Presentation (provided only to CAC prior to the meeting) cacPresentation1.pdf  
<http://forum.bostonoverflight.com/webx/Phase%20%20Document%20Sharing/cacPresentation1.pdf>

- IC Alternative Noise Review Document.pdf (provided only to CAC prior to meeting; inconsistency with PC discussed at meeting)  
<http://forum.bostonoverflight.com/webx/.ef5bd36>

**Attendance:**

Attendance for those in person and on the phone was taken.

**Initial Comments:**

T. English emphasized the intent of this meeting: to review Level 3 measures noise modeling results. S. Smith acknowledged that the agenda has some flexibility and that all measures scheduled for review may not require a long discussion or depending on attendees and their personal schedules, may be shuffled around to accommodate those individuals. Group consensus was to move Measures F-H, F-G, and F-M to the end of the agenda.

**Agenda Item Discussion Summaries:**

Before going through each measure, S. Smith reviewed the CAC objectives screening criteria and the FAA NEPA criteria related to annual noise results. PC focused on the DNL (dB) metric results, including affected census blocks. IC supplemented the discussion, focused on CAC supplemental metrics, including daily events and daily minutes, which were shared with CAC the night before.

**Measure G-I (v2) (Preferred Runup Location)**

S. Smith noted that the INM DNL results for the preferred run-up location showed no changes for both CAC and FAA criteria. S. Smith stated the key input assumptions for this measure. He explained the assumed headings of the aircraft and referenced Slide 6, which depicts the percentage of time for each run-up heading depending on what runway configuration is in use.

S. Smith reminded all that DNL population numbers are based on 2000 census data because the MA Geographical Information System (GIS) has not yet converted the U.S. Census data, as required for release and use. W. Zamore recommended checking with the MA Planning Commission for the 2010 GIS data. S. Smith noted this project has consistently applied MassGIS data as a source and is used by numerous state agencies. In addition, PC inquired to a third-party vendor who also indicated they had not yet completed their conversion process. S. Smith will look into the MA Planning Commission for 2010 centroid data. **ACTION ITEM.**

J. Woodward stated that although there were no DNL changes, the supplemental metrics for time above (TA) 60dB showed some negligible increases for Winthrop and East Boston and toward the south and west.

J. Falbo expressed concern about the lack of relief the measure provides. He wanted to see some noise relief that CAC could vote for. He asked about the run-up enclosure measure. F. Leo said that the run-up enclosure house is not viable due to limited space on the airport and that Massport can't move the aircraft run-up area any further away

from communities than what is currently proposed. S. Smith referenced J. Falbo to the analysis PC conducted and applied by Massport to make that determination. F. Leo mentioned that run-ups are one component to reduce ground noise. By itself, it does not indicate a substantial level of relief, but when considering the additional BLANS measures related to ground noise cumulatively (encouragement of single-engine, idle-reverse thrust, electrified gates and research into surface movement management), there most likely will be some relief. J. Falbo inquired about metering, the FAA's NextGen and anything else. F. Leo stated that the MIT Study [surface movement management] shows a lot of promise and some noise relief.

S. Smith asked S. Kunz (CAC President) if the CAC reached a consensus on this measure. S. Kunz commented further that last evening's discussion, primarily led by J. Woodward, was productive. However, no decision on Measure G-I (v2) was made. CAC requires more time to understand the noise results before they can reach a decision on each measure.

#### Measure G-J (v2) (Holding Area for Delayed Departures)

S. Smith proceeded through the slide presentation (Slide 10-11 for this measure) and referred to the hold pad near the center of the airport, pointing out that it was not noise modeled. The reasoning was based on the level of effort involved to build a model that involves traffic management initiative delays, which do not occur frequently in a typical year. Because the average annual day weighting would be so small, its impact on average annual day noise results would be negligible. The result would show very little benefit or effect on noise reduction. S. Smith emphasized qualitatively that the measure could prove to be helpful when delays do occur. In addition, the hold pad is a benefit to the FAA operationally. Therefore, PC believes the holding area does have merit and the CAC should consider this qualitatively.

J. Falbo queried about NextGen effects and what can be expected with it as a benefit. S. Smith responded that it's really a matter of managing time. It provides another option to the controller to hold on the pad rather than on Runway 15R when there are 22L/R departures and can be a win-win situation for both noise and efficiency reasons.

