

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

DATE: 10/13/09
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: 11/05/09

ATTENDEES (include affiliation):

| Name | Affiliation |
|---------------|------------------|
| Steve Smith | PC |
| Jon Woodward | IC |
| Terry English | FAA |
| Gail Lattrell | FAA |
| Flavio Leo | Massport |
| Jerry Falbo | CAC (Winthrop) |
| Sandra Kunz | CAC (Braintree) |
| Wig Zamore | CAC (Somerville) |

OBSERVERS (include affiliation):

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

COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:

| Individuals | Files |
|---|-------|
| Project File BLANS Forum CAC BOS/TAC | |

I. Attendance:

Steve Smith took attendance.

II. Approval of 7/28/09 and 10/06/09 Meeting Notes:

For the 7/28/09 notes, there was clarification regarding section V b. FAA Air Traffic Evaluation Team Meeting. The 7/28/09 and 10/06/09 notes were then approved.

III. PMT Meeting Material Distribution:

S. Smith stated that M. Zlody has voiced frustration with the file sharing process because not all information is shared, so it has been difficult to keep up to date and informed. He also said that the PMT should decide what to share before/after PMT review. He asked CAC for their position on this. After some discussion, S. Kunz and J. Falbo decided that it was okay to send everything that is sent to them to the entire CAC membership. From this call forward, there will only be one email (unless

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

otherwise specified) sent prior to each PMT call. All agenda, notes, and files will be disseminated to PMT, CAC, and BOS/TAC.

T. English added that there may be a rare case when she may be directed to initially share a certain file with PMT only.

IV. BOS/TAC Agenda:

S. Smith said that he revised the original BOS/TAC agenda. J. Woodward asked S. Smith what he is hoping to accomplish with the results of the 2005 noise modeling results. S. Smith said that he would like to show the results at the meeting if there is time.

F. Leo thinks that the '05 results discussion will end up being about where the '07 is going. He said that discussion about '05 would be informative, but there are decisions to be made regarding '07. He said it would be wise to think about how to present the information (relevant vs. non relevant issues). S. Smith feels that the '05 results should be discussed, because a lot of time and budget went towards processing these.

J. Woodward said that '07 results will be critical for the CAC, not so much the '05 results.

After further discussion, it was determined that the '05 contours shouldn't be presented before the '07 contours are completed. A status report could be provided to meeting attendees as follows: 2005 contours are completed, 2007 contours are still in process, and a full report will be forthcoming when completed.

S. Smith led a technical discussion regarding the Future Year No Project alternatives. Both the FAA and CAC needs to understand the differential between the alternative that incorporates both Phase 1 and Phase 2 measures and the alternative that does not include Phase 1 and Phase 2 measures. This is not identified in the scope, but PC highly recommends adding it. PMT concurred.

S. Smith then proceeded to discuss the TAAM results presentation. J. Woodward asked if the ops baseline TAAM modeling will include 2007. S. Smith said that the TAAM analysis only involves 2005 levels. J. Woodward then recommended that presenting the results at the BOS/TAC meeting is not necessary at this time until there are comparative results to measures.

F. Leo requested clarification from S. Smith that the point of adding the baseline to the year is to calibrate the model. S. Smith confirmed that the primary objective for the 2005 analysis was to calibrate the model, but the secondary objective was also to provide existing conditions delay metrics. Overall, the No Action, No Project and Proposed Action results will be the most critical to support decision-making. PMT agreed that at this time, there is no good reason to present the 2005 results at the BOS/TAC meeting.

There was more discussion about rearranging the agenda. S. Smith said that there probably won't be much time spent on Level 2, except for the FAA's status. In addition, there is not too much information available to go over with BOS/TAC related to Level 2.

J. Woodward discussed Level 2 Screening criteria within the SOW for operations and noise parameters. He said that CAC now has a more specific set of criteria for noise reduction goals. He recommends including language from the CAC goals and objectives for criteria for the design measures in Level 2 Screening in the reassessed scope of work and the qualitative effects of Level 2 screening. S. Smith agreed that the screening should now include the CAC goals, objectives and

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

criteria language, and remove language that is no longer applicable. This would be reviewed with BOS/TAC.

