



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

GENERAL MEETING

JANUARY 9TH, 2020 AT 4:00PM

Conference Room #2 & 3 | State Transportation Building | 10 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02116

Meeting Minutes

Members Attending		Members Absent	
Arlington	Frank Ciano	Bedford	Heidi Porter
Belmont	Myron Kassaraba	Boston 2 – South Boston	Dave Manning
Beverly	Gloria Bouillon	Boston 7 – South End	Steven Fox
Boston 1 – East Boston	John Nucci	Cohasset	Ralph Dormitzer
Boston 3 – Fenway	Maura Zlody	Concord	Vacant
Boston 4 – Roxbury	Joanne Keith	Everett	Tony Sousa
Boston 5 – Hyde Park	Irene Walczak	Hingham	Katie McBrine
Boston 6 – Roslindale	Alan Wright	Lexington	Vacant
Braintree	Sandra Kunz	Lincoln	Vacant
Brookline	Heather Hamilton	Malden	Christopher Webb
Cambridge	Bill Deignan	Nahant	Robert D’Amico
Canton	Jim Aufiero	Quincy	Frank Tramontozzi
Chelsea	Roseann Bongiovanni	Revere	James Mercurio
Hull	David Carlon	Salem	William Legault
Lynn	William Bochnak	Scituate	Vacant
Marblehead	Charles Gessner	Swampscott	Vacant
Medford	Peter Houk	Watertown	Vacant
Melrose	Peter Navarra	Worcester	John Genkos
Milton	Tom Dougherty		
Randolph	Gerard Cody		
Somerville	Wig Zamore		
Weymouth	Gene Castignetti		
Winthrop	Jerry Falbo		

Other attendees:

Matthew A. Romero, MCAC Executive Director

Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, MCAC Counsel

Stephanie Ackley, MCAC Administrative Assistant

Flavio Leo, Massport

Anthony Gallagher, Massport

Colleen D’Alessandro, FAA Regional Administrator

Reggie Davis, Regional Ombudsman

Carl Newton, Flight Procedures Specialist, FAA

Rebecca Cointon, Executive Director (Acting), Office of Environment and Energy

Kathleen Bergen, Communications Manager, FAA

Ken Knott, Acting Deputy Regional Administrator

Welcome to the State Transportation Building

The Massport Community Advisory Committee Chair, David Carlon, welcomed members and guests from the FAA and Massport for being part of the evening’s presentations, as well as the members of the public. The Chair notified members that the meeting was audio recorded by request of members of the public and approved by the Chair.



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Vote to approve Minutes of June 10, 2019

Motion to approve the minutes from the October 10th, 2019 Annual Meeting was made by Mr. Navarra, seconded by Mr. Ciano and passed unanimously, with Ms. Keith abstaining.

MCAC Massport Board Member Update

Mr. Nucci started by discussing drone usage by members of the public, and the safety concerns this raises, specifically regarding aircraft safety. Mr. Leo stepped in to further this discussion, adding that there are education programs being established, and that Massport has advocated to the FAA for a pilot test site at Logan Airport. They have also begun a public outreach campaign, using signage, social media, videos, and press coverage to help get the message out to the public. They are also working with the FAA, MA DOT, and TSA regarding the drone issues, and all are working together to be part of the solution. Mr. Nucci pointed out that there is signage available, and members are welcome to reach out to obtain them.

Chairman Update

Mr. Carlon started by presenting the FY20 Goals and Initiatives slide, which included the status of each line item. Ms. Kunz asked when the Committee can expect the RNAV study to be completed, and Mr. Carlon explained the process that is ongoing. The memorandum was signed in September of 2016, and the presentation of recommendations by Dr. Hansman was done about a year ago. At that point the goal was to have the study completed by September of 2019. In January 2019, there were outstanding items that were prepared for Massport, and they were presented to Massport in June. Milton has made additional requests as part of this study as well. Mr. Zamore pointed out that he does not expect Dr. Hansman to present an environmental assessment until the very end of the study, which will be more robust and detailed than the updates he has been able to provide. Mr. Deignan added that the 33L working group has been working diligently, that they have submitted questions back to Dr. Hansman and Massport, but they have only gotten partial responses, and it seems that they are very slow in their response. Mr. Carlon pointed out that in recent conversations with Massport and Dr. Hansman, it was communicated that this study needs to wrap up in the near future, since it cannot go on forever, and so all are working to figure out where there are still holes in the report, so that they can obtain answers. He hopes that by June, communities will begin to act. Mr. Kassaraba explained that these communities have been asked to agree on recommendations regarding the 33L dispersion, and that they experience frustration and difficulty getting explanations to their questions in a respectfully timely manner. Mr. Carlon would like to have a forum specific to the questions the communities have. Mr. Carlon briefly touched on the Fly Quiet Report, and that it has taken two years but there is still no final report. The MCAC Aviation Subcommittee has reviewed the latest version and provided its feedback to Massport, but there is no published version from Massport at this time.

