



# MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## GENERAL MEETING

JANUARY 10, 2019 AT 4:00 PM

Transportation Board Room | 10 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02116

### Meeting Minutes

#### Members Attending

Arlington	Frank Ciano
Bedford	Heidi Porter
Belmont	Myron Kassaraba
Boston 1 – East Boston	John Nucci
Boston 3 – Fenway	Maura Zlody
Boston 5 – Hyde Park	Irene Walczak*
Braintree	Sandra Kunz
Cambridge	Bill Deignan
Canton	James Aufiero
Chelsea	Roseann Bongiovanni
Cohasset	Ralph Dormitzer
Hull	David Carlon
Lynn	William Bochnak
Marblehead	Charles Gessner
Medford	Peter Houk
Melrose	Pete Navarra
Milton	Cindy Christiansen
Revere	James Mercurio
Salem	William Legault
Somerville	Wig Zamore
Watertown	Andrea Adams*
Weymouth	Gene Castignetti
Winthrop	Jerry Falbo

#### Members Absent

Boston 2 - South Boston	David Manning
Boston 4 – Roxbury	Joanne Keith
Boston 6 – Roslindale	Alan Wright
Brookline	Heather Hamilton
Everett	Tony Sousa
Hingham	Katie McBrine
Malden	Christopher Webb
Quincy	Frank Tramontozzi
Scituate	Brad Washburn
Worcester	John Genkos

#### Vacancies

Beverly
Concord
Lexington
Lincoln
Randolph
Swampscott

\* Participated remotely

Other attendees: Matthew A. Romero, Executive Director and Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, Counsel

Massport attendees: Flavio Leo and Elizabeth Dello Russo Becker



## MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### Welcome & Introduction

Chair David Carlon reported that Michelle Ciccolo representing Lexington and Richard Malagrifa representing Swampscott had both resigned from the Massport Community Advisory Committee (MCAC). He also noted that this would be Ms. Dello Russo Becker's last meeting, and that Mr. Anthony Gallagher from Massport was out sick.

### Vote to approve Minutes of October 18, 2018

Motion to approve was made by Dr. Christiansen, seconded by Mr. Navarra. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

**Dr. Christiansen left the room at 4:15 PM and the quorum was lost.**

### Treasurer Report

Mr. Kassaraba updated the Committee on the Q2 FY2019 financials, reviewing information presented in the presentation. Mr. Mercurio asked how much the MCAC receives, and Mr. Kassaraba explained that the current year's budget totaled \$300 thousand, with funding increasing each year by \$50 thousand until reaching a final level of \$500 thousand. Responding to questions from Mr. Ciano and Mr. Mercurio, Mr. Kassaraba explained that they were Massport, not State, funds, and that they disbursed the funds quarterly to the MCAC.

### Executive Director Update

#### *Massport CAC Meetings and Locations*

Mr. Romero noted that the next two MCAC General Meetings were scheduled for Thursday, March 28 [this meeting was subsequently rescheduled for April 23, 2019] and Thursday, July 10. Given the MCAC's history of rescheduling the September meetings due to the timing of Labor Day and the December meetings due to member availability, he proposed future MCAC General meetings to be held in October, January, March/April, and June. He noted the June meeting was mandatory due to the close of the fiscal year.

#### *Conflict of Interest Reminder and Update*

Mr. Romero reminded the MCAC that the state required Conflict of Interest (COI) Law training for members as special state employees. MCAC staff is now responsible for this rather than Massport staff. He noted that Open Meeting Law (OML) trainings were recommended, but not required and that online OML trainings would soon be posted on the state's website.

#### *Massport 101 Training Update*

Mr. Romero noted there were a variety of areas that could be covered – "Logan 101," maritime, fisheries, real estate, and more. He explained he would be polling members to determine interest in topics and format for these training.



## MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### *Parking Reimbursement Update*

Mr. Romero reported that having reached out to various other agencies and boards that none reimbursed for public transportation, but many either reimbursed members for parking or provided free parking for members. He recommended a policy that would be consistent with the majority of other boards surveyed but would correct for discrepancies due to different parking garage rates. Members could continue to be reimbursed for parking if they chose, but the maximum reimbursement rate would be set at the Transportation Building garage rate.

Mr. Deignan wanted the MCAC to be a leader and reimburse for commuter rail and other public transportation costs. Mr. Legault agreed, and Mr. Mercurio suggested only reimbursing for public transportation and not for parking. Mr. Ciano responded sometimes it was difficult to use the public transportation options available to him during inclement weather and wanted parking reimbursement to remain, but supported Mr. Deignan's recommendation for public transit reimbursement. Mr. Falbo agreed.

Mr. Navarra suggested a survey to gather information on costs, and Mr. Zamore suggested a flat rate for a Charlie card to make it easier. Mr. Romero would report back after the survey.

