

**Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS)
South Shore Elected Officials Meeting
Congressman Delahunt's Office, Quincy**

**MEETING SUMMARY
May 2, 2007**

Attendance:

BOS/TAC Members:

Gail Lattrell (FAA Airports), Steve Kelly (FAA), Barbara Travers-Wright (FAA), Jim Peters (FAA), Janel Showalter (FAA), Flavio Leo (Massport), Anthony Guerriero (Massport)

Project Consultant (PC) Team:

Stephen Smith (Ricondo & Associates, Inc.), Scott Hamwey (Planners Collaborative)

Elected Officials, CAC, and Other Interested Parties:

State Rep. Frank Hynes, Tom Walsh (Senator Kennedy), Jon Jennings (Senator Kerry), Kathy Melia (Congressman Delahunt), Robert Butman (State Senator Hedlund), Stephen Burm (State Rep. Bradley), Brian Patterson (Webster Staff), Mary Jordan (Rep. Murphy), Jamie Lynn (Rep. Murphy), GiGi Marachi (Rep. Hynes), Richard Agnew (Town Administrator Scituate), Katie O'Donnell (Selectmen Marshfield), Jon Witten (Selectmen Duxbury), Gary Banks (CAC Scituate), Andre Martocchini (Selectmen Duxbury), Marianne McCabe (CAC Marshfield), John Clifford (Town Administrator Marshfield), Patti Epstein (Selectmen Marshfield), James Boudreau (Norwell Selectman), Katherine Koch (The Mariners)

1. Introductions

K. Melia welcomed attendees to Congressman Delahunt's office and explained this meeting was a follow-up to an earlier meeting hosted by State Representative Frank Hynes at the State House in March. She introduced Barbara Travers Wright of FAA.

Barbara Travers-Wright announced the Logan Airport Centerfield Taxiway record of decision (ROD) was to be presented to legislators and elected officials tomorrow at FAA's Burlington office, and that the second item on that agenda would be the BLANS project.

Gail Lattrell explained the cumulative noise analysis was complete. Steve Kelly then introduced Stephen Smith of the project consultant team.

2. Presentation of Noise Analysis

S. Smith explained he would be presenting three cumulative impact maps. The first slide represented cumulative results using DNL contours. He explained that a 1.5 DNL change is significant for NEPA, and that as the map demonstrates, significant changes are occurring over water only.

S. Smith presented the second slide, which showed DNL changes for the entire study area. It showed a good decrease in cumulative noise in the Hull/Hingham/Cohasset area and most of the increases occurring over the water. The third slide showed the supplemental metric developed by the CAC. This metric, SEL, is intended to capture how long, and how loud noise impacts are. The CAC had chosen >60 SEL as the

noise level to capture in the analysis (in terms of the change in the number of >60 SEL events experienced at various locations). S. Smith explained how the independent consultant team (IC) took a look at the results at a number of noise monitoring sites and compared one community to another. He added that the IC matrix of results is available on the website and that it includes changes in events >50 SEL as well.

Gary Banks asked how the data for the analysis was collected. S. Smith replied that it was from the INM model and explained what that was. G. Banks asked his question again to confirm that the data had not been collected from actual readings. S. Smith said that this was correct, but that the INM was based on scientifically reviewed algorithms.

Andre Martocchini asked what the light green color in south Marshfield and Duxbury meant. S. Smith replied that it meant that there would be five to ten more events in Marshfield above 60 SEL. He added that north Marshfield receives much greater noise benefits than the southern part of the town receives disbenefits.

Rep. Hynes asked if this analysis accounted for noise between 10pm and 7am. S. Smith answered that it did not, but that DNL did. He explained that while DNL is a difficult metric to relate to the real world for people, it has been proven to be a good planning tool for people's reaction to noise levels. Rep. Hynes added he wanted to thank Congressman Delahunt for the use of his office and for the work that the staffs of Senators Kennedy and Kerry had done to set up the meeting.