Treasurer Report

Mr. Dougherty reviewed the FY20 Q2 budget, and explained that all expenses are in line, and the committee is on track with its spending.

Executive Director Update

Future Meeting Schedule

Mr. Romero highlighted the meeting schedule, that all the FY20 meetings have been scheduled and that



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

members should have the updated schedule (sent via email to members). He added that we will be working to schedule subcommittee meetings now that the new year has arrived, and that members of those committees need to respond to staff emails regarding their general availability so that these meetings can be scheduled.

MPA Annual Current Expense Expenditure Budgets Review Update

Mr. Romero updated the Committee on the MPA Annual Current Expenditure Budgets Review, noting that preliminary questions had been submitted to Massport at the end of November. Massport was assembling its internal team to best address all of these questions and will be conducting a kickoff meeting with the Collins Center and MCAC staff by the end of January.

Update from FAA

Colleen D'Alessandro provided a brief introduction to her team, adding that members present are from various locations from across the country. She also reintroduced Reggie Davis, the Regional Ombudsman, and explained that they now have an ombudsman website where the public can contact him. (The link to the ombudsman site can be found below)

https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/apl/noise_emissions/airport_aircraft_noise_issues/noise_ombudsman/

RNAV Study Block 1 Update

Carl Newton, Flight Procedures Specialist, presented an update on the RNAV Block 1.

Reference the Presentation Titled "BOS Block 1 Update".

Mr. Newton explained that due to waivers that had not been approved, they redesigned the procedure to better meet criteria. He explained that the Block 1 recommendations are to modify Runway 15R Departure SIDS to move departure tracks further north away from populated areas, and to implement an overwater RNAV approach procedure and RNP overlay to runway 33L that follows the ground track of the JetBlue RNAV Visual Procedure. Along with the presentation, he explained new mapping that had been created, comparing the track of the previous procedure with the newer versions. He explained the difference between Option 1 (Green and Blue Lines, Pg. 7) and Option 2 (Pink Lines, Pg. 7), that more aircraft can use Option 1, that FAA experts recommend this option and will move forward to finalize this. Option 1 is the revised RNAV Runway 33L and RNP procedure, which requires no waivers. Option 2 is the 2018 RNAV/RNP procedure, which was denied. He pointed out that if the MCAC preferred Option 2, the Committee would need to provide a formal written letter to the FAA. Mr. Carlon presented a motion to the members.

1. To refer the FAA's Block 1 recommendations for Runway 33 arrivals to Massport to coordinate further study and analysis by M.I.T. and to report back to the MCAC Executive Director on or before April 2, 2020.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Ciano and passed unanimously.

2. To request Massport and the FAA to provide to the MCAC Executive Director detailed data on all 2019 overnight flights, sometimes referred to as nocturnal flights (approximate timeframe 10pm – 7am) for Runway 33L Boston Light Visual flight path arrivals – including but not limited to:
 - Each flight and airline;
 - The model of each plane; and
 - for each plane identify whether or not it is equipped with RNP capability, and if not identify which planes can be enabled or modified to include RNP.



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

This motion was seconded by Mr. Dougherty and passed unanimously.

3. To request Massport and the FAA to provide to the MCAC Executive Director detailed data on all 2019 overnight flights, sometimes referred to as nocturnal flights (approximate timeframe 10pm – 7am) for all runways – both departures and arrivals – including but not limited to:
 - Each flight and airline;
 - The model of each plane; and
 - for each plane identify whether or not it is equipped with RNP capability, and if not identify which planes can be enabled or modified to include RNP.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Ciano and passed unanimously.

BU/MIT Grant, Study on Potential Health and Economic Impacts of Overflight Noise (FAA Reauthorization Section 189)

Rebecca Cointin, Executive Director (Acting), Office of Environment and Energy, presented to the committee. Reference the Presentation Titled “Update on FAA Environmental Research and Reauthorization Provisions.”

She discussed that HR302 (FAA Reauthorization), Section 187, Aircraft Noise Exposure, and that the FAA is on track to deliver results in October 2020.

She added that Sec. 173 and Section 188 reports are complete, under DOT review, and that once these reports have been presented to Congress they will be presented to the MCAC. The FAA has also awarded a \$1.7 Million grant to Boston University (School of Public Health) and MIT. The goal with this study is to examine and identify long-term health impacts attributed to noise exposure resulting from aircraft flights. They are working to acquire existing epidemiology studies focused on long-term health questionnaires, and plan to use them to contribute to their research. NIH epidemiology studies are also being leveraged. There is also a geographical spread, and good coverage of all the locations under review. (See map on Pg. 6 of presentation).

She added that these teams of researchers are going to use noise data from 1995 forward, and they hope to link noise exposure data to demographic lifestyle and health data collected from long-term health studies. Also pointed out that MIT will be focusing on economic harms or benefits for businesses located under flight paths at select US airports. Mr. Romero asked how far back they are confident with their data, and Ms. Cointon replied that they have completed analysis going back to 2000.

Mr. Kassaraba asked how changes in flight paths and times will be reflected in the data. Ms. Cointon replied saying that each year they will review noise value and see how it changes over 5 years. She also added that they start by reviewing flight paths, and then begin mapping their data. Mr. Zamore pointed out that WHO/Europe Noise Impact Systematic Study looked at the overlap of aircraft noise and rail noise, and found the combination had more impact than any single contributor. Ms. Cointon responded saying that they will know if they are by road or rail, but she is not sure how the researchers will obtain that actual information. Mr. Zamore added that Volpe has a model, and Ms. Cointon said that she is very familiar with their model.

She continued with further explanation of Section 189, adding that the impacts are selective based on the data that was collected over the lifespans of people. The FAA is starting a larger national sleep study, that they are working on getting approvals, and will be doing a separate research project. She



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

completed explanation of Section 189 by reviewing the forecasted schedule. They plan to finish this report within 3 years, and that by February 2022 the FAA will have their final reports in house. She discussed the efforts the FAA is making relating to aircraft noise and that they are working to understand noise, increase public understanding, reduce noise at the source and provide mitigation. They are working to better understand emissions, reduce them at the source, and mitigate. She discussed the science of particulate matter, gave examples of what makes various types of particulate, and explained aircraft emissions contribute less than 1% of all particulate matter in metropolitan areas. She concluded her presentation by explaining that the FAA plans to utilize a comprehensive approach to address environmental challenges, work with a broad range of stakeholders to understand issues and develop solutions, place more focus on innovation to overcome noise and emissions challenges, continue to seek partnerships for research and development, and continue to be responsive to priorities outlined in the FAA reauthorization Act of 2018.

Mr. Houk stated that he is happy to know about the sleep studies that the FAA plans to conduct and understands that the results are about 2 ½ years away, but to have to wait that long for the completion of the sleep study, just to find out that 2-3 hours of sleep isn't enough doesn't seem helpful right now. There are places in this area that are very greatly impacted by international flights due to the RNAV. The sleep window that these residents actually experience is far less than the recommended 8 hours because there are so many of these late-night flights that easily disrupt residents' sleep.

Mr. Zamore mentioned that the presentation was framed well. He pointed out that Massport and other large airports have been doing climate analysis at 3,000 feet and lower, which makes sense for breathing zone and health impacts, but 90% of climate impact from aviation is above 3,000 feet. He suggested that the whole air column be included in order to have a more accurate climate analysis. He also pointed out that the science community all include black carbon because they know it has massive climate impact, but because it is not a greenhouse gas, people who are regulatory in their orientation forget to count it. Black Carbon has a massive impact, not just in Ultra-Fine Particle Creation, but also in the climate because it is so absorptive. He suggested that Massport and the other large airports correct that simple methodology error, which is a very large one, and include black carbon in its studies going forward. Ms. Cointon replied, stating that she would make sure her office discussed this matter.