Mr. Dormitzer asked that the Executive Director assist subcommittees to find meeting venues, and Mr. Carlon noted that Mr. Romero was working on meeting locations for the MCAC and all subcommittees, trying to standardize them for increased participation.

In response to a member's inquiry, Mr. Carlon explained that while he urged members to report back to their appointing authorities, it was not required, though the MCAC as a whole was required to report back to the Governor.

### Massport Update

#### *HMMH Study of Fly Quiet programs and Noise Reporting*

Mr. Leo presented to members, noting that this was the first draft. He expected dialogue and further discussion, and he viewed this as an iterative process. He reviewed sample data and various options for reporting for Logan as laid out in his presentation.

Ms. Kunz wanted the report simplified with less data, and asked what the end result was supposed to be, referencing San Francisco's report. Mr. Leo noted that the reporting was standard for the industry and was consistent across other airports.

Mr. Kassaraba was surprised not to see any ranking of the airlines since the reports we had provided Massport as examples included them. Mr. Leo stated that they could provide that, and Mr. Kassaraba clarified that he wanted noise rankings by airlines. Mr. Kassaraba also noted that flights by hour and time of day was not included in any of the reporting but it should be. 5:00 – 6:00 am flights have increased significantly, and reporting this would provide information that could be useful. Mr. Deignan



## MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

agreed, also noting that Fly Quiet Reporting should have measures that compare year by year. He further agreed with Ms. Kunz that the reporting should be simplified for constituents.

Mr. Dormitzer stated that there must be a report card and asked how to come to agreement to move forward. Mr. Leo responded that he wanted a priority of the things the MCAC wanted to see in the report so he could manage resources on Massport's end to include them in future drafts. Members discussed next steps and timing of the reports, and Mr. Leo discussed the final report and automation for providing the future reports.

Ms. Walczak raised concerns about environmental and health reporting, noting that Minneapolis provided monthly reports with this type of data.

The Chair discussed next steps and noted that a lot of work had gone into what should be included in the reports. He noted that there are components the MCAC wants in the report that were in the sample reports but missing from this draft. He noted this was just the beginning, that the document/presentation would be circulated for feedback and comments to all members and the subcommittees.

Mr. Navarra was frustrated at how long the process was taking, that he wanted to see some data and the report. Ms. Kunz suggested taking one month's worth of data and building from there, and Mr. Falbo agreed.

### EPA Grant to Replace Diesel Equipment at Logan Airport

Ms. Dello Russo Becker presented, noting that this would be her last MCAC meeting. She thanked members and congratulated everyone on the work accomplished to date.

Ms. Dello Russo Becker noted that the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was providing Massport with \$541 thousand to replace diesel equipment on the tarmac by 2027.

### **Dr. Christiansen returned to the room at 5:17 pm, restoring the quorum.**

Ms. Dello Russo Becker explained that moving to all electric vehicles on the tarmac would reduce carbon by 16%. Mr. Navarra asked how much the grant would cover, and Ms. Dello Russo Becker responded that it would cover less than half. Mr. Leo noted that it was a matching grant.

### RNAV Study Process Update

Mr. Leo noted that the federal shutdown would delay the process on the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) end. He asked about how to best do outreach for Block 2. MIT was committed to providing some additional outreach, but there were not enough resources for numerous meetings.

Mr. Deignan asked what work was left for MIT to do, and asked for census block data on the impacts of the alternatives. Mr. Leo acknowledged this and noted that the infrastructure had been built to drill down more based on feedback heard in October 2018 and from various elected officials. He noted that a



## MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

big factor in implementation to be considered is the FAA workload impact – the higher the workload, such as controller-based, the less likely to be implemented as far as dispersion goes.

Dr. Christiansen stated that not everything requested had been looked at. Mr. Leo responded that if a community felt that something had fallen through the cracks to bring it to the Committee so it could be worked through the body so there would be a definitive source of inputs for the MIT team.

Mr. Kassaraba asked who Massport was waiting on, noting he wanted a target date of June 2019 for everything to be done and a vote taken so Massport can go back to the FAA with a directive from the MCAC on the selected alternatives to start the formal .41 process. Mr. Leo agreed that this was the balance being struck with the MIT team – they can provide data, but Massport cannot go to FAA without community consensus. Mr. Deignan stated he wanted data before he brought the information to his community. Mr. Kassaraba wondered how this was all going to come together. Mr. Leo explained that even without a final product the MCAC has a good idea of what is going to happen, meaning areas that will go up and areas that would go down. He remarked that Block 1 was easier because it helped everyone, but Block 2 was always going to be more challenging.

Ms. Walczak was confused about the data being collected pre- and post-RNAV and what data would be presented. Mr. Leo clarified that Massport and FAA had the data – pre-RNAV, current (post-RNAV), and potential future RNAV are the three components.

