

**Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS)  
Continuation of Phase 2 PMT/CAC “Mini-Summit”**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

Date: April 14, 2009

Time: 6:00-9:00 PM

Location: Massport LOC

**ATTENDEES (include affiliation):**

Name	Affiliation
Terry English	FAA
Gail Lattrell	FAA
Flavio Leo	Massport
Betty Desrosiers	Massport
Stephen Smith	PC (Ricondo & Associates, Inc.)
Jon Woodward	IC (Landrum and Brown)
Sandra Kunz	CAC (Braintree)
Jerry Falbo	CAC (Winthrop)
Buddy Borgioli	CAC (Swampscott)
Dick Morrison	CAC (Chelsea)
Ralph Dormitzer	CAC (Cohasset-prior meetings legacy Attendee per Sandra Kunz)
Wig Zamore	CAC (Somerville)

**OBSERVERS (include affiliation):**

Name	Affiliation
Alan Reed	FAA-Recorder
Gary Hufnagle	FAA (ATCT)
Terry McIntyre	CAC (Weymouth)
Will Lyman	CAC (Jamaica Plain)
Ron Hardaway	CAC (E. Boston)
Mona Thaler	CAC (Brookline)
Maura Zlody	City of Boston, Environ. Dept
Bernice Mader	CAC (Quincy)

**COPIES OF SUMMARY SENT TO:**

Individuals	Files
Attendees	Project Files

\*Of note: there was a problem with telephone audio quality at Massport throughout parts of the telecon. As with all minutes summaries, A. Reed requests that where voids appear, participants should submit corrections prior to finalizing the document.

**1. ATTENDANCE**

Attendees and Observers stated their names and employers/communities represented for the record; S. Smith announced who was on the phone line and noted that all observers on the phone line would be muted. As new people join the telecon, they will be muted as

well, until the line is open at the end of the meeting. T. English stated that A. Reed is taking notes, but that the FAA would not be recording the meeting. She noted that FAA had originally agreed to record the mini-summit meeting at CAC's request to assist in assuring note accuracy as the meetings were being held during the day and not all CAC members could participate. She also noted that the FAA stated at the first meeting that the tape was to be considered as draft, not a transcript of the meeting and that the recordings were not intended to be precedent setting. Since this meeting is being held in the evening and there were some issues with CAC requests for tapes and/or transcripts of the previous meetings, the FAA will resume the normal course of note taking which has worked well in the past.

J. Falbo announced he would be recording the meeting. He reasoned the need was based upon having so much information presented at these meetings that it's difficult to absorb, not being an expert in all aviation matters. He feels the CAC shares this deficiency, it is an open meeting, and it's to the CAC's benefit to have him use the recording as a tool to better understand what and why things were said.

T. English stated that for the record, the FAA objects to the CAC recording the meeting as it may inhibit the free flow of ideas and that that meeting notes should be an adequate record of the meeting as they have been in the past.

The group discussed the use of the recording from the previous two meetings.

## **II. PREVIOUS MEETING NOTES APPROVAL**

R. Dormitzer commented that after reviewing the minutes of the 3/16/09 meeting, he wasn't sure what was accomplished with each measure. He requested that each measure be written in a "decision and action" type of format. Also, J. Woodward commented that there was some confusion within the context of the measures discussed: using similar first name spellings incorrectly. A. Reed suggested that future meetings minutes reference individuals by initials rather than first names. No dissention was observed by the comment.

The group made other general comments about the notes. Consensus was that rather than summarizing the conversations of individual members, notes should be more reflective of what was accomplished.

***The meeting notes (3/16/09) will be approved as they are amended, reflecting the above standards. A. Reed requested two weeks for the final draft (4/28/09). ACTION ITEM-FAA/A. Reed.***

S. Smith suggested the group proceed with reviewing the ACTION ITEMS from the 3/16/09 meeting (13 total items). See Attachment 2.

T. English proceeded through the list, with concurrence from the group that items #1-4 were complete.

There was a discussion about item #5 and costs absorbed.

S. Smith would like to discuss what is needed for '07.

J. Woodward addressed CAC's concerns regarding the baseline \*.

R. Dormitzer would like specific metrics with color illustrations depicting no noise areas with attention to anomalies.

S. Smith would update the '07 baseline noise, based on the '05 INM inputs. Additionally, S. Smith and J. Woodward would look for any anomalies between them. CAC would also have to come to an agreement on grid points to have IC evaluate, based on those submitted a year ago and how to move forward. The IC recognizes this as a quality control obligation to the CAC.

The group discussed population noise metrics based on the years '05 and '07. CAC needs to determine whether grid point metric results or "GIS" mapping output is preferred for their purposes associated with the updated existing conditions. Each method involves different costs, GIS being the most expensive. W. Zamore mentioned the need to have a refined level of population/noise metric relationships. R. Dormitzer would also like to see how the population changed from Phase 1 to now, noting that converting the Phase 1 matrix to current conditions is difficult to do.