W. Zamore asked for more data on noise modeling error and sensitivity. S. Smith stated that there are no quantified error values for each variable in INM. S. Kunz asked whether a cumulative package could be considered. S. Smith stated that qualitatively, yes but quantitatively, no because it would have very little effect on the average annual day result. J. Woodward further iterated that taking events individually may not show much benefit, but taken together, there could be a recognizable benefit.

S. Smith stated that in any event, this measure could be carried forward in a NEPA document if CAC decides to recommend it.

#### Measure F-K (v2) Extend Runway 27 RNAV Gate 1 nmi Southwest of WYLYY

In accordance with the earlier group consensus, S. Smith moved to the discussion on Measure F-K (v2) (Slides 23-27). Based on the centroid analysis for CAC criteria, 13

people were newly exposed to 55 DNL or higher, which is not considered a substantial increase based on CAC goals and objectives. And, net 59 fewer people were exposed to 55 DNL or higher (72 existing less the 13 newly exposed). F. Leo requested clarification of what the marginal increase really means. S. Smith explained that the BLANS protocol requires that the census block centroid be used to identify affected populations. He said that Massport also uses the centroid. F. Grandi explained that when you're looking at centroids, you may get some local, averaging imperfections, because if the INM contour intersects with the centroid (even if it is on the edge), the entire population within that centroid is counted. This is a direct effect when using point data. Other possibilities, like pro rata division of census block population based on geographical area, have been determined to be less accurate overall.

D. Pomicter wished to make two points, ideally reflecting what a next refinement would be: looking at the base contour line and looking at a period where it shifted. The 2015 noise baseline is different than the 2007 the CAC has seen, which was significantly different than the 2005 (shifting from south to northwest). It appears that the 2015 noise is generally greater than 2007 overall; and he asked what operations growth and noise differences are forecast in the 2015.

S. Smith explained that the 2015 baseline is from the Boston RNAV STARs project and is based on 2009 operations. There is growth in operations for 2015 compared to 2009.

D. Pomicter asked how the CAC members and their communities are to understand this and would it be possible to add at least a footnote to explain, in further detail. S. Smith agreed to add a footnote. D. Pomicter responded that he would like the 2009 noise modeling information (by grid point to allow comparison of current and forecast 2015 and potential Measure changes and the 2010). S. Smith explained that the 2009 data is available in the EDR. F. Leo believes he can get this and will provide as necessary.

**ACTION ITEM.**

F. Leo stated what he believed the main point of the discussion for Measure F-K(v2) was: that the aircraft stay in the corridor a little longer. It is really an overflight issue, with aircraft staying in a little longer before they fan out.

J. Stewart thought the goal was to shift higher. He believes the data hurts more than helps the communities. J. Woodward commented that mixed results came from the data, hence the communities are going to see positive or negative results with generally less than 10 events a day.

S. Kunz added that good and bad things were learned from the meeting last night, while her criterion remains: how are the people affected? The results make it difficult to tell. J. Stewart added that (the data suggests) lopsided effects.

J. Kennedy agrees with J. Stewart, however, in that there appears to be some benefits to Mattapan, Milton, and Hyde Park.

D. Pomicter stated that the goal is to decrease aircraft noise effects. He believes it's true that: 50 dB affects some people just as much as 60 dB does some others, but, decreasing noise from operations has limits—particularly as operations grow. The goal is to help people—whether a few or 4,000 of them—by shifting some of the noise from most affected to less affected, to more equitably share the noise overall. D. Morrison agreed. D. Pomicter again stressed the importance of understanding the modeling results based on more focused maps.

S. Smith stated that the CAC goals and objectives focused on how to accomplish the goals; everything considered would be equally weighed. D. Pomicter commented that the maps and analysis provided so far do not tell the whole story. Noise level weighting for changes to all people is needed. And, relative ending levels, as well as degree of total change is needed. And, easy visibility of most affected relative to lesser affected. He also inquired about the population census data—particularly regarding the inclusion of higher education institution dormitory population, which is not resident year round. S. Smith referenced both the noise protocol and scope of work related to the analysis and output.

D. Pomicter said that with better understanding of the analysis, he believes there may be limited cases for tweaking now to better balance positive and negative affects. F. Leo observed that in terms of what the data says, tweaks may be limited because the results do not reflect a need to do so. This is an analysis of tracks, while looking at industry changes related to fleet mix. These are not dramatic changes and we are at a point where this is an overflight issue. S. Smith added that overflight is where acoustics come in and the reason for single events and requested feedback from IC. J. Woodward reflected that this was discussed last night, having good and bad results.