Rep. Hynes said he understood there would be an increase from 420 flights to 660 flights with these alternatives. He asked if the average person would perceive noise from the additional flights and also asked if it would be possible to expand the purple shaded areas (reduced noise) on the map. S. Smith replied by giving a quick overview of the project and FAA's responsibility to ensure that whatever is implemented is safe. Rep. Hynes said he understood the history, but since there were concerns being expressed now, asked if it was too late to expand the area receiving noise benefits. G. Lattrell explained they had tried to maximize the noise benefits for the entire study area and S. Kelly added the planes have to cross back over the shoreline somewhere. S. Smith explained that the change from 420 to 660 was an error and pointed out the error on the IC table, and therefore the alternative was not adding more overflights. He then used the same table to demonstrate how the six points in Marshfield selected by the CAC for noise monitoring were getting a good balance of benefits.

Marianne McCabe said there were 70,000 annual flights, to which S. Smith replied that the number sounded high. She then referenced the number of flights below 6,000 feet. S. Smith said that this number was an error in interpretation because 6,000 is the breakpoint for the categories. She added Jon Woodward of the IC wants to spend project money on actual noise measurement. S. Smith explained Massport was in the process of updating their noise monitoring equipment in the most intensively affected areas, closer into the airport.

Rep. Hynes asked that if these new alternatives were actually imposed could Phase II demand the actual collection of noise data. S. Kelly replied the cost would be exorbitant. A. Martocchini asked how they could tell the ambient noise levels aren't at level X without measuring them. He suggested they need baseline data. S. Kelly replied the model can be calibrated using real measurements. Rep. Hynes asked if once the new patterns are established they would be measured. S. Smith said the databases are calibrated by acoustical standards and users themselves are not allowed to calibrate them.

John Clifford asked why they couldn't increase the shoreline crossing altitude from 6,000 feet to 8,000 feet. S. Kelly said the air traffic controllers identified 6,000 as the highest the crossing could be. He added that much of the benefit will come from the predictability. G. Banks said as a former pilot, he could assure them that they would not want to be in the plane higher than 6,000 feet at the point because the landing would be a "slam dunk".

Rep. Hynes asked why they couldn't move DRUNK. S. Kelly suggested that would simply be moving the problem. G. Lattrell emphasized that region-wide there were great benefits. Rep. Hynes said he agreed with that assessment, but he's in the business of getting the larger body to understand the concerns of the smaller community. S. Kelly said the noise change did not trigger federal significance standards and the airline industry is already concerned about the additional mileage being imposed by these alternatives. Rep. Hynes suggested they could model the results of moving the shoreline crossing south and then they would at least have a choice. He said it is possible they would discover there really aren't any negative business impacts.

M. McCabe asked why they don't just redo that alternative. S. Kelly asked why the affected communities would trust them anymore then. M. McCabe replied that at least then the affected communities would be a part of the process.

P. Epstein asked if the alternative could be moved into Phase Two. S. Kelly said they do not want to do that. Rep. Hynes asked if FAA would be willing to do it if the CAC was willing to. G. Lattrell answered the FAA believes there is reason to move forward on this now. P. Epstein asked if they were concerned the CAC was inequitable in its representation when it arrived at this alternative.

M. McCabe said the ROD talks about "adverse effects" and she believes these results meet the definition of adverse. A. Martocchini added they can't have any confidence without actual measurements. Rep. Hynes said he is hearing that these alternatives cannot be moved into Phase II. S. Kelly answered he did not want to spend \$2 million more of the taxpayers' money to end up in the same place.

J. Boudreau asked what people in the dark green area who already hear noise would hear when they were on their decks after this was implemented. S. Kelly said it

depends. G. Lattrell said the IC would be bringing a noise machine to tomorrow's meeting to approximate noise levels.

S. Smith responded to concerns about the INM by saying they are in compliance and everything with aviation is modeled the same way. He explained to Andre it is not the same as highway because there are so many more points to model.

Mary Anne said the CAC and IC did not measure noise in Marshfield and Duxbury and Massport does not have any monitors in those towns.

3. Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Rep. Hynes said they are all new the process and they just want to be included in it. M. McCabe read Section 304 of FAA order 1050, that the use of a categorical exclusion (CatEx) is precluded when likely effects on the human environment are likely to be controversial.

G. Lattrell said the FAA plans to move forward. M. McCabe asked if they could have time to have their expert review the noise data before FAA makes a determination on a CatEx. Rep. Hynes asked how long before a CatEx decision would be made. S. Kelly said he has seen this movie before and knows how it will end. J. Clifford said the bottom line is it will adversely affect these towns and that they are looking for a compromise offer.