Mr. Houk thanked Ms. Cointon for her presentation and asked if any of the widely-reported pushback from the FAA on regulations on climate change will affect this study. She responded that the Center for Environmental Quality wants to update the national policy, but she has not been briefed on what the White House is proposing. They will continue to do research. Mr. Houk asked that if there are any changes in the national policy that would affect these studies, could they notify the MCAC. He added that perhaps local legislators could assist in preserving these studies.

Ms. Kunz asked if Ms. Cointon expects any budget cuts will coming from the federal level and Ms. Cointon replied speaking to her specific budget, which has held steady for 5 years.

Ms. Walczak pointed out that she believes noise is a form of pollution as well as the particulates. She asked if there are specs with manufacturers. Ms. Cointon explained that the FAA doesn't get involved directly with engine manufacturers, but they set engine standards. It is the FAA's way of telling manufacturer what the standards need to be.

Mr. Deignan asked if the new ombudsman has received communications from anyone, and how the noise complaints work, if they are divided between Massport and the FAA. Ms. D'Alessandro answered that she would need to follow up regarding the noise complaints, and that they track all noise complaints by individual and region, and that every complaint is responded to. She added that there has not been a significant increase of contact, even with the new ombudsman in place.

Mr. Deignan followed up by asking what actions the FAA takes when they are contacted, and which



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

office (Massport or FAA) is best suited for their specific complaints. Ms. D'Alessandro explained that if it is a safety issue, the FAA should be contacted, and anything else can go to Massport or both Massport and the FAA.

Environmental Assessment for 4L Approach Procedure

Reggie Davis, FAA Regional Ombudsman, explained that the purpose of the RNAV and 4L approach procedure. It is intended to provide a de-conflicted stabilized approach procedure that allows vertical and lateral guidance when weather or winds require landing on 4L. This procedure would address several needs: Increasing safety of arrivals on 4L, Reduce arrival delays during weather events, conforms to national policy to implement NextGen RNAV procedures, Reduces Air Traffic Control workload and thereby enhances safety, and enhances safety and efficiency overall at Logan Airport. The new procedure will follow existing flight tracks as closely as possible. Mr. Davis then explained the History of FAA's Environmental Review of the 4L RNAV Proposal, explaining that this process began in 2015, several meetings have taken place, the FAA has committed to conduct an Environmental Assessment (EA), and that the EA project has entered the FAA's budget planning and prioritization process. He then discussed the Community Involvement Plan, and that in September of 2019, the FAA awarded a contract to prepare an EA for the proposed 4L RNAV approach. In October, there was a kick-off meeting held to begin the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. As part of that process, the FAA will publish a notice of the draft EA availability in local newspapers, other media, and/or on the internet, which will initiate a 30-day public comment period. The FAA will revise the draft EA, as necessary, in response to internal and external comments received on the draft document, and prepare the final EA. The EA process can take up to a year or more to complete. The FAA is developing a Community Involvement Plan (in collaboration with the New England Regional Airports Division, Regional Administrator's Office, and Massport) concurrently with the NEPA process. The FAA will ensure all meaningful involvement in the project communication and outreach activities. This outreach will include informing elected officials, Massport, MCAC, the public, and conducting workshops. He added that they are working to develop an informal workshop specifically for MCAC, and they are currently working out the details. Mr. Davis then discussed the tentative schedule, pointing out that the Draft EA has a 30-day public comment period. There will be 2 Public workshops held in the Third Quarter of CY2020. The Final EA will be prepared in the Fourth Quarter of CY2020. Mr. Davis then displayed the proposed RNAV IFR Track to 4L. Ms. D'Alessandro added that this slide is from 2015, but it should be a visual to see which communities they are talking about.