J. Stewart interpreted what he believes the model data was saying, detecting no benefit to the specific procedure. S. Smith reminded the group to maintain perspective about placement of the lines (with reference to the ground), while F. Grandi pointed out that looking farther away from airport, one should keep in mind the factors of weather, including temperature and winds. As far as modeling goes, we've done all we can and it meets industry standards.

D. Pomicter stated that the problem is that based on the results, it appears the CAC may vote no on the measure because it does not appear to be beneficial overall, the negatives appear to outweigh the positives. S. Smith asked if this was the consensus of the CAC. There was no indication that this was the fact and CAC needs more time to review the results.

S. Kunz reflected that J. Woodward's presentation using the Google Earth software helped the CAC to zero in on areas of concern; particularly noise over dorms is a factor. D. Pomicter also noted that one can get lost looking at some of the maps, while labeling the town boundaries, would help. S. Smith indicated that all members of BOS/TAC were

not provided copies of a map D. Pomicter was referencing during his discussion. FAA and Massport were not provided the materials IC presented the night before.

D. Pomicter made the following requests (regarding IC information and PC DNL results), which he believes should be annotated on the maps and tables to ease and increase understanding:

- Footnote: Airplanes not arriving or departing Logan and all helicopters are not included in the noise model results.
- Community boundaries (in addition to titles)—including Boston neighborhoods titles and boundaries.
- Measurement Location IDs (grid points).
- Spelling: Charlestown, not Charleston; and P28 is Roslindale, not Jamaica Plain.
- Order by total noise, to emphasize clearly those most affected—in addition to alphabetical, to ease locating individually.
  
- The BOS VOR radio beacon from which distances are measured

He asked T. English her opinion on these requests. T. English responded that this would be a (data) sorting issue, motioning towards J. Woodward. Additionally, D. Pomicter believes this information should be in every noise study from the FAA and from Massport—many were in the 2005 & 2007 Noise Analysis and have not been continued. T. English responded that the FAA typically looks at total population numbers within the various DNL noise contours and does not focus on segregating the information by community.

D. Pomicter also observed that the Tables obscure the greatest positive impacts of the noise results—because the figures are overly rounded; they are not scaled in far enough to get a better understanding of small effects in the currently most negatively impacted communities. S. Smith indicated that all of the information is available to CAC and IC and the CAC should clearly identify what additional information they need to make a decision and coordinate this through the IC. If IC requires PC support, we will coordinate it with IC. He indicated it would be too difficult and inefficient to meet individual requests.

The group discussed the finer details on the amount and substance of what to put in the baseline report. D. Pomicter suggested putting in as much as possible in the BLANS Level 3 report and stated that the FAA's goal should be to include this type of information in all FAA noise reports. T. English said that the amount of additional information FAA includes in a noise report would be decided on a case-by-case basis. J. Stewart observed that there is always another piece of the community impacted, whether it's a nursing home, dorm, or other sensitive area and questioned what those specific details would be that are included.

S. Smith recommended that ideas should be recorded and funneled through the CAC for further coordination with the PMT. J. Woodward further questioned the group how city

or town boundaries, within the city of Boston, would be drawn and delivered—most easily as in the 2005 & 2007 Noise Modeling Analysis, using information from the BRA.

Another question by the group related to a centroid depicting a decrease in DNL levels. T. English noted the centroid location in South Boston. S. Smith deferred questioning its accuracy to verification by Wyle and IC. F. Grandi reflected that centroids are not necessarily representing the exact location of population within a census block. It represents the center point of the entire block. One must look at the specifics of placement of the point in relation to the contour line. If the point is near the line outside of a noise exposure area and the line moves just one foot, the centroid could now be located within the noise exposure area. J. Woodward indicated that the changes related to this were small and for decision-making purposes, may not be used. The change in DNLs for this point is in some cases, less than 0.1 dBA.

In conclusion, CAC indicated the potential need for more information in order to make a decision on this measure.

