



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

GENERAL MEETING

JUNE 11TH, 2020 AT 4:00PM

RingCentral Virtual Meeting

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	William Legault
Hull	David Carlon	Salem	James Mercurio
Lynn	William Bochnak	Scituate	Brad Washburn
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

Ryan Almassy, Operations Support Group Manager, Eastern Service Area, ATO/FAA

Sean Doyle, Senior Aviation Noise Policy and Research Specialist, Office of Environment and Energy



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Welcome to the State Transportation Building

The Massport Community Advisory Committee Chair, David Carlon, introduced himself welcomed members, staff and members of the public to our first virtual meeting. He asked for patience as we navigate this new virtual world and unusual times. The Chair notified members that the meeting was audio recorded by request of members of the public, and approved by the Chair. The meeting began with a roll call for attendance, and the Chair explained that all votes will be taken by roll call as well. Mr. Romero added that people welcome to participate by audio only, if they so choose.

Chairman Update

The Chair shared comments on three items that were not on the agenda, but were planned prior to COVID-19. The Massport Budget Review Initiative, which was a charge in the MCAC's Enabling Act, and to be conducted by the Collins Center, is on hold due to COVID-19. Prior to the virus, the project was on schedule and will resume once Massport's operations return to some level of normalcy.

Regarding the Fly Quiet Report, it was the Chair's understanding that the report would be published very soon and the Committee is waiting for Massport to publish the report. Lastly, pre-COVID-19 we had extended an invitation to Dr. Jonathan Levy and his team at Boston University School of Public Health to present at this meeting. Unfortunately, we have had to reschedule for a later date. This presentation was going to focus on Dr. Levy's research on air quality related to Logan Airport. This was a unique opportunity for the Committee to hear first-hand from leading experts doing the research. The research is funded by the FAA and supported by Massport. Members of the Executive Committee and staff met with Dr. Levy and his team a few months ago, where he provided a briefing on the current research and future plans, as well as discussion on research funding. This meeting was extremely informative and eye-opening, and the Chair looks forward to having the BU Team present to us in a future meeting.

Vote to approve Minutes of January 9th, 2020

Motion to approve the minutes from the January 9th, 2020 General Committee Meeting was made by Mr. Ciano seconded by Mr. Deignan and passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Following the vote to approve minutes, additional members were admitted to the meeting and identified.

MCAC Massport Board Member Update

Mr. Nucci thanked the Chair and Committee for the opportunity to provide an update on the Massport Board activities. He also thanked the CAC for all the work put in to make this virtual meetings happen, and understands the work that goes into it and the challenge that it poses. The Massport Board is still meeting despite the ongoing pandemic, and public comment is still available. There have been staggering reductions in both flight and passenger volume over the past few months. The airport has been able to take some of this time to pursue humanitarian flights, assisting in bringing in PPE and other materials. One of the ground transportation issues, with Logan Express there is a reduction in schedule due to down ridership. Runway 9/27 Rehabilitation project has been pushed forward, and started in May, due to the reduced activity at the airport. They also had a virtual community meeting regarding this project. Massport hopes for return to somewhat normal activity soon, and there is a large amount of work preparing for the new normal, including signs and social distancing guidelines.



Executive Director Update

Future Meeting Schedule

Mr. Romero discussed the future meeting schedule and format. All of our scheduled meetings are going to continue to be held, but will be done so virtually due to the ongoing pandemic. Once in-person meetings are allowed, we hope to transition back into that format, and will keep members informed as the situation changes.

Sound Insulation Updates

Lisa Weiland, Massport CEO, has sent a letter to the FAA to advocate the revisit on the policy of reinsulating of certain homes within the current 65 DNL contour. Many individuals played a part in keeping this moving forward. Counsel, Chair, and Mr. Romero wrote letters to our local congressional delegation to further raise the issue, and Congresswoman Clarks office reached out to discuss talking points for the hearing on the FAA's FY21 Budget.

Funding for BU Research Team

Mr. Romero thanks Secretary Chow for releasing the additional funds to conduct the work being done by the team at BU regarding ultra-fine particles.

South-Central Florida Metroplex Virtual Workshop

Mr. Romero discussed the email sent to members regarding the FAA's Community Workshops in the South-Central Florida Metroplex area. The FAA anticipates using this same format for our local 4L Environmental Assessment process.

Treasurer's Report

MPA Annual Current Expense Expenditure Budgets Review Update

Mr. Dougherty discussed the FY20 Year End Projections, and that we are approaching June 30th, the end of our fiscal year. Our budget is set by the MