

MINUTES OF THE MASSPORT CAC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

FEBRUARY 16, 2018 AT 1:00 P.M.

(11 pages total)

Location: Brookline Town Hall

333 Washington Street, Room 111, Brookline, MA 02445

Members Present: David Carlon, Myron Kassaraba, Wig Zamore, Pete Navarra, Maura Zlody,
Pam Hill and Jerry Falbo

Members Absent: None

Others attending: Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, Esq. and Cindy Christiansen (Milton) and Darcy Devne
member of the public from Medford.

1. Public Comment

Milton member Cindy Christiansen stated she would be recording the meeting. She then spoke.

She provided a copy of her comments and it is attached and incorporated herein as Attachment

No. 1.

Member of the public, Darcy Devne of Medford, MA spoke. She also provided a copy of her

comments and it is attached and incorporated herein as Attachment No. 2.

2. Review and approval of meeting minutes

Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of January 11, 2018 were reviewed. Myron and

Pam had some minor amendments. Motion by Myron, second by Pam to approve as amended.

Approved unanimously.

3. Update on Massport CAC Enabling Act Amendment & Executive Director Hiring Process

Dave gave a special thank you to Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert and Jerry and Myron for all their help

with the Speaker and Myron with Senator Brownsberger.

Pam thanked Dave and Maura. Myron noted that Brownsberger was surprised how fast it went through. Jerry commented the quickness was due to the support of the second most powerful legislator DeLeo, which helped tremendously.

Dave has sent around the legislation and will also post. Dave noted that the Legislature gives but they also take away. He wants to be sure MCAC are good stewards and he believes the CAC must work with MPA as an advisory body. He noted through this process there will be ties to MPA because we have to follow their procedures. Maura asked what does the language on policies and procedures mean.

Jennifer said she intends to send an email to MPA asking for all relevant policies. There will be further discussions on this topic both internally and with MPA. Myron also noted that any new MOU will need to include ALL policies.

Pam asked what Dave meant that MCAC is advisory to MPA. Dave clarified that MCAC is an advisory body and the purview is the MPA budget and all of its operations, the port and other airports. Dave noted there was some opposition to the additional funding. Some legislators thought the money could be better spent elsewhere. Also, there was opposition from host communities in so far as they wanted to know what was the benefit to its own community interests. Dave noted that MCAC needs to be cognizant and focus on regional interests and solutions.

Dave updated members on the Executive Director search. 2 candidates are recommended as finalists for the Executive Director; Tedd Carr and Brian Kane. Their resumes were distributed.

There were 26 applicants. The Executive Committee will need to interview the finalists. A date in the near future will be determined that will give MCAC members an opportunity to attend.

4. RNAV Study Update from Massport

Liz Becker is trying to get a date with John Hansman for a presentation. Ralph Dormitzer is also coordinating to get a briefing at the Aviation Sub-Committee prior to March 15th CAC meeting. MPA still supports another public hearing when John Hansman has information to provide. Dave noted that there are still some outstanding questions on Block 1, and Block 2 has some heavy lifting. Dave went to the MPA Board meeting and he indicated he wants more participation from the FAA and he wants increased rationale for the recommendations and reasoning behind recommendations.

Wig commented that as we move forward will there be an opportunity for options and an assessment of impacts on the ground so that people can react to it rather than one presentation. Comprehensive noise monitoring is important and HMMH does a better noise monitoring process.

Myron said Hansman told him there would be a more in depth analysis and options presented and time for comment. Wig said communities need to look at the impact. Wig said it is not clear that Hansman has the capacity to do this.

Myron suggested that the section from the last EC minutes on the RNAV Block 2 should be forwarded on to MPA noting the intent in this regard.

5. Massport Update on Airbus Vortex Generator Retrofit

Members reviewed a hand-out from Liz Becker. Wig noted that to do this the fuel needs to be drained first before the \$200 piece goes in to the plane. He suggested that when major maintenance is done that this fix should be done then. Myron noted that American is going to retrofit, but was reluctant to let MPA know. They claimed it was more expensive than people thought it was. Darcy Devne asked where the maintenance was done and questioned that it is usually done at their hub not necessarily Logan. Dave noted that tracking these upgrades is difficult. There will be more on this topic at the MCAC on March 15th.

6. Massport Community Engagement Update

Dave noted that the MCAC asked MPA to let us know about community requests. Liz provided correspondence from the Board of Selectmen Town of Milton to the FAA and MPA dated January 29, 2018. This was noted as correspondence and copies were available.