Measure F-HH (v3) Runway 33L jet departures north of Admiral's Hill thence northwest to 5DME or 5K ft MSL

The group reviewed the noise contours and impacted communities (slides 28-39). S. Smith discussed the noise contours that have a substantial effect (slide 31). It appears that there is a shift, moving everything north of the river, which is consistent with the change in the procedure. The (slide 29) chart shows the most substantial differences, with an increase of 50 DNL and higher. W. Zamore commented that the data makes it difficult to intuitively understand, but the effects seem denser and out further. The view is surprising.

W. Zamore added that Somerville has the most highways and diesel trains of any community in the area. He said that adding more noise to the area is kind of a last straw for people, since they're getting jets overhead now. He asked what's going on further west, reflecting that Somerville was told that they could not have measures in that area and initially, elected officials wanted to extend the heading northeast to about 7 miles before proceeding on course. He indicated one would expect changes in those areas as well. S. Smith clarified that the maps show changes within noise exposure areas but do not reflect where all of the changes are.

S. Smith (slide 28) illustrated that the flight path extends to 7 DME and that we are seeing DNL changes way below 45dB. He described to W. Zamore that the corridors can narrow or expand, due to RNAV. It sounds like the goal is-trying to reduce noise at the inner part of the flight path, but the farther out noise is a by-product of an RNAV procedure. The group examined the slides depicting noise levels around Somerville.

S. Kunz questioned the altitudes in these areas. B. Brunelle answered that they are 6,000-7,000 feet. S. Kunz remarked that Lexington has been successful at getting less noise and it would be nice to get the same for Somerville. W. Zamore commented that the information has been helpful.

S. Smith announced that the discussion on Measure F-V (v2) will begin after the lunch break.

## LUNCH BREAK

### Measure F-V (v2) 260 course heading from 22R in lieu of 290 for props/turboprops heading north, northwest or west until 2,000 ft MSL

S. Smith reviewed flight tracks (Slide 40), which showed a decrease of noise in Winthrop, noting that these changes are less than 1 dBA. F. Grandi noted that the contour lines only moved by one (1) foot. Because the point was so close to the baseline contour, the slight shift was enough to locate the centroid outside of the noise exposure area. S. Smith continued to the table (slide 41) to show the noise changes, moving onto the graphical representation (slide 42).

While T. English questioned F. Grandi about the effective movement of 1 foot, F. Leo asked if the negligible effect could be ignored. F. Grandi answered that one could choose to discount the result of this centroid.

D. Pomictier stated that he disagreed with this assessment and believes the benefit is real, a legitimate savings. Turning less of an angle, from further down the runway, and (consequently) from higher off the ground is consistent with less noise to Winthrop. S. Smith motioned to J. Woodward to show part of the CAC presentation, from the previous night related to this measure.

As J. Woodward led the group through the presentation, he discussed the effect of Google Earth software and how the group could better analyze the benefit. He noted that if the aircraft were moved, he didn't know if there is a substantial change (in the order of a .001 dB change).

D. Pomictier stated that no one seemed to benefit, in the nearby communities, including East Boston, Charlestown Chelsea, and Everett. He believes it makes no sense, does not believe it is an anomaly, and that it is wrong to try to discount and nullify the result.

S. Smith denied D. Pomictier's accusation. All the results were presented based on the spatial analysis in GIS. No results were scrubbed or removed. The information today is presented to CAC. It is up to CAC to decide how they want to use the information during their decision process.

D. Pomictier responded that the information received is showing zero relief. J. Woodward acknowledged D. Pomictier's explanation and point. J. Falbo was confused and expected a reduction of noise. To further examine the results, the group discussed the numbers from the F-V (v2) charts (slides 41, 44). D. Pomictier discussed the population centroids and the different effects between those affected communities. D. Pomictier emphasized the importance for CAC to be able to look at the noise exposure

areas with options to scale in and out. S. Smith indicated he will coordinate with IC related to additional information CAC needs. **ACTION ITEM.**

D. Pomicter pointed out that the different results hurt more areas than helped. J. Stewart commented that he was trying to figure out what the numbers really mean.

The group contemplated the actual benefits realized. S. Smith pointed out that mathematically there are benefits, but perhaps not considered to be perceptible. D. Pomicter questioned whether props are counted in the data- not jets (in the 27 routes) and he wanted to make sure the data is captured. S. Smith confirmed that they are and that short takeoffs are also included in the baseline.

