



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

GENERAL MEETING

APRIL 23, 2019 AT 4:00 PM

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

Meeting Minutes

Members Attending

Arlington	Frank Ciano
Belmont	Myron Kassaraba
Boston 1 – East Boston	John Nucci
Boston 3 – Fenway	Maura Zlody
Boston 4 – Roxbury	Joanne Keith
Boston 5 – Hyde Park	Irene Walczak*
Boston 6 – Roslindale	Alan Wright
Braintree	Sandra Kunz
Cambridge	Bill Deignan
Canton	James Aufiero
Chelsea	Roseann Bongiovanni
Cohasset	Ralph Dormitzer
Hull	David Carlon
Marblehead	Charles Gessner
Melrose	Pete Navarra
Quincy	Frank Tramontozzi
Revere	James Mercurio
Salem	William Legault
Somerville	Wig Zamore
Watertown	Andrea Adams
Winthrop	Jerry Falbo
Worcester	John Genkos

Members Absent

Bedford	Heidi Porter
Beverly	
Boston 2 - South Boston	David Manning
Brookline	Heather Hamilton
Concord	
Everett	Tony Sousa
Hingham	Katie McBrine
Lexington	
Lincoln	
Lynn	William Bochnak
Malden	Christopher Webb
Medford	Peter Houk
Milton	
Nahant	Bob D'Amico
Randolph	
Swampscott	
Scituate	Brad Washburn
Weymouth	Gene Castignetti

* Participated remotely

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

Massport attendees: Flavio Leo, Anthony Gallagher



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Welcome & Introduction

It was noted that there was not a quorum at the start of the meeting, so the MCAC could discuss and ask questions, but not take any votes.

A quorum was achieved at 4:18 pm with the arrival of the member from Chelsea, Roseanne Bongiavanni.

Vote to approve Minutes of January 10, 2019

Motion to approve as amended by Mr. Ciano was made by Mr. Legault, seconded by Mr. Navarra. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Treasurer Report

Mr. Kassaraba reported that he and Mr. Romero were working on the draft FY20 budget. There is currently sufficient funds in the MCAC account, and the good news is the financial systems to request and receive transfers is in place.

Executive Director Update

Conflict of Interest Reminder

Mr. Romero reminded the MCAC that the state required Conflict of Interest (COI) Law training for members as special state employees.

Part-Time Administrative Assistant Hiring

Enabling Act Amendment Bill S.2149

The proposed bill would significantly increase the membership of the MCAC by giving select communities multiple representatives, as well as add the City of Peabody to the MCAC. The Executive Director had reached out to the bill's sponsor, Senator Walter Timilty, multiple times via email, phone, and in person office visit, to request an explanation on the background and reasoning for the bill, but had not received a response yet. The Executive Committee had voted unanimously to not support the bill.

Mr. Carlon reported that the Hull Board of Selectmen had voted to oppose this bill. Senator Boncore, who co-chairs the Joint Committee on Transportation had indicated that it would be helpful to have a resolution from the MCAC. Mr. Legault from Salem said no one had reached out to him, and he doesn't support this bill.

The following motion was made by Mr. Navarra and seconded by Mr. Falbo:

To oppose Senate Bill No. 2149 "An Act Relative to Increasing the Membership on the Massport Community Advisory Committee" and to authorize the Executive Director to send a letter to the



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

members of the Joint Committee on Transportation notifying them of the MCAC's vote and requesting that the Committee take no action on the Bill.

Ms. Adams reported that Watertown's administration was unaware of the bill even though they would receive an additional voting member. There was not contact with Watertown and the communities receiving additional voting members appeared random.

Further discussion included concerns about finding additional members to serve, as well as an increased challenge of securing a quorum. The consensus of members who spoke was to not support the bill.

The motion was unanimously passed by roll call vote.

RNAV Study Update – Dr. John Hansman

FAA officials introduced themselves to the MCAC including Colleen D'Allessandro, Acting Regional Administrator and Steven Sherwood, Acting Deputy Regional Administrator. They were attending only to listen today, but they planned to provide technical experts to attend the next MCAC general meeting in June.

