

Boston Logan Aircraft Noise Study

BOS/TAC Meeting Agenda

Subject: Phase 2 Work Efforts

Time: 4:30 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Date: May 24, 2007

Location: Department of Transportation Volpe Center, Cambridge MA

Call-In Phone Number: 1-781-238-7745 pin# 6613

Meeting Objective: Gather insight from BOS/TAC and attending CAC members regarding the Phase 2 efforts.

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>
4:30 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.	Opening Remarks
4:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Familiarization with New BOS/TAC Members
5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.	Phase 2 Statement of Work Process <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review SOW Outline• Review Alternative Analysis Process
6:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.	PC/IC Work Effort Status <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss where PC and IC are in the SOW Process
6:30 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.	Break
6:45 p.m. – 8:45 p.m.	Phase 2 BOS/TAC Communication/Decision-Making Protocol <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss goals and objectives for BOS/TAC• Discuss ideas and suggestions with members related to communicating information to members, CAC, and the general public.• Discuss and conclude on BOS/TAC's consensus decision-making process.
8:45 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	Phase 2 Baseline Noise Modeling Protocol <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss PC progress and general overview of preliminary approach.• Discuss use of noise measurement data during noise modeling efforts.• Discuss and identify key concerns of BOS/TAC members.
9:30 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.	New or Other Business

**Boston Overflight Noise Study
BOS/TAC Meeting**

MEETING SUMMARY

May 24, 2007

Attendance:

BOS/TAC Members:

Steve Kelly (FAA), Joseph Davies (FAA Air Traffic), Gail Lattrell (FAA Airports), Gary Hufnagle (FAA), Bettina Peronti (FAA), Brian Brunelle (FAA), Flavio Leo (Massport), Frank Iacovino (Massport), Steve Lathrop (Hull), Sandra Kunz (Braintree), Dick Morrison (Chelsea), Bob D'Amico (City of Boston Mayor's Office), Ralph Dormitzer (Cohasset), Bob Driscoll (Winthrop), Maura Zlody (Boston), Ron Hardaway, (East Boston), Declan Boland (Hingham),

CAC Observers: Marianne McCabe-phone (Marshfield), Wig Zamore (Somerville), Leo White (Beverly), Buddy Borgioli (Swampscott), Peter Koff (Cambridge), Bernice Mader-phone (

Project Consultant (PC) Team:

Stephen Smith (Ricondo & Associates, Inc.), Clint Morrow (Wyle), Tom Connors (Wyle), Scott Hamwey (Planners Collaborative)

Independent Consultant (IC) Team:

Jon Woodward (Landrum & Brown, Inc.)

1. Introductions

Stephen Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked if the order of agenda items was appropriate. He then introduced the members of the Project Team (PC) from Wyle—Clint Morrow and Tom Connors, and discussed both Clint's and Tom's credentials.

2. Baseline

Steve Kelly explained that changing the baseline year at this point would come with high costs. In response to Maura Zlody's question about the cost, he replied that it would be on the order of \$200,000.

Ralph Dormitzer said he thought Tina Gatewood said that they couldn't use 2005 in the EIS. S. Kelly replied she meant the 2005 numbers would be too old by the time an EIS was conducted. He added that 2006 may even be too old for the out years, and maybe they could do a comparative analysis instead. S. Smith discussed the purpose of the existing condition and the importance of the future No Action alternative. Phase 2 will assess the benefits of proposed alternatives by comparing to the future year No Action, not the existing conditions year. Flavio Leo said \$200,000 is a lot of money and if Runway 27 is the issue with the EIS maybe the analysis could be done there only.

Steve Lathrop asked what you are paying for 2006 versus 2005 and added he thought they were doing this analysis. S. Kelly replied they have already done 2005 and S.

Smith said they have already used it for operations simulations work. This work started when the contract was signed in 2006. Gail Lattrell added FAA had approved the commencement of the work. S. Lathrop raised concerns about work being done without consulting BOS/TAC. S. Smith emphasized that related to noise modeling, no work has started until there is an accepted noise modeling protocol. All PC has accomplished to date is collecting the 2005 radar data and processing it.

