

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

DATE: 10/06/08
TIME: 4:30 p.m. EST

Telephone Conversation
 Meeting
 Other

SUBJECT: Phase 2 Bi-Weekly Project Management Call

SUMMARY PREPARED BY: Rick Peloquin

DATE PREPARED: 10/06/08

ATTENDEES (include affiliation):

| Name | Affiliation |
|---------------|----------------|
| Steve Smith | PC |
| Rob Adams | IC |
| Terry English | FAA |
| Gail Lattrell | FAA |
| Bernice Mader | CAC (Quincy) |
| Jerry Falbo | CAC (Winthrop) |
| Flavio Leo | Massport |

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

| Name | Affiliation |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Ron Hardaway | CAC (East Boston) |
| Richard Doucette | FAA |

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

| Individuals | Files |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| Project File BLANS Forum | |

I. Attendance:

Steve Smith took attendance.

II. Approval of 9/02/08 Meeting Notes:

The approval of the 9/02/08 meeting notes has been put on hold until PMT has a chance to review the necessary clarifications that were added to the Phase 1 Implementation Monitoring – CAC section (page 2) of the Status Update. The approval is expected to occur by the end of this week. Note: Approval was received the next day.

III. CAC September 25th Letter Clarifications:

- a. Development of Goals and Objectives - The FAA was not sure if the CAC expected it to interpret what it believes are the goals and objectives of the CAC. Per B. Mader, the CAC does not need the FAA's interpretation and is working on determining its goals and objectives in two capacities. The first is to determine the goals and objectives as a group (CAC). Secondly, it will determine the goals and objectives of what it expects from the study.
- b. Clarification was needed regarding the May 28th, 2008 IC Summary of CAC Decisions because this document had not been sent to PC or FAA. Rob Adams (sitting in for J.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

- Woodward) informed the PMT that he had a copy of this document. B. Mader explained that this summary was part of a presentation that J. Woodward gave at a CAC meeting on 5/28/08. Per T. English, the FAA will review the language in the presentation as the CAC justification for the rejection or acceptance of measures.
- c. In the letter submitted to the FAA, the CAC requested that the measures proposed by Representative Hines by the town of Marshfield be evaluated. However, there was no mention of the one proposed measures from Somerville. T. English asked B. Mader if the FAA should assume that no mention of these proposals means that the CAC doesn't support them. B. Mader said that she didn't recall seeing these letters and asked that they be sent to CAC. T. English reminded call participants that these letters were sent to PMT and posted to the web in July '08. She said that she would resend the letters to B. Mader and the CAC. These letters will be discussed at the next CAC meeting on 10/23/08. These proposed measures from the elected officials meeting will also undergo the same Level 1 screening as the other measures did, if CAC approves. T. English told PMT that Level 1 assessment of such measures (from elected officials meeting) won't affect the project budget. (Note: later in the week, CAC leadership indicated to FAA to proceed forward with evaluating the Somerville measure after review the Somerville letter)
 - d. Phase 2 Evaluation Process – This topic was discussed during the approval notes from the previous call. The following information was copied from section iii of the Status Update from the 9/02/08 PMT call: A discussion ensued about Phase 2 measures and how the effectiveness will be evaluated when they are implemented in the future. The earliest implementation date is estimated in 2011. PC/FAA requested that CAC think about the type of evaluation it would recommend for these measures and suggested to hold discussions until the time comes. T. English indicated that there is no funding allocated for this evaluation in the current SOS for Phase 2.
 - e. Clarification was needed regarding the number of measures that could be evaluated for Level 2 Screening per the SOW. The scope is budgeted based on the assumption that 18 measures will be sent to Level 2 Screening. T. English mentioned that there are currently 35 measures on the table and some of them are in Level 1 Screening process. B. Mader mentioned 12 measures voted by CAC and the three additional measures proposed by the elected officials. S. Smith mentioned the need to complete the Level 1 Screening process to determine the actual number of measures, including the need for clear G&O that may also eliminate others.

Action Items: (1) R. Adams will forward the CAC presentation from 5/28/08 created by J. Woodward to PMT.

(2) T. English will forward Somerville letters/proposals to PMT, so that CAC can discuss these at the upcoming meeting.

IV. Status Update:

a. Action Item Status:

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

i. Level 1 Screening Report

Level 1 screening is currently on hold based on reasons outlined in the 8/13/08 FAA letter to CAC.

ii. CAC Goals and Objectives

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

The CAC is still working on determining its goals and objectives. B. Mader Informed the PMT that these will be discussed at the upcoming CAC meeting, but cannot guarantee that they will finish this topic. She also agreed to send FAA a status update after the meeting to inform them of the progress.

B. Mader advised the PMT that Level 1 Screening was put on hold because of reasons listed in the CAC letter that was sent to FAA. S. Smith stated that the letter was received recently and that more time should be given to FAA to digest the letter before responding to details. He also mentioned that giving more time this letter to be reviewed will not affect Level 1 screening if the information is available.