J. Woodward pointed out that the Level 3 evaluation can show the population changes and the PC is not contracted for that, the IC is. ***S. Smith suggested that the IC and CAC get together to determine exactly the type of output needed from the 2007 update noise run from their purposes. S. Kunz indicated the need for a CAC meeting to discuss and would like the IC to meet with the CAC in person. ACTION ITEM-CAC/IC***

T. English continued through item #6 as complete.

S. Smith added that item #7 (noise complaint update) will be forwarded to the group.

T. English added that completing action item #8 was pending internal CAC voting on issues in that item.

Item #9 has been completed.

The CAC will address the specifics of item #10.

Action item #11 has been completed. Item #12 will be ongoing.

In response to item #13, T. English picked a time of 2-4 PM, Thursdays that the CAC may call her to ask general FAA environmental questions or to get clarification on any BLANS process or NEPA related issues. She said that she could not speak for the Tower

or TRACON on operational issues and did not want to hear derogatory remarks about other CAC members. Consistent with the BLANS protocol, if the CAC question is project specific and/or technical and related to such things as the noise analysis, ATC operation, etc., she will ask that they submit the question through S.Kunz so that the entire CAC may benefit.

F. Leo responded to this action item saying he recognizes his position as a public servant and will respond to phone calls, emails, etc, ASAP.

### **III. MINI-SUMMIT MEETING PURPOSE: RESOLVE KNOWN BARRIERS TO MOVE FORWARD**

S. Smith summarized the mini-summit's main purpose as looking at the Goals & Objectives (G&O) statement; review fan headings in Level 1; accept compromises to get over hurdles; get back to the flow and focus of the meetings. There was no noted dissention.

### **IV. GOALS & OBJECTIVES-ACTION PLAN**

S. Smith: The G&O and fanning are inter-related. Working through the fanning issue will foster the forward movement of the G&O.

B. Borgioli believes that fanning is a wide open issue and feels that moving it to Level 2 gives the FAA "a blank check". There needs to be specific language regarding fanning Measures 17 and 21. He believes they are too general. Additionally, D. Morrison would like "good science" to describe noise reduction that could result from fanning. T. English pointed out that the PC prepared a summary memo pertaining to this. J. Falbo reviewed the contents of memos from the Dallas/Ft. Worth (Dec 14), Detroit Metro (Dec 5 memo), and Minneapolis/St. Paul airports regarding over-flights, which suggested that some type of noise relief was offered by fanning.

S. Smith offered that in order for fanning to be defined by a measure, it must be moved to Level 2. J. Falbo insisted that the CAC voted against it. The group recognized the benefit that fanning over industrial areas has, while there is no effect over water. After a discussion about the pros and cons of considering fanning, T. English stated that she had no more details of the proposed fanning actions for Measure 17 and 21 other than what was contained in the report. T. English will seek clarification of Measures 17 and 21 from the ATCT and TRACON.

F. Leo suggested that Measures 17 and 21 be passed to Level 2 with "strong reservations". He and T. English added that the NEPA process would ensure full logical refining of the measures.

D. Morrison and B. Borgioli went on to explain the process by which the CAC voted to reject fanning measures: the intent was not to impact more of the population. At the same time, they discussed that some tradeoffs that may need consideration to reduce

noise. *There were discussions related to CAC's need to clarify Measures 17 and 21 in order to further consider each. FAA agreed to discuss with ATCT to determine more specifics related to divergent headings for each runway, and investigate original intent of Measure 21. ACTION ITEM-FAA/T. English. B. Borgioli volunteered as CAC liaison to tower for fanning specific issues. ACTION ITEM-CAC/B. Borgioli.*

The issue of fanning rests with clarification of FAA intentions and CAC's benefit analysis.

## **V. BACK ON TRACK PLAN**

### **a. BOS/TAC Meeting Schedule**

S. Smith suggested a possible BOS/TAC meeting for May 28, 2009, pending an agenda, which would include re-scoping and 2005 baseline review. T. English requested CAC input to finalize the Level 1 Screening Report. R. Dormitzer commented that the IC should review all measures with the CAC prior to finalizing. T. English and F. Leo suggested an addendum be added to the Level 1 Screening Report for CAC review that captures all of the comments and additional information generated as a result of the recent mini-summit meetings.

J. Falbo still has reservations concerning single engine run-up. F. Leo reiterated from the last meeting that there is a letter in the back of the Level 1 Screening Report that addresses single-engine starts. B. Borgioli further clarified that the letter serves the intent that the option is available to pilots, but that option rests strictly with the pilot and aircraft profile, not the airline.

### **b. Complete Milestones-Level 1 Screening Report/Scope Re-Assessment**

A group discussion defined future meeting milestones: B. Desrosiers believed it should include baselines and Level 2 Screening. S. Smith added that the #1 milestone should be the Level 1 Screening Report. B. Desrosiers suggested the order of business to prompt a BOS/TAC meeting:

1. Clarify fanning issues
2. Attach all outstanding comments and issues as an addendum to the screening report
3. CAC to review and provide further comments as necessary
4. CAC to vote on elected officials measures
5. Finalize the Level 1 Screening Report
6. Conclude details and cost estimate to update 2005 existing conditions to 2007
7. The PMT review the scope and budget

S. Kunz commented that this meeting would conclude "Mini-Summits". R. Dormitzer added that more CAC meetings are needed for collective input. Both concluded that the CAC still lacks a comfort level in dealing with all issues.