J. Stewart had a question about the impact table, asking J. Woodward if we have information on the detail of people. J. Woodward responded that we have population data from the 2000 census, which represents different areas. He said use of the centroid is preferred, noting that 2 years ago this helped in the early part of this project. We can include those population numbers, but should put less credence in them.

J. Stewart noted that you have to find people benefitting from this. J. Woodward pointed out that 131 grid points aren't nearly as parceled out as the centroids. D. Pomicter commented that this measure is intended to address props and turboprops and questioned if it is possible to extract these from this. S. Smith responded that the noise analysis and results is designed to assess changes for a cumulative average annual day.

D. Pomicter commented that the communities should not have to live by criteria of long ago. J. Woodward noted that the shift of flights downtown could be masked by jets. D. Pomicter responded that turboprops and props are a different category of noise with different frequency composition and event time profile—extending the intrusion, noise for longer and entering the house further. S. Smith suggested that D. Pomicter talk to J. Woodward about results offline and explained the process of how to download the information that he is seeking.

#### Measure F-R Shift Runway 4R RNAV departure waypoint east (Slides 45-52)

S. Smith restated that the intent was to reduce noise to Revere Beach while avoiding noise increases to Nahant. He pointed out that the CAC criteria table shows a reduction of 620 people in the 60 DNL or higher and 945 less people in the 55DNL or higher. He also noted that there are 216 newly exposed people and these are primarily within Winthrop as can be seen in the contour graphic. There are no substantial increases based on CAC criteria.

B. D'Amico commented that there is nothing on Revere Beach, hence why should the existing RNAV procedure be moved at all. B. D'Amico indicated his concerns related to Nahant and commented that the current RNAV procedure is working very well. He believes the change would impact Nahant.

J. Falbo remarked that he does not appreciate the increase in noise indicated by the centroids located in Winthrop. B. D'Amico added that current RNAV is better. S. Smith

responded that the measure was requested by CAC.. J. Falbo answered that this does not support a decrease, however, S. Smith acknowledged that overall, this does represent a decrease in noise (on the whole).

B. D'Amico emphasized that this is a computer model he helped establish, stating that reality is a different world. As a result, he doesn't believe the figures (represented in the slides) are accurate. S. Smith emphasized that the INM is the model being used for all BLANS measures and the only means to use for an objective analysis. He is simply reporting numbers. This is why single-events are provided as well, so that CAC can assess the measures based on what people hear.

The group discussed what the real impacts were. B. D'Amico described what the real effects meant to him and Nahant. B. Brunelle reflected that (the results) don't show any increase or decrease to Nahant. B. D'Amico emphasized that this is not the case. He stated the assessment is part of technique and part climate. His point is that the shift is not fair. S. Smith pointed out that this is a new route proposed by the CAC. Based on the results, it will be up to CAC to decide if this measure moves forward.

The group continued and looked at a Google Earth slide, showing how far the noise contours have shifted (200-300 feet). S. Smith commented that this is a "sideline noise" and doesn't go directly over houses. The group continued, looking at several F-R noise contour maps.

S. Kunz asked if these (routes) could be tweaked. B. Brunelle offered that for the RNAV SID on RWY 4R, airplanes stay on runway heading until 520 feet MSL, then direct NHANT, then eastbound. Aircraft can be turning as early as Bayswater Street direct to NHANT or to the proposed waypoint. He discussed the different types of RNAV legs used for the initial heading from the runway, but indicated he would have to refer to the RNAV specialist, J. Harris, to see if any would pass RNAV flyability criteria. T. English indicated FAA will review the possibility. **ACTION ITEM.**

D. Pomictier asked if it is possible to turn and clear the shore while not impacting Nahant. He added that the goal is to not negatively affect most severely affected Winthrop, while providing some benefit to severely affected Revere, and be less negative to less severely affected Nahant—to determine a better balance, to avoid losing any benefit from our efforts.

S. Smith responded that we can't get another waypoint here, noting that there is a .22 nautical mile difference between the existing waypoint and the proposed relocation to the east. In addition, the procedure needs to end up in the same location, just east of the Nahant causeway to maintain the Phase 1 alternative. We can only move (it) to the left.

J. Woodward asked D. Pomictier if he was looking to relocate the waypoint on the shoreline, while questioning B. Brunelle if we can have an RNAV undefined, until passing the shoreline. He responded that there may be 1,000 feet before the turn. He and J. Woodward discussed options for creating something off the runway heading, but

no option was concluded upon. FAA will look into possible modifications, with the intent to avoid increased noise within Winthrop.