B. Mader stated that the reason why the Level 1 Screening is not completed is because the FAA requested CAC to provide reasoning for why it rejected certain measures (e.g. fanning). T. English stated that FAA needs clear goals and objectives for the rejections. B. Mader remarked that it is not the function of the CAC to provide legal reasoning for rejecting a measure based on a purpose and need statement. FAA agreed, but emphasized that this project is not currently under NEPA. The project is an alternative analysis, and as such, requires overall clear goals and objectives that each proposed measure is intended to meet. Along with the CAC proposed measures, there should be associated goals and objectives.

iii. Phase 1 Implementation Monitoring - CAC

This topic was discussed during the approval notes from the previous call. The following information was copied from section iii of the Status Update from the 9/02/08 PMT call: It was also mentioned that the target implementation date for the RNAV procedures is August 2009. These measures will not be evaluated until after implementation. If any of these measures don't achieve the initial goal, they may be adjusted – although there is no guarantee that they will be adjusted. It was J. Woodward's recommendation to CAC to withhold evaluation until all Phase 1 measures are implemented.

A discussion was held regarding what the FAA plans to do in evaluating those Phase 1 measures already implemented. S. Smith said that there is a budgeted task 3.2 in the SOS for IC to assist CAC in developing a operations report focused on Phase 1 measures that would provide key statistics in determining effectiveness, should the CAC decide to move forward in this direction. If CAC elects this option, IC can provide support in assessing which reporting mechanism would be the most effective for assessing operations data. Massport would provide raw data upon request, but cannot produce any reports or conduct analysis. It was stated that the radar data would be sufficient to evaluate the effectiveness of these measures, but should be determined by CAC with IC consultation. S. Smith stated that it is clearly up to CAC as to when they would begin conducting the scoped task, and the type of reports that is most effective based on available budget.

iv. 2005 Noise Modeling

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

v. 2005 TAAM Modeling

The calibration is complete and the baseline review has been started. B. Mader asked PC if any data from the environmental data report would be used in the modeling. S. Smith advised that BOS/TAC agreed and used 2005 as a base year, but the future year no action noise modeling would use the most current information (e.g. use of Runway 14/32; current runway use patterns, etc.).

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

vi. 6/25 CAC Meeting Notes

These notes are being reviewed by CAC. Currently, S. Smith has not received any comments on the meeting notes and has asked B. Mader to check with the members to see if there will be any submitted. Since so much time has elapsed, S. Smith asked B. Mader to give the members a deadline. She responded by stating that she would resend the notes and try to get comments back this week. S. Smith said that he would resend the most current notes (corrected version) to ensure that B. Mader had them. He also asked her to check the notes that she sent to CAC to make sure that they are the same version and to let him know if they aren't.

Action Items: (1) S. Smith will forward meeting notes to PMT.

b. PC Project Schedule/Budget Update:

S. Smith briefly discussed the project schedule/budget update that was emailed to the PMT. He also reminded the PMT that the schedule and budget are continuously updated based on project activity and invoices, and this information is being made available/shared each month.

B. Mader asked PC what project it is currently working on. S. Smith stated that PC is working on the 2005 noise analysis and TAAM modeling which will eventually be sent to IC for review. PC is also providing some support to FAA, working on project management details, preparing for PMT calls, and periodically updating the website. B. Mader responded by saying that she wants to slow down the IC and have it only work on necessary items in order to help save budget.

Action Items: (1) B. Mader to send IC invoice approval letter to F. Leo

V. BOS/TAC Meeting Schedule:

There was discussion about having a BOS/TAC meeting in November, but it was decided to skip this meeting and continue with the originally scheduled date of 1/29/09. However, a web meeting could be scheduled prior to the next BOS/TAC meeting.

There was discussion on this call about the broadening of the roles in which the BOS/TAC was originally created. It was intended to provide technical information, but has played a much broader role in the recent year. The CAC considers this a benefit and would like to keep the BOS/TAC in this context. J. Falbo added that a lot of the input from the BOS/TAC has been more related to process than technical information.

B. Mader also informed PMT that CAC has created its own subcommittee technical group. There was a lot of discussion about this and the main concern was that it could add another layer, and potential problems, to an already complex situation (e.g. schedule conflicts, meetings, etc.).

T. English expressed that this was the first time she has heard about the subcommittee and wonders how it fits into BOS/TAC, but agrees that there are pros and cons. She also thinks that this subcommittee should be more internal to the CAC and requested that this topic be discussed further during the next PMT call.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

S. Smith said that there could be advantages to having this subcommittee, especially if it allows for more efficient decision making. It was stated by CAC that this is the ultimate goal of forming the subcommittee.

B. Mader requested PMT that the BOS/TAC meeting in January will be held at the Logan Office Center instead of Volpe because the latter is not handicap accessible. F. Leo expressed his concern about the room not being large enough, but believes that the group can be accommodated.

VI. Miscellaneous:

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

The next PMT call is scheduled on 10/21/08 at 4:30 pm Eastern.