Bob D'Amico asked if departure data was to be used for the Runway 27 analysis. S. Kelly said only radar track data was used. Wig Zamore asked what the percentage change was. Dick Morrison stated 2005 and 2006 are likely to be similar per Jon Woodward. J. Woodward stated it is likely the flight tracks were similar but runway utilization could change. He said they are looking for a standard year to use for base year, which will be applied for the future No Action as a starting point. If baseline condition includes standard runway utilization, there's no problem. He added he thinks 2005 is more typical based on the understanding that numerous runway closures occurred at night in 2006 for construction. For the No Action alternative, S. Smith added any runway changes (such as 14/32) would be included.

P. Koff asked how the baseline will be updated for the EIS. S. Kelly said if the EIS is conducted, they may be able to use a comparative analysis to determine if a new existing conditions year is required. P. Koff said this meant that whether 2005 or 2006 were used, neither year's data would be frozen for the EIS.

F. Leo asked for the purpose of the baseline—was it to just calibrate the Total Airfield Airspace Model (TAAM) for operational analysis? S. Smith answered that it was for that purpose and for existing conditions metrics. He suggested it could be considered a validation exercise as well when developing input for INM. F. Leo asked why there is all of this concern if it is only a validation exercise. R. Dormitzer answered because it is being used to judge changes from the baseline based on alternatives being implemented. G. Lattrell suggested that the group may be talking about two different things. In the pre-planning phase they were only concerned with the delta. S. Smith emphasized that the “baseline” for Phase 2 will be the future No Action alternative, not the existing conditions. The No Action will include Phase 1 implemented alternatives, use of Runway 14/32 and the center taxiway.

S. Lathrop said we are on the cusp of a change in how the Airport is used and that 14/32 will change the runway utilizations. This change is not being captured in 2005 and 2006. D. Morrison asked what S. Lathrop would recommend. S. Lathrop said he would recommend they pay attention to the potential problem. D. Morrison said they have to make a decision. S. Smith asked if it was worth \$200,000. F. Leo said no. S. Kelly said the 2006 numbers are the most currently available data for a complete year. S. Smith asked how having the most up to date information would help this project. S. Kelly suggested a simple explanation for why 2005 was used be included. B. D'Amico said FAA should do the comparative analysis to make sure that 2005 remains adequate.

S. Kelly said he understood the Runway 27 sensitivity because there is an assumption that we're now more in compliance. W. Zamore said the term "sensitivity" should not be used in the traditional sense.

S. Lathrop asked if the EIS would result in redeveloping the existing condition. S. Smith said in "NEPAese" 2005 is existing conditions. He asked if the question was would they need a new existing condition in the EIS. S. Lathrop said by the time they get to a future year No Action, the baseline EIS will be based on a set of facts different than what happened. S. Smith explained NEPA comparison requirements, and that the No Action alternative is based on a future year scenario that involve assumptions based on existing conditions as well as those actions that are known to occur in the future, such as the Phase 1 alternative, use of Runway 14/32 and taxiway improvements. It is the No Action alternative that serves as the "baseline" for environmental consequence determinations, not the Existing Conditions.

J. Woodward attempted to answer the questions with a diagram on the white board. He displayed flight tracks, runway use profiles and aircraft types being fed into the existing conditions model, which help determine a "typical" day. He explained that these assumptions feed into the future baseline or No Action, along with modifications for Phase I tracks and usage and future operating assumptions. The results are compared against the evaluation of alternatives from Phase 2. If the EIS starts far enough in the future—say 2010—we may have to look at different future baseline (perhaps 2015), which would involve primarily fleet mix and operation level adjustments.

R. Dormitzer asked whether the current conditions are based on 2005 or 2006. R. Hardaway asked if the Centerfield Taxiway has any impact on future baseline. F. Leo said Massport did not believe construction would have an impact. R. Dormitzer asked if they knew what the future baseline or No Action year is for Phase 2. S. Smith said the scope calls for 2010. R. Dormitzer asked if you could really know where things are going. S. Smith said today the issue at hand is 2005 and 2006. He proposed that they continue as scoped with 2005. S. Smith proposed *a resolution to maintain 2005 as the Phase 2 existing conditions in addition to conducting a comparative analysis between 2005 and 2006. There was a general consensus in support of the proposed resolution.* S. Smith asked who was opposed. R. Hardaway said he wanted to know how Centerfield Taxiway would be used. S. Smith said it is in future baseline not current conditions. There was no clear opposition to the resolution. S. Kelly asked if S. Smith would be document the resolutions and send it to the CAC. S. Smith said yes.