F. Leo observed that the current RNAV procedure off RWY 4R is working pretty well. Once you start tweaking, you disrupt current movement. He continued, saying that the “bookend” is only 200 feet away and if this is pretty tight today, then the RNAV (must be) working great.

Measure F-GG (v2) BOS jet arrivals from south to Runway 22L or 27 cross DRUNK at or above 8,000 ft MSL

The group had no comments or questions on this measure. PC did indicate a centroid representing 19 people that would experience a reduction. CAC indicated they did not see this in IC’s presentation last night. S. Smith stated several versions of the population analysis were provided to IC and IC most likely used a previous version.

Measure F-HH (v3)

J. Falbo asked if the FAA could relook at Measure F-HH(v3) to see if it can be tweaked to possibly reduce noise impacts to the underlying communities. S. Bogosian and T. English said that the FAA can look at it but could not commit to a specific time frame due to ongoing training for implementation of the Boston RNAV STARS. **ACTION ITEM.**

S. Kunz confirmed the CAC is not going to let this go. S. Smith added that we still need to see what happens with version 3 before a “version 4” is introduced. He responded to W. Zamore, that we’re not looking at census shifts. W. Zamore responded that 50% to 2/3 of all housing in the area is going to be in Somerville.

D. Pomictier added two summaries of concerns: (1) with the RNAV as designed, many of thousands of complaints are on the way; (2) the goal of a more isolated turning point closer in has actually moved noise further northwest.

Measure F-G Runway 32 Visual North of Hull (Late Night)

S. Smith briefly remarked that this procedure is based on the existing 33L visual approach. The only difference is the last leg to Runway 32. He indicated that use of Runway 32 for late-night hours is very seldom used, if not 0%. In addition, the current noise abatement procedure for late night indicates Runway 33L as the preferred runway, which makes the use of Runway 32 during late night hours more unlikely. Due to the use assumptions, there are no changes showing a benefit.

Measure F-H Runway 32 Visual Approach Similar to Runway 32 RNAV Approach

S. Smith reviewed (slide 19) and based on FAA estimates, 10% of aircraft are expected to fly the procedure, consistent with the intent to say west of Hull. R. Dormitzer had a question about aircraft arriving on Rwy 32. B. Brunelle responded that if they can use it, we assign it.

Measure F-M Runway 14 Departures stay north of Hull and raise altitude over shoreline

S. Smith commented that this was used once since Runway 14-32 was opened. Because its use is 0%, there were no operations assigned to the tracks. This makes the baseline and Measure F-M the same.

#### Next Steps

S. Smith remarked that the study is now in CAC's court, as the FAA waits for the CAC to take a vote on which measures they would like to see put together to form an alternative.

#### Other Business:

J. Falbo questioned the status of the Single Engine (G-B/G-B (v2)) and Reverse Thrust (G-F) measures. He asked if an environmental assessment (EA), will qualitatively address noise reduction impacts. T. English responded that Massport is in the process of implementing the measures. As a result, the measures will not be part of a proposed action in a NEPA document (i.e. an EA). She foresees the NEPA document providing a summary of all the Phase 2 measures, including a description of the measures Massport implemented. She also noted Massport's commitment on establishing a noise abatement committee and that further discussion on ground noise measures would occur within that group.

J. Falbo requested if CAC could have further discussion about the document. T. English confirmed that CAC would have input on a Phase 3 NEPA document during the scope development as stipulated in the BLANS SOW.

D. Pomicter asked if the FAA sees itself as part of ongoing Massport and CAC discussions, and asked if the CAC could request of the FAA directly (rather than through Massport.). F. Leo responded the Massport intended to work with the CAC and would invite FAA to participate as appropriate. T. English added that the FAA would respond to Massport's requests and provide FAA subject matter experts as appropriate.

D. Pomicter asked on the status of the final Phase 2, Level 2 Report, which has been under discussion and review since the FAA draft and CAC response comments in May 2011, with last BOSTAC review Meeting August 9, 2011. T. English responded that the FAA is working on completing the internal draft within a week and should have a final report to BOS/TAC-CAC by mid-November. D. Pomicter noted that it would be inappropriate for the CAC to make any Level 3 decisions before the Level 2 Report is issued.

The meeting adjourned at 2 PM.