Wig asked about getting flight tracks and patterns from everyday so citizens could look it up. Wig would like to move ahead with standard reporting of flight track data. Myron and Wig had discussed getting data for every flight but he understands the security concern. Members discussed the exact data and reports that were desired or deemed necessary. Wig noted that people get frustrated when they have to reinvent the wheel and find the flight path information by themselves .

Myron agreed that there should be some standard reporting of daily flights by day and hour. Myron noted that Bill Deignan wanted the individual flight log by day for Medford. Myron believes that the better source is Count Ops from the FAA. Members discussed types of reports and data that make sense to request.

7. Massport Strategic Planning and Forecast

Dave noted that MPA is embarking on its 3-5 year plan and MCAC should be looking at the plan very carefully. He said we could see an explosion in passenger volume – 50 Million passengers total. Last year was 38.5M passengers. Members discussed impacts and consequences. The conversation at the MPA Board was purely speculation and conversational. Dave discussed the comments at the MPA Board meeting. Dave wanted to participate and be sure that the MCAC participated in the process. Pam wants to comment on the structure of the process for public input. Dave thinks asking MPA for the community process is important. Myron noted the January 17th MPA Board information is now posted. Myron said a lot of the construction on-site would need environmental review, so each item would have an individual process. Wig noted the expansion of Terminal E and the large planes now that have 16 doors 8 on each level. Myron discussed the types of planes being flown to get the yield.

Dave noted that MPA must come up with a plan and MCAC will need a briefing.

8. Discussion of adopting a Policy for Submitting Requests, Proposals, and Resolutions

Peter had some further updates to the draft policy. Dave asked members to get comments back to Pete and Dave. Then it will be sent to the general membership for review. Pete will send to Jennifer for legal review. Cindy Christiansen and Darcy Devne opposed the policy provision that gives the Chair the option to place the matter on the agenda or not.

9. Discussion on General Meeting March 15, 2018

Members discussed agenda items, timing, quorum concerns and logistics. There was renewed concern about members who never attend. Dave wanted that issue tabled until the Executive Director is hired.

10. Noise Monitor Update

Wig gave an update on the meeting. He was pleased with the turn out. He will put the Power Point out in the packet for members. Dave asked if the baseline information was provided. Wig noted that the information was provided and helpful. Members discussed models and EDR for monitoring noise. It was noted that some airports publish real time information but MPA does not.

Cindy said she still does not have the info she asked for in May 2017.

11. Correspondence

Milton Letter from Liz Becker

12. New Business – reserved for matters the Chair did not reasonably anticipate at the time of posting

None.

13. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 3:03 p.m. by Pete, seconded by Maura, unanimous vote to adjourn.

Documents:

Milton Letters from Liz Becker

Hand out on Vortex Generators

Draft Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting of January 11, 2018

Minutes approved on March 15, 2018

See attachments to follow.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1 – Executive Committee Minutes 2-16-18 Massport CAC
Public Comment:

CL Christiansen; EC mtg, MCAC, 2-16-2018

Dave I contacted you a few days after the last meeting and asked to walk with you about items that were requested but not provided in the MCAC RFI. I was not given the courtesy of a phone or email response. I understand one problem might be your time and I hope my statement today will lead to a solution of that problem.

For the fun of it, I have a word-association fill-in-the blank question at the end of my statement that I hope you will be able to answer.

When I walked into my 1st **Logan** CAC mtg – about 2.5 years ago, the committee and consultant had been working tirelessly on Test 1 and were moving on to Test 2 – rotation of runway use, will it work? what does the data show? – all this in an attempt for the committee to eventually vote on a fair and implementable RUP. I asked for copies of flight paths and flight tracks – just to get myself up to speed – and because, of course, this information was needed for informed and conscientious decisions about when to flies planes where.

But it was not available to committee members – Why? ?? How could this Logan Community group be wrapping up Blk 1, I mean Test 1, and moving on to Test 2, without this critical information? I immediately went back to my appointing authority to tell them of this crisis in the making – a group of appointed representatives inching toward decisions that would affect tens of thousands of Massachusetts residents and they did not have the information necessary to make fair, informed decisions. What was the underlying problem? Massport. The LCAC leaders had asked – over a year prior but, had not received the information and did not have the necessary power or energy for follow thru.

Fast forward: new MASSPORT community committee, new committee leaders - you, and most importantly, new MA law that states our purposes and gives us all the necessary and convenient power to carry them thru. But here we are once again, fast forwarding backwards to the same Ground Hog's Day: now it is not RUP, but the MIT Study, now it is not lack of information about flight paths and affected communities, but lack of information about scope of work, independence of consultants, timeline, financial disclosures, how

community input will be recorded and used; and now, the root cause of this lack of information, this missing piece that led to failure of the LCAC, is not Massport, but the MCAC itself because we have not carried out our purposes and used our statutory power to demand transparency and information.