The group discussed planning for a BOS/TAC meeting, tentatively set for 4:00-9:00 PM, 5/28/09 at Massport. S. Smith noted that this would be the point where a re-assessment may be necessary.

**c. CAC Vote on Elected Representatives Measures**

*In the interim, the CAC should vote on:*

*Level 1 FAA Determinations Preliminary Draft, dated March 13, 2009 (elected representatives recommendations)-ACTION ITEM-CAC. Once this is complete, the FAA will send the results to their respective offices. ACTION ITEM-FAA (pending CAC vote).*

**d. PMT Meeting Schedule**

*PC requested participants to consider getting back on track with scoped meetings. Participants agreed to start PMT Calls and tentatively schedule BOS/TAC meeting for 5/28/09. Next PMT meeting, pending milestones completion: April 28, 2009, 4:30 PM.*

**VI. OBSERVER COMMENTS/QUESTIONS**

*R. Dormitzer requests RNAV updates from FAA. ACTION ITEM-FAA/T. English*

B. Mader confirmed with T. English, re: office hours to answer CAC questions-2:00-4:00 PM, Thursdays. B. Mader would like clarification on previous years' decisions on runways-specifically RWY 22; a question about fanning over water; and confirmed that a previous ROD can be superseded by a new one. T. English invited B. Mader to call her during the Thursday time slot with her specific questions.

W. Lyman will email his comments.

M. Zlody has no comments.

M. Thaler will email comments about fanning. She sought clarification from T. English about conditions to modify the ROD. S. Smith clarified the different methods, including a discussion about the G&O statement.

G. Hufnagle welcomed S. Kunz as the new CAC President.

R. Hardaway thanked the group for the detailed discussion/input on fanning.

**The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 PM.**

**ACTION ITEMS:**

*I.* The meeting notes (3/16/09) will be approved as they are amended, reflecting the above standards. A. Reed requested two weeks for the final draft (4/28/09).

**Action:** *FAA will forward amended meeting notes (3/16/09) with tracked changes to participants. Participants will provide approval via email no later than one week after the notes are provided.*

**Assigned to:** *Alan Reed, FAA*

**Deadline:** *April 28, 2009*

2. S. Smith suggested that the IC and CAC get together to determine exactly the type of output needed from the 2007 update noise run from their purposes. S. Kunz indicated the need for a CAC meeting to discuss and would like the IC to meet with the CAC in person.

**Action:** *S. Kunz to schedule a CAC meeting in May*

**Assigned to:** *Sandra Kunz, CAC*

**Deadline:** *May (tentative)*

3. There were discussions related to CAC's need to clarify Measures 17 and 21 in order to further consider each. FAA agreed to discuss with ATCT to determine more specifics related to divergent headings for each runway, and investigate original intent of Measure 21.

**Action:** *FAA will provide further definition of Measures 17 and 21*

**Assigned to:** *Terry English, FAA*

**Deadline:** *April 28, 2009*

4. B. Borgioli volunteered as CAC liaison to tower for fanning specific issues.

**Action:** *B. Borgioli is the point of contact for the CAC regarding fanning.*

**Assigned to:** *Buddy Borgioli, CAC*

**Deadline:** *As needed.*

5. In the interim, the CAC should vote on: Level 1 FAA Determinations Preliminary Draft, dated March 13, 2009 (elected representatives recommendations). Once this is complete, the FAA will send the results to their respective offices.

**Action 1:** *CAC will vote on Elected Representatives recommendations and forward written notification of decision to FAA. FAA will forward results to elected representatives.*

**Assigned to:** *Sandra Kunz CAC leadership*

**Deadline:** *May (tentative)*

**Action 2:** *(contingent upon Action 1) FAA will notify elected representatives of FAA and CAC findings.*

**Assigned to:** *Terry English, FAA; Sandra Kunz, CAC*

**Deadline:** *June (Pending Action 1)*

6. R. Dormitzer requests RNAV updates from FAA.

**Action:** *FAA to forward RNAV updates to CAC.*

**Assigned to:** *Terry English, FAA*

**Deadline:** *As updates occur.*

7. PC requested participants to consider getting back on track with scoped meetings. Participants agreed to start PMT Calls and tentatively schedule BOS/TAC meeting for 5/28/09.

**Action 1: Hold PMT call 4/28/09 at 4:30 PM EST**

**Assigned to: Stephen Smith, PC**

**Deadline: Agenda- 4/24/09; Call-4/28/09**

**Action 2: Confirm Agenda for BOS/TAC meeting**

**Assigned to: Terry English, FAA; Sandra Kunz, CAC**

**Deadline: 5/14/09**

**Attachments:**

1. Continuation of Phase 2 PMT Mini-Summit Meeting Agenda-April 14, 2009
2. 3/16/09 PMT/CAC Mini-Summit Meeting Action Items
3. Observer emailed comments