

## Notes from Logan Mitigation Meeting October 24, 2002

State Transportation Building

8-4 pm

Attending:

Ed Freni  
Buddy Borgioli  
Joe Davies  
Bettina Peronti  
Flavio Leo  
Betty Desrosiers  
Richard Lettieri  
Ralph Dormitzer  
Antonia Pollak  
Maura Zlody  
Anastasia Lyman  
Bill Manning  
Dick Morrison  
Rick Bessom  
Bob D'Amico  
John Silva  
Michelle Ricci  
Vince Scarano  
Steve Lathrop  
Gail Lattrell  
Terry Flieger

Vince opened the meeting with what the Noise Study Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) should be working toward at this meeting. We should have enough information to have Massport send out the Request for Proposals (RFP) following this meeting. Also, we should be prepared to send out a schedule at the close of today's meeting. We also need to have some discussion concerning the organization of the TAC. Lastly, we will share the role of the FAA Airspace Evaluation Team and the process for reviewing all proposals.

Rich Lettieri, legal counsel for Massport, made a statement concerning Massport needing to have legal counsel present as a result of the pending lawsuits. Anastasia Lyman, CAC, strongly objected to Massport Legal Counsel being present, stating that it negated the promise of working together in good faith. Discussion ensued. Compromise reached: at this meeting, there would not be legal counsel present, but the issue was tabled to be resolved before the next meeting. Every effort will be made to arrive at a decision as to the role of legal counsel at the meetings resolved prior to the November 7, CAC meeting.

Joe Davies initiated a discussion concerning airlines and their involvement. He felt the group should be more varied and inclusive. Consider the aircraft operators and users (ie.

ATA, ALPA). Vince Scarano explained his intent was to target airlines. It was agreed that we identify more than just airlines on the organizational chart.

Anastasia Lyman recommended that we work on basis of consensus and not voting. Discussion ensued. Joe Davies offered a definition of consensus to which we agreed: through compromise we could all accept the final decision.

Betty Desrosiers, Massport Aviation Planning, wanted business interests included in the chart. Maura Zlody, City of Boston Environmental Department, recommended using the Seaport Transportation Management to represent affected businesses with a stake in the process. Betty suggested that perhaps we need a perspective that represents the economic impact to business like a Chamber of Commerce. The organizational chart will be revised to include the business component.

Joe Davies led a discussion on the noise evaluation. Most proposals will be within 30 miles of Boston airspace. FAA retains sole authority on airspace in the United States. The FAA group will consist of air traffic control experts. They will consult with other divisions within the FAA on an ad hoc basis.

The FAA group will evaluate the proposals to determine if they are rational, workable, do they fit within the NAS plan/does the National Airspace Plan prevent them from doing something? Whatever we do must mesh with New York airspace. This will be a screening process. Anastasia asked where were the limits of study. Could we move outside the NY airspace environment? Are we constrained by system efficiency? Joe answered that we are not ruling anything out, but efficiency will always be on the table. We must look at balance and tradeoffs. FAA will consider safety, efficiency and noise reduction. Joe added that the FAA will not act in a closed door fashion. Vince Scarano added that the Study's consultant will document the results of all of the evaluation of potential noise abatement proposals. We will need a complete record, whether the proposal is accepted or rejected.

The next discussion centered on PRAS. We reached a consensus on needing, "the potential development of a PRAS system as part of a noise abatement process" without reference to the existing PRAS. Anastasia Lyman stated that the CAC would take a vote on full support of a new PRAS at the November 7 meeting.

The Part 150 process will not apply as this study will not be a regulatory one, but a more creative study. Vince articulated that an EA or EIS for sensible proposals that may flow from this study would be eligible for federal funding. We will likely phase the grants for this study. In that way we can better define the first grant then approach the second.

John Silva stated that we need to develop a new Noise Exposure Map in phase 2 for sound insulation purposes. There was consensus on that point.

Discussion ensued regarding forecasts. FAA and Massport have confidence in the existing EIS forecasts. The FAA and Massport do not believe the forecasts to be

inappropriate. CAC disagreed. They requested that the TAC consider using updated forecasts for the purpose of the new Noise Study. It was agreed to look for a level of forecasting expertise in the RFP.

We all agreed to the concept of TAC and both consultant teams' sharing the information/data that will be input to modeling prior to the airspace modeling.

Joe Davies wondered how persons outside the CAC would contribute to the study. We need to have a vehicle for outreach to the community to accept their thoughts. We need to have a process to deal with impacted communities not represented by the CAC. Process should be open, but is not yet defined. This idea was tabled. No definitive answer, but we need to resolve it in scoping.

On behalf of the CAC, Anastasia Lyman stated that there still exists a request for nighttime curfew and cargo restriction analysis to be addressed as part of this study. Elimination of airport activity is not on the table, according to Massport, the ROD committed to a noise study to review overflight. John Silva will get back to Anastasia Lyman on whether a Part 161 process could be entertained in spite of having no Part 150 process. John added that it was likely that Washington would see the Part 161 process as a method of last resort. Need to identify what issues are not subject to change.

Mediation remains an open issue. CAC requested a mediator be present to observe and able to assist when needed throughout the Noise Study. Discussion ensued. Massport did take a position against the need for mediation. FAA did not take a position either way at this meeting.

Can consultants work on the Noise Study if they have done airport work before at Logan or are currently under contract for work at Logan. Is there a conflict of interest? FAA will determine the answer and get back to the group.

All consultants should have the same background with which to prepare. Betty Desrosiers will provide the list to Gail Lattrell, Terry Flieger, FAA Regional Air Traffic Control, will supplement the list to include past RODS, and the CAC will supply a list of members and their bylaws for the consultant background information.

Four significant items remain unresolved, yet must be addressed prior to scoping:

- 1) legal issues (counsel presence at meetings)
- 2) access restrictions (cargo)
- 3) forecasting (effort)
- 4) mediation

Next meeting will be at the Logan Office Center on November 18 at 9:30 am.