Look, I appreciate the long hours, strategic thinking that has gone into a goal to get an ED – but the MCAC has to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. While a very small group of you from NW and SE of Logan chew gum for the necessary work to get an ED, let the rest of us walk – because we have seen the path to failure – lack of information, lack of transparency, same underlying destructive framework now, but with new barrier creators - ourselves. I have offered my time, expertise, devotion to finding regional solutions, to obtaining information and community input, and here I am, once again, at one more EC meeting, asking that while you chew gum, let some of the rest of us walk.

A year and a half ago I started asking that we form a hearings committee, hold a real hearing, make formal requests for information, make follow up requests for information – and each time, I have offered to help because it is unrealistic to expect any single individual or small group of volunteers in this Community Committee to do all of the work. And almost every time, my and other general members requests have fallen on deaf ears, and been tabled or delayed. To be true to our mission statement that we are a voice of all affected communities, you, this group of elected leaders must figure out a way to walk and chew gum at the same time. My suggestion? Use the skills, expertise, and energy of the 20 or more dedicated Community representatives, **this is not a 1, 2, or even a 5 man show.**

Here's my fill in the blank word-association question:

Logan CAC, Massport CAC

RUP, MIT study

Test 1 & Test 2, Block 1 & Block 2

MassPort does not provide information; MCAC does not obtain information

Logan CAC RUP failed, Massport CAC MIT study _____

Please include a copy of my statement in the record of this meeting.

ATTACHMENT NO. 2 – Executive Committee Minutes 2-16-18 Massport CAC
Public Comment
Darcy Devne, Milford, MA

Massport Noise Monitors Ignore More than Half of Planes

Medford, MA

Friday, September 1, 2017, was a relatively quiet day on Stearns Ave. in Medford. According to Massport's flight logs, only 348 airplanes used Runway 33L to depart Logan airport. Beginning before 6am and continuing through midnight, each of those planes used R33L's virtual runway extension that runs straight through Medford. This is one of

the FAA's Highways in the Sky, flight paths less than 1/10 of a mile wide, whose destructive effects have prompted lawsuits in several states. Michael McLaughlin lives on 32 Stearns Ave in Medford and hears each of these flights, sometimes every 90 seconds for hours. He files noise complaints with Massport each month.

According to Massport, "Each day readings are taken from sensitive noise monitors that are able to sort out the sound of a passing plane thousands of feet overhead from the routine din of neighborhood traffic a few feet down below." Yet Massport's noise monitor, located on Thatcher St in Medford, didn't record more than 50% of the flights over McLaughlin's house on Sept 1. Some of these 188 "ghost" planes, such as Jet Blue 1067, registered 80 dBA. Last fall, Medford's noise meter was placed on top of the Andrews Middle School, almost directly under TEKKK. Luke Preisner, the Medford representative for the former Logan Community Advisory Committee has collected and analyzed daily data.

So what went wrong? Location and Settings. According to Kent Johnson, a volunteer data analyst with Boston West Fair Skies, "the missing flights seem to be predominantly ones which turned southwest from TEKKK." TEKKK is the point at which the R33L runways splits into 4 precise paths. Medford's Andrews monitor, located almost precisely under the TEKKK, faithfully records each flight's noise. Massport's official noise monitor for Medford is at Magoun near Thatcher, less than .4 mile north from the Andrews monitor. It seems obvious that the location of the Logan monitors should have been changed to align with the new RNAV routes, but that didn't happen. Despite comments in the 2013 EA for R33L, the issue of monitor placement was completely ignored, and continues to be ignored. There is only 1 noise monitor in Milton, for example, despite the different arrival paths.

Further, each monitor can be adjusted. According to the FAA, DNL includes all airplane noise. But Logan's noise monitors are set to ignore any noise – including airplane noise – below an artificially high decibel level. And monitors can also be set to, for example, only count airplane noise that persists for a minimum amount of time. Thus, more planes can be “vanished” from the data.

Since the RNAV flight paths changed in June 2013, month after month, for almost 5 years now, Massport receives a flight log with the number of total operations, and also receives noise monitor reports from 30 locations in the Metro Boston area. Those figures don't match. In the case of the Medford noise monitor, it seems that more than half of flights may not have been recorded. That would mean approximately 50,000 flights were missed since RNAV was implemented on R33L. And that's just one monitor and one runway. What about the rest of the noise from Logan?

Massport should make it a priority to move and adjust monitors to truthfully reflect the noise that Logan planes make. And the MCAC should give Massport a deadline and follow up faithfully.