Ms. Walczak suggested that the other RNAVs (27, 33L) are included on the visual, so that people can see what communities are being affected. Mr. Carlon asked about the proposed workshops, and Mr. Davis explained that the contractor, along with subject matter experts would be available, along with visual aids, in order to answer questions that participants would have. Mr. Dougherty suggested that they host a meeting prior to the workshops, that would allow input and the ability to express their concerns. Ms. Kunz suggested a better map be used in their presentation, and that the map used is useless in defining what communities are affected or where the actual flightpath is. Mr. Carlon asked where the workshops would be held, and Mr. Davis explained that they are working to determine the exact locations of these meetings. Mr. Kassaraba made a comment, having lived through the 33L Departure EA, he believes this process is disrespectful to the communities. Having watched this go on nationally, you are basically presenting information, allowing people to provide input, but that is never responded to until you publish your findings to the most significant impacts. We were then told there was a post-implementation review, which does nothing more than confirm that the aircrafts are flying the routes the way that the procedure was designed. It has nothing to do with community impacts. If you said



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

there was going to be no significant impact there is no validation. He understands that this is what the FAA is required to do, but he does not think that it is effective as a mechanism for communities to actually be able to provide feedback that gets responded to prior to the implementation of procedure. By the time you are at the point where you're publishing the EA, you already know that it is going to be approved. He feels strongly about this because they've been fighting for 6 years to try and undo the RNAV procedure for the 33L. If he had known then what he knows now, he would have advocated sooner, and he hopes the FAA get sued when they do this. Ms. Walczak was part of the 33L that sued and feels that this is a much more complex process that requires more evaluation. She suggests that with the proposed 4L, it will impact communities that have not previously been overflown. She doesn't believe that the EA is the proper mechanism for the 4L. She added that it is all for the efficiency of Logan Airport at the expense of the residents living under the RNAV. Ms. D'Alessandro mentioned that they are planning to conduct the workshop for MCAC members in advance of the EA, which would give members the opportunity to ask questions and provide input prior to the draft being published. Mr. Houk asked if the purpose of the workshops is anything more than educating the public and that there is no actual feedback process. Ms. D'Alessandro explained that the workshops are held during the public comment period of the EA, so that they can talk to experts and ask their questions, and have multiple ways to submit comments, at the workshop, online, or by letter. Mr. Houk asks if the FAA uses those comments in any way to help form the procedure. Ms. Cointon said that the FAA has to answer questions as part of their process. Mr. Kassaraba asked if they can provide any examples where the questions or comments raised by the public have resulted in the change of the intended procedure. Ms. D'Alessandro said that they would look into this question and provide an answer. Mr. Ciano thanked the FAA for participating in these discussions.

Update on Noise Insulation Review – Massport CAC Counsel

Counsel provided an update on Noise Insulation, explaining the process so far, and where it has led to. In the summer of 2019, she began research to determine if PFCs (Passenger Fee Charges) could be used to fund noise mitigation and insulation. Her initial determination was yes, and so she was put in touch with Massport's Legal team, who she has had successful collaboration with. She then asked the question formally, and Massport acquired outside legal counsel. They determined that yes, the funding was available, but they would have to work with the FAA in order to appropriate these funds. She then contacted Mr. Doucette, from the FAA, who came and spoke at the previous MCAC meeting. She then sent a letter with follow up questions from the Executive Committee to Mr. Doucette, and he responded to those questions. At this point, members now need to begin reaching out to their congressional delegation and make specific requests to Massport for the funding.

Mr. Falbo added that he read the FAA report, and that they blame the failure of the windows on the homeowner's lack of maintenance. They later point out that the products warranties have expired, and he is clearly frustrated with the lack of ownership on the FAA's part. He agrees that congressional delegation needs to be approached.

Mr. Carlon pointed out that we will draft and repackage this information and begin to reach out to elected officials on further guidance on how the Committee is allowed to proceed.

Update from Massport

RNAV Study Update – Flavio Leo

Mr. Leo addressed the Committee and explained that Mr. Hansman needs to be in attendance in order to present his analysis. He believes that the work is nearly completed, adding that MIT has gone beyond the original scope of work due to the community involvement, and that he looks forward to the report



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

wrapping up soon. He also thanked the MIT team, and all female team who was present at the meeting, adding that this is a big milestone to have made.

Mr. Ciano asked why Massport has not implemented curfews, rerouting or fanning, and Mr. Leo explained that Logan Airport is a 24/7 international airport with grandfathered use. He added that rerouting, or fanning, is what MIT is looking at, the 33L working group has provided their suggestions on how to disperse the volume, and that runway use is a complicated conversation.