- Action Items:**
- (1) S. Smith to move 2005 Contours into status report and remove from the BOSTAC agenda as a separate item.**
 - (2) T. English and A. Reed to arrange for dinner to be catered.**
 - (3) A. Reed to resend call number and PIN for CAC meeting (T. English sent this info via email while on the call).**
 - (4) S. Smith to send revised BOS/TAC meeting agenda.**

V. Outreach Plan Update:

T. English advised PMT that she received good comments back regarding the outreach letter and will resend it with track changes to PMT.

S. Smith asked about the draft fact sheet of what was sent out to the press for the project. He said that there should be a link to the concept files and a brief description of each. T. English said that she has a draft, but it is in a very rough form and she would like to receive comments back.

J. Woodward asked T. English if the telcon with the newly identified communities was confirmed for Monday, 10/19/09, but she said that it wasn't because Barbara hadn't heard back from all of the communities yet. T. English also stated that she is okay with the telcon not taking place by 10/19. If this occurs, she can provide an update after the BOS/TAC meeting.

S. Smith brought up the study area and said that it should stay the same for now and can be redefined, if needed, after Level 2 Screening. He referenced the note on the maps provided to PMT that explains why the study area would not change at this time.

J. Woodward asked T. English what she hopes to accomplish from the outreach telcon. T. English said that the telcon is a courtesy call to the community representatives in advance of the FAA letter to:

1. Inform them of the study in general
2. Inform them of the proposed noise abatement measures that could affect their communities
3. Explain to them how to get involved with the study
4. Provide them with an opportunity to ask clarifying questions

VI. Scope Reassessment:

S. Smith sent the scope reassessment to PMT first. He wanted concurrence from PMT before sending it to the entire CAC and BOS/TAC with track changes. The two main topics to discuss in the reassessment are

1. Decided by CAC with FAA and MPA concurrence that PRAS is on hold pending completion of Phase II
2. In Phase 1 north/south shore communities expressed concerns related to the "over the water" concept of PRAS since directing aircraft over Boston Harbor would eventually overfly those communities.

He also read an excerpt from page three of the scope and explained that the scope allows for looking into PRAS in Phase 2, but Massport and CAC have to come to a final decision if PRAS should still be included.

Telephone Conversation/Meeting Summary

Boston Logan Airport Noise Study Logan International Airport

J. Woodward made reference to PRAS as a concept of preferential runway use, and should be considered as such when a decision is made by Massport and CAC. The Phase 1 measures are also constructs of a preferential runway use concept.

F. Leo also asked what the issue is regarding the scope reassessment.

S. Smith stated that the issue is that PRAS is specifically called out in the ROD. There is discussion of PRAS in Phase 2. Because it is mentioned in the ROD, he suggested that the term needs to carry through until a final decision is made on PRAS as it is defined today, which is scoped for Phase 2. He emphasized the importance of what PRAS means according to the ROD, and needs to be reconciled first before we can proceed towards other optional measures.

F. Leo asked how to scope preferential runway use in Phase 3.

S. Smith advised that if the CAC believes that preferential runway use can be used, a decision related to the current PRAS must be made first. The decision needs to include reference to CAC and Massports belief on the effectiveness of preferential runway use related to the Airport and the unique circumstances related to not only with the DNL 65, but also areas exposed to lower levels.

F. Leo agreed that PRAS still has to be discussed even if for just a minute because it is stated in the ROD.

There was more discussion on how to refer to preferential runway use without only using the term PRAS. It was then determined that it should be referred to as PRAS and other types of strategies for preferential runway use when discussed in Phase 3. This will be further discussed at the upcoming BOS/TAC meeting.

T. English noted that any additional changes in the SOW related to PRAS would first need to be coordinated with the FAA evaluation team before finalizing.