S. Kelly asked if they should **proceed as scoped with the 2005 data supported by a comparative analysis for 2006, with an agreement that they would include a memo to BOSTAC/CAC explaining the rationale for this approach.** D. Boland said he would be comfortable with that. B. D'Amico said his vote assumes a comparative analysis will be conducted. S. Lathrop asked if the existing conditions noise analysis work would produce a set of INM flight tracks. S. Smith said yes. S.

Lathrop asked if they would get to learn how they did that. S. Smith said yes. S. Lathrop asked if there would be opportunities for quality control, adding that in Phase 1 it became difficult to isolate the effects of alternatives because the data were aggregated. S. Smith said those are appropriate comments as part of the noise protocol discussion. S. Kelly said he would post information on this discussion on the Runway 27 website. M McCabe (Marshfield) asked for information on the Runway 27 website.

3. Scope of Work

S. Smith outlined the work already conducted, including public coordination, existing conditions research, and alternatives analysis project planning. He explained what the PC was currently working on, and then J. Woodward explained what the IC was working on.

J. Woodward explained that most of the IC work has been reactive. He said they have begun reviewing TAAM information from the PC, attending the legislative briefing, and developing noise measurement protocols. He said during the April 12 teleconference with the CAC, noise measurement sites were selected. These included 12 side-by-side sites with the Massport monitors (including Hull, Weymouth, Quincy, the South End, East Boston, Winthrop, Piers Park and Nahant). They also identified supplemental sites for noise monitoring, including Melrose, Downtown Boston, the western South Shore, Cohasset and Scituate. Some sites have already been measured, and by June 20 all should be done. Once the noise measuring is finished, the IC will do a correlation analysis of the side-by-side results and the flight track data, and evaluate the noise data with distance from airplanes to measurement site (for use in the noise modeling).

P. Koff asked if the Downtown and Melrose points were being taken when Runway 33 is in use. W. Zamore asked if Point D had been collected, to which J. Woodward replied it had, for an entire week. J. Woodward discussed weather conditions and the variance in results (planes climb faster on cold days than on warm days). He said that temperature information will be available.

R. Dormitzer asked when they would first see results, to which J. Woodward replied it would be the fall. S. Smith added it could be later than that depending how long it will take to get BOSTAC and CAC acceptance of the noise modeling protocol.

4. Decision/Communications Protocols (Project Plan)

S. Smith said everyone should have version 2.00 of the protocol that was emailed to all BOS/TAC and CAC members about three weeks ago. J. Woodward had added noise measurement and various types of CAC meetings to version 1. S. Smith said the goal of the Project Plan is to provide direction and a means to communicate information, therefore the BOS/TAC has been gathered to get their insight into the Project Plan. He gave an overview, including a list of objectives and expectations and

then started going through the outline, asking if there were any comments for each section. There were one comments on section one—the project goal statement. R. Dormitzer said the project goal statement isn't really a goal, but rather a process. He said the goal is to provide noise relief. G. Lattrell said if they had a goal that broad, they would be unlikely to find alternatives where everyone wins. R. Dormitzer said that he believes that has to be the goal, but that there are then the ways that you achieve it. S. Kelly said they pulled language from the ROD so they wouldn't have this discussion. S. Smith stated that the goal provided is language from the FAA Record of Decision and that all members please provide their comments and concerns as it is written in Version 2.00.

D. Boland said if they are here for a process then he is wasting his time. S. Smith stated that this project plan was requested by members of CAC to provide clear direction of how Phase 2 will be conducted, when, how, who descriptions related to decisions, general timeline and public dissemination of information.

D. Morrison suggested the goal statement begin with “The goal of the study is to reduce airport noise by evaluating...” and then continuing with the proposed statement.