Mr. Houk asked about the analysis being done and was concerned whether the options being presented could be implemented or not. He didn't want to waste time discussing dispersion options if the FAA would reject them. Mr. Leo responded that the MIT team was experienced enough to present options that were doable, but reminded the Committee that they were not the FAA, who has the ultimate say.

Ms. Adams understood that Massport and MIT wanted to be confident in the data, but asked what MCAC members should do with the options presented – should they bring them back to their appointing authorities or wait until more data was available to present? Mr. Leo stated that members could make a judgment call in that regard; however, the fundamental truism is that any change from the flight paths that exist today will cause burden shifting. The general degree of the shift can be seen even in these preliminary graphics.

Dr. Christiansen stated for the record that she was frustrated by the rushed presentation and believed that the MCAC did not have the materials ahead of time adequately to review it given its technical nature.

Mr. Ciano echoed Ms. Adams's question about whether or not to bring this information back to his community now or not.

The Chair noted that all of the data and information has been on the website since it was received and any member should feel free to comment or provide feedback. Mr. Carlon reported on a meeting he attended as an invited guest only – not in his role as the MCAC Chair – with the legislative delegation and noted that Dr. Hansman's presentation was virtually identical to the one given in October to the MCAC. Additional analysis will be provided according to Massport and Dr. Hansman with regard to the before and after. This additional work must be done, but he acknowledged this is a challenge. The Chair



## MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

detailed how he had been reporting back to his community as a response to inquiries about what to do with the information presented; however he believed it was premature to make a decision, because there will be more information and analysis.

He reminded members that Block 1 presented three alternatives to the FAA that were not accepted. Block 2 is in a similar place – even once recommendations are made by the MCAC and presented to the FAA by Massport, there is no guarantee that the preferred alternatives will be approved.

Mr. Kassaraba noted that Block 2 has a significant impact to R27 and R22, so it is a big issue for more than the 33L communities. He wanted a schedule and a process set forth so that a vote can be taken in June.

Mr. Zamore agreed it was premature and noted that it was difficult to have any discussion without before and after analysis, and Mr. Carlon added that this had been formally requested by an elected official at the meeting he attended. He also highlighted one minor change in Dr. Hansman's presentation to the legislative delegation, namely that his team performed additional analysis on Runway 27, trying to identify other options that would not impact the Record of Decision (ROD). They had conducted preliminary analysis of moving the waypoint back to its prior position before RNAV implementation.

Dr. Christiansen asked how to provide feedback and to whom she should send any questions. The Chair requested all members send any feedback, comments, or questions to the Executive Director, the Chair, and Mr. Leo.

The Chair explained that there would be another briefing by Dr. Hansman, and noted that the legislators had discussed their process as elected officials. There must be a public forum in order to assess options and impacts.

Mr. Houk believed it was a "chicken and egg" problem – communities needed more modeling from Dr. Hansman before being able to go forward with a solution. The Chair said he would convey that message.

### Discussion of Massport CAC 2019 Goals and Objectives

The Chair reviewed a presentation of some upcoming FY19 goals and initiatives including a budget review and annual report as required by the Enabling Legislation. He noted some opportunities to pivot the MCAC's focus after the RNAV and Fly Quiet Reporting initiatives including "greening" of the tarmac (as referenced by Massport's earlier presentation), impacts of Massport's regional airports, ground transportation initiatives for Logan, and maritime operations. He noted there were also opportunity for long-range "moon shot" goals beyond FY2019 including advocating for an updated version of the Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA), which hadn't been updated since 1990 as well as new airline fuel standards.

### MPA Annual Current Expense Expenditure Budgets Review Update

Mr. Carlon noted that the annual review was an obligation of the MCAC's Enabling Act and explained that the MCAC would be going out with a Request for Information (RFI) to find a third-party consultant or agency to conduct the MCAC's first budget review. Because Massport's budget is very large and complex, he explained that the approach for the first review would be to limit the scope to one or two



## MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

areas or segments of Massport's budget. He noted the two areas identified by the Executive Committee for possible review were the Noise Mitigation Office's budget and/or Massport's airline fees, landing fees, and marketing incentives.

### Environment and Health Subcommittee Update

Mr. Zamore had provided a hand-out relative to his subcommittee meeting schedule and a list of items to be taken up with his subcommittee. He provided an update on his subcommittee's work to date.

Dr. Christiansen asked that Wig note that information was requested a year ago from Massport and they said they would provide it but have not.

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

None.

### Public Comment

None.

### Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Navarra, seconded by Mr. Houk and passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 PM.

### Documents and Presentations:

- Massport Presentation
- Chair's Presentation
- Agenda
- October 2018 meeting minutes
- Environment and Health Subcommittee handout
- Massport sustainability calendar and book