Mr. Houk asked how the flights would increase compared to what they are currently seeing for volume at night, considering the new increases Massport has planned. Mr. Leo explained that there is a challenge putting a number out, given the current possible changes to RNAV. Their goal is to have a new procedure in place, that has all the criteria that was discussed in the presentation, and meets the community's goals. Mr. Houk followed up with questions regarding a specific flight, departing very early in the morning, and that he is interested in understanding the criteria that allows them to do this on a reoccurring basis. Mr. Leo explained that he cannot comment specifically to the particular flight, but that there are many factors, such as weather and wind speed, that come into play when the Air Traffic Control Tower makes decisions for runway use.

Mr. Kassaraba added that it is not only weather permitting, but its volume permitted, and that there is currently no cut-off time for the head-to-head overnight procedure is allowed use. He believes that the opportunity to use that procedure, even with new RNP's, should be very limited based on volume. Mr. Leo explained that if the FAA allows the new RNAV/RNP, this will take more volume.

Mr. Wright added a comment, this is the problem with Massport's growth, and that it is only going to get worse. Technology is not going to overcome this.

Mr. Deignan asked if there is a better way to improve the flow of information as questions come up from the working groups, and suggested that Massport do a better job communicating, and keeping the working groups and the Committee informed as to where things stand. Mr. Leo pointed out that Dr. Hansman will be present at the April meeting to answer questions. Mr. Houk added that he wants to see Massport explain where things stand as part of the process, and that waiting for 2 months for answers to still have no word is not acceptable.

Fly Quiet Report Presentation - HMMH

Mr. Leo explained that they plan to have HMMH present at the next General Meeting, publish their last quarter, including the updates from the last working group meeting, and the Committee can direct questions and comments directly with those involved.

New Business

None

Public Comment

Cindy Christensen, Milton, had 2 comments both directed at the 4L EA. She said that it is not going to matter how many meetings you have, it is not going to matter how many runway operations you include; it is all about DNL. She referred to an area in Milton where the DNL is about 51.7 on average throughout the year, and under 200 flights per day, but they could triple that number and that area would still not have a significant impact. She suggested that the FAA share the actual volume of planes expected with their proposed increase, not just percentages. Her second comment was that in May of 2015, FAA there were 2 approaches, the JetBlue Visual Instrument approach and the FAA GPS RNAV, it appears that this is only about the latter, and so another questions is what about the JetBlue Visual,



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

which is an instrument approach that was part of the original plans and also part of the RNAV study that ties into 4R's repairs.

Bill McCarthy, Hull, hopes to see some progress made, instead of coming to meetings and having no questions answered.

Frank Kerr, Hull, was concerned with the proposed changes with the 33L approach and thinks he will start to see incoming as well as outgoing planes. He added that he believes this is a safety issue, and wants to know what the actual safety issue is that is holding up the new 33L.

Alban Bassuet, Boston, suggested that the DNL is an issue, and may need new criteria.

Edward Burkurt, Somerville, explained that the RNAV was supposed to have no significant impact. In the past, he never noticed the aircraft noise, and now its 400 flights a day. He wants to see Massport's growth stopped, because residents are paying with their health.

Michael McCain, Medford, explained that he is impacted from flights every 1-3 minutes, with no respite. There is no feeling of joy in their homes, and they don't sleep. He has lived there for 26 years, and only in the last 5 years has it become unbearable. The lights and noise over the same homes over and over are like torture.

Jeff Kerr, Hull, asked if the public will be made aware of all the reports that Dr. Hansman has presented, even the rejected.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05pm.

Documents and Presentations:

Agenda

Draft Minutes from 10-10-2019 MCAC Annual Meeting

MCAC General Meeting 1-9-2020 Agenda Presentation

Block 1 Update 1-9-2020 FAA Presentation– Carl Newton

Update on FAA Environmental Research and Reauthorization Provisions 1-9-2020 – Rebecca Cointon

Environmental Assessment for the Boston Logan International Airport (BOS) Runway 4 Left (4L)

Approach Procedure 1-9-2020 FAA Presentation – Reggie Davis