S. Smith asked if there were any comments on section two—the work plan. D. Boland asked what the difference was between information shared by CAC or by BOS/TAC. S. Smith replied they send them to both groups—CAC and BOS/TAC. Bob Driscoll said not everyone was on computers and they need other forms of media to communicate with people. S. Smith said this had been discussed during Phase 2 scope of work development at the June 8, 2006 meeting, and the result was agreeing to communicate with elected representatives. B. Driscoll said it always comes down to cost or safety with this project. S. Smith said FAA did reach out to newspapers at the end of Phase 1 and would conduct similar efforts in Phase 2. G. Lattrell said it is in the scope to talk to newspaper, radio and television outlets. D. Boland said it should be a more collaborative thing. S. Smith asked if an objective specifically related to media outreach was necessary. S. Smith said there is a protocol related to information requests, and that is to go through the CAC chair or to email FAA. Sandra Kunz said the problem with the media is they like to focus on the negative and sometimes they don't know enough about the subject and they write something misleading.

B. D'Amico said when he was chair he was on the Boston Neighborhood Network and the phone was smoking. He asked what happened to the neighborhood meetings. S. Smith said there legislative briefings were provided in the scope, which were designed to keep elected officials informed so they may be able to address questions from their constituents. R. Dormitzer said they were a bit inexperienced when it comes to dealing with the press and suggested they may want to consider bringing in a media relations person.

M. McCabe suggested neighborhood meetings be held and that the consultants would not be necessary in order to keep costs down. D. Morrison said each CAC member should be doing this. M. McCabe said Massport and the FAA should do this because the CAC is not the public, and they have their own interests.

R. Hardaway suggested a quarterly press release so that when people received media inquiries they could be referred to the latest release.

S. Smith said the objective is to share information and one way is the website. D. Boland said the website should be a proactive tool. F. Leo said there was more than that—the project has a long lead time and is very technical. He said there was no silver bullet for solving that and they couldn't force a journalist to do a story on it. D. Boland said one unified positive message is needed. He said they needed confidence as a group to develop this message. B. Driscoll said they needed to utilize cable television and make a 15 minute documentary. S. Smith asked if they needed an objective stating “provide proactive public relations program including...”

D. Morrison suggested that FAA staff make calls to local representatives at key decision points. Joe Davies asked what they were talking about because the statement of work includes all of these activities. S. Smith acknowledged the name of the task, but the scope of work does not include activities being suggested at this meeting today. S. Smith said the website is the primary tool and that he is hearing that it isn't enough. R. Hardaway suggested referring this to a committee.

S. Lathrop said he has a long list of unanswered questions. S. Smith referred him to the information request protocol, and that questions posed by S. Lathrop are in the process of being responded to. S. Lathrop said they (CAC chair and co-chair) are being empowered to use their discretion, to which S. Kunz replied she resented that comment. She said that she had forwarded all of S. Lathrop's questions. S. Smith suggested discussing this with the CAC, that this topic was not appropriate for BOS/TAC. S. Lathrop said the protocol was never agreed on and that the CAC leadership does not have the right to screen his questions. B. D'Amico said every question he has asked has been answered at a cost to this project. S. Kelly said he has been on the phone with S. Lathrop more than everyone else and that it is not fair for him to claim FAA has not been responsive. M. McCabe said the information that goes through CAC leadership is filtered with conflicts of interest and they are not a disinterested party. S. Kunz said she disagreed with M. McCabe's perspective. R. Dormitzer said it was unfair to talk about the CAC acting as a filter. S. Smith emphasized that this topic is not appropriate for BOS/TAC, and should be discussed at a CAC meeting. He asked that unfounded and personal accusations not take place at this meeting.

The PC agreed to flesh out 2.6 to be more specific on media outreach.

D. Morrison said they have limited resources and fairness suggests that S. Lathrop's concerns can't all be addressed without others not having an equal opportunity to

have their concerns addressed. S. Lathrop agreed and said he thinks IC should be answering CAC questions, saying J. Woodward suggested that it costs IC \$200 per question. S. Lathrop said its worth it to spend \$200 many times to get critical questions answered and that its up to CAC to budget the money.