A member of the public requested to recorded Dr. Hansman's report and this request was granted without objection.

Doctor John Hansman provided a report to the MCAC. His report was presented and outlined in a Power Point presentation (see presentation for details).

Throughout the presentation, members asked questions and engaged in discussion including benefits across fleet types, sequencing, and design feasibility. Dr. Hansman noted that each option had been evaluated on an individual basis and combined analysis had not been done. He noted that was appropriate for this stage and combined analysis would be part of the DOT 41 process if an option moved forward.

There were questions about RNP capabilities and when full adoption was anticipated. Dr. Hansman clarified that there were two levels of RNP. The lower level was just GPS-based, but the higher level (RNP-AR) required both equipment and trained crew, but could perform tighter turns and other more complicated maneuvers. Jet Blue was well equipped for RNP-AR, but full implementation for RNP might not be for a while.

He noted that with delayed deceleration and delayed landing gear deployment, Air Traffic Control (ATC) has concerns. In particular, they like to use the landing gear to assist with slowing down the planes and would like to retain that ability. Additionally, the number one cause of fatal accidents is running off the runway so the way to use landing gear and restricting it was not popular with the pilots.

Dr. Hansman discussed continuous descent approach and noted that ILS needed to approach the glide slope from below, but RNP/RNAV could approach it from the top. Dr. Hansman noted that in Block 2 all options had trade-offs. For example, a tighter trombone turn could be implemented but it would result in greater concentration, but would result in certain noise benefits compared to current procedures.



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

He noted that he and his team were continuing to push forward with “Runway 22 Departures Option C,” noting that it is currently flown now. It would require additional ATC effort, but they felt it was worth exploring. Mr. Carlon appreciated the additional work on this option, and reminded that the Logan CAC was an interest group, not a state agency like the MCAC. Ms. Adams agreed, noting that the Logan CAC was fixing a problem with their original request, but we now know there is a different problem created by implementation, and flight procedures should not be “chiseled in stone.”

Mr. Falbo asked if there were any options for relief for Point Shirley in Winthrop. Dr. Hansman responded that due to Point Shirley’s proximity to the airport there were no available options for relief as part of the RNAV Study. Mr. Falbo requested that this be noted in his report, and Ms. Bongiovanni requested similar language for Chelsea.

Dr. Hansman reviewed departure dispersion options for 33L and 27. He noted that moving the waypoint would be the easiest of the options, and noted that options including additional ATC work would be more challenging. Dr. Hansman presented histograms showing impacts to the communities for the various options presented, and it was noted that Allston impacts seemed to be missing. Dr. Hansman would look into it and update as needed. There were discussions on comparative analysis and the baselines being used including pre-RNAV, post-RNAV, and possible RNAV Study option implementations. Members had different ideas about the baselines that should be used to compare the options. There was discussion about how an analysis on hours of operation and frequency and persistency was required as well.

Runway 27 options as it related to the Record of Decision (ROD) were discussed. Dr. Hansman noted his analysis included options currently violating the ROD, but noted the options not violating the ROD including moving the waypoint would be more likely for implementation. Ms. Keith requested that similar analysis that had been conducted by Runway 33L departures be conducted for Runway 27 departures.

Subcommittee Update

Mr. Zamore reported that there was a well-attended and informative presentation from Massport on the sound insulation program. Mr. Carlon reported that he and Mr. Falbo had met with Senator Boncore and Congresswoman Clark’s staff to discuss the matter as well.

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

Mr. Ciano asked about the current Uber and Lyft discussion related to Massport. Mr. Navarra noted that Executive Committee had discussed it as well and noted that the Massport Board of Directors would be voting to adjust the fees, but not the curb location, which Massport could implement without a Board vote.

Public Comment

Members of the public from Medford, Belmont, and Milton spoke. They were concerned with the perceived increase of flights, particularly nighttime operations and weekends, noting the impact of the



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

concentration on the quality of life for residents in those communities. In addition, further analysis and evaluation of arrival dispersion options was also requested.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 PM.

Documents and Presentations:

- Chair's Presentation
- Agenda
- January 10, 2109 meeting minutes
- Dr. Hansman's RNAV Study Presentation