Leo White asked if S. Lathrop was paid to come to these meetings. S. Lathrop said he was, and was always opened about this. S. Kelly said the reason for the protocol is so everyone can get answers. M. McCabe said the ability to communicate with the consultant is similar to overall project communication. She said she was told by FAA in January that they were instructed not to answer her questions by CAC. S. Kelly said M. McCabe was referring to an incident with Tina Gatewood who was given instructions by S. Kelly, but he is sorry that she had worded it that way. M. McCabe is a member of the CAC, and all members should be aware of comments and concerns made by other members. G. Lattrell said the communications protocol is an outgrowth of a lessons learned from Phase 1, that taking all phone calls is not practical.

S. Smith said BOS/TAC needs to move on. S. Lathrop said if they were going to have a discussion, everyone should have a say. S. Smith asked if they wanted to proceed, to which the group replied they did not and wanted to proceed to the next topic. M McCabe said it was unfortunate that millions of dollars were being spent on a corrupt process. S. Smith once again emphasized that unfounded and personal accusations should not take place at this meeting. All members are here to find a means to reduce aircraft noise impacts, not make unsubstantiated claims and accusations. Such claim only hinders the noble intent of this project and those who volunteer their own personal time to make a difference. S. Smith requested that the group take a 10-minute break. The group agreed not to take the break and to move on to the next topic.

S. Smith continued discussing the Project Plan and said he would give the group two weeks to respond, acknowledging that was tight. D. Boland asked him to please be conscious of the summer season and potential vacations plans. R. Dormitzer asked how the Project Plan is different from the Phase 2 scope. S. Smith stated the content is similar, but presented differently. This was developed as requested by CAC at the May 2nd meeting. PC always assumed the Project Plan was the Phase 2 scope, but members such as J. Stewart did not feel that it adequately outlined the project plan and process.

J. Woodward said based on what he's heard from the CAC, there is never a regular or predictable flow of material. He added that meetings are called a month ahead of time and then rescheduled. He said he thinks the group needs to agree to regularity. He pointed to section three of the Project Plan where it recommends a BOS/TAC meeting every four months, near the end of the month. He then described the rest of the schedule from the plan. He pointed to the commitment for consultants to provide information at least 2 to 3 weeks before each meeting. IC feels that such a plan provides a better means for volunteer members to plan their busy schedule.

R. Hardaway asked for the target reply date. S. Smith said it was June 8th. R. Dormitzer said the problem is that the scope and the Project Plan don't relate exactly. He asked S. Smith to identify which task in the scope is tied to the steps in the Project Plan. S. Smith agreed to incorporate this in Version 3.00.

5. Noise Analysis Protocol and Development

Tom Connors said he was looking for questions and feedback on objectives, sequence and issues after his presentation. He said the objective was to develop an achievable noise modeling process to develop INM input that accounts for ground and altitude variations. The purpose is joint decision making, PC/IC coordination, addressing CAC concerns efficiently within scope, a collective of understanding of limitations, gaining confidence, etc.

Clint Morrow reviewed progress on the draft noise modeling protocol. He said next steps are that PC will collaborate with IC, there will be FAA review, and IC will present results to the CAC after the proposals are reviewed with FAA. There will be a demonstration of analysis tools to IC and CAC members, a CAC comment period, decision milestones, and signoff. He outlined protocol sections and went through each chapter and identified the scope tasks addressed, before opening the topic to discussion.

R. Hardaway asked if the ground noise referred to aircraft only and not support vehicles. C. Morrow said it was just for aircraft. B. Bargioli asked if there was any plan to demonstrate the noise model. S. Smith said they can show them the INM. B. D'Amico asked how INM handles standard procedures versus RNAV. C. Morrow said in Phase 2 they will do it the same way as in Phase 1—look at RNAV and standard for each procedure and model the appropriate track dispersion and utilization.

B. Driscoll asked why the alternatives examined as part of the Centerfield Taxiway study will not be revisited. He said Winthrop can't accept this because only six members of the impacted communities were involved. He suggested inviting the six to come before the BOS/TAC to discuss their experience. G. Lattrell replied that FAA has made a finding and spent money on consultants' analysis of the alternatives. B. Driscoll said this can't be passed over and the six should be invited here. F. Leo said Massport disagrees because they don't feel the Centerfield Taxiway becomes part of the baseline and Massport won't support alternatives that reduce the efficiency and safety of the Airport as well as conduct further analysis on alternatives that were already fully analyzed.

J. Davies asked if the approval or lack of approval of Discerno (Wyle's proprietary tool used for noise screening and Number of Event above metric summation) and Sound Plan (used for ground noise modeling), which require FAA approval, affect the schedule because FAA is not always quick to approve new things. T. Connors said he

would expect FAA to ask us to demonstrate Sound Plan. He said he doesn't know about schedule implications because he hasn't had those conversations with FAA yet. S. Smith emphasized that there is a Plan B for ground noise analysis if FAA does not approve Sound Plan---use of the FAA's recommended procedure documented in the INM user manual.

D. Boland said he liked the plan, but asked them to please explain the acronyms in the future. He also asked what the study is doing to look at traffic doubling in 15 years without noise efficiency of aircraft improving for another 25 years. S. Smith said the operation and efficiency of the fleet is a constant when comparing future No Action and alternatives, but will involve effects of expected future traffic levels and fleet mix. D. Boland asked if it was possible to look at the doubling of traffic. S. Smith said he understood the question, but said he is currently just looking at the scope year of 2010.

W. Zamore asked if there was a wide enough range of input provided for CAC or are they just getting locked into a few small decisions. W. Zamore mentioned there was a health impacts study going on and asked if there was any opportunity to bring their findings in. B. Driscoll said it would be helpful. S. Smith explained that none of the data going into AIRMOD (air quality model) would be very relevant to noise modeling. W. Zamore asked if they were planning on looking at what the experience was in towns on the 90th percentile worst day, saying perceptions are based on worst experiences. T. Connors said not to the extent they are looking at in the health impacts study, but will be modeling each of the six major runway configurations separately. M. McCabe requested the website for the health impact study. W. Zamore provided contact information for the Massachusetts Department of Public Health. He then said population density is an important issue, saying it has been used to consider environmental justice issues. S. Smith said they are using the MAPC data as a source.

P. Koff asked if there was a study timeline so they could see the proposed flow of the study. S. Smith said there is a Gantt Chart they are working on which is very extensive. He said it is easier to manage the technical work than it is to manage CAC review, which is the primary driver of the schedule. For example, existing condition noise modeling cannot start until we have an agreed upon protocol. PC needs to review the schedule with Project Management to assess issues associated with expected time of completion.

R. Dormitzer asked what the level of accuracy would be, saying it has to be better than what they have today. S. Lathrop said he was impressed by the level of input in the noise modeling protocol and is concerned that the Phase 2 work has already begun. He asked if they would get a good early iteration crack at it. S. Smith said all they have done is take the radar data from Massport and put it into a format compatible to Wyle's analysis tools. Nothing presented in the protocol has been done or will be done until the BOS/TAC and CAC agrees on the plan. J. Woodward said CAC has had an expectation of getting into the weeds of the information and thinks that's a good thing here.

D. Morrison said it was helpful to get the spreadsheets from J. Woodward in Phase 1 because he could review them on his own. He requested that future materials be provided in electronic format rather than Acrobat Reader format.

S. Smith asked if a subcommittee should be formed of individuals interested in getting into the weeds of the noise modeling protocol. D. Boland thought it was an excellent idea and that perhaps there was a need for several subcommittees. S. Smith asked for consensus. F. Leo suggested that this was the original intent of BOS/TAC. He cautioned against new subcommittees saying there would now be two layers to go through. D. Morrison suggested people with interest could review certain issues. G. Lattrell offered ground noise as an issue that some members would be very passionate about, and others would not have an interest. F. Leo said this could be addressed by compartmentalizing the meetings. No conclusion was made related to subcommittee formation. PC will proceed as originally planned via entire BOS/TAC and CAC review.

6. Closing Remarks

S. Smith and the BOS/TAC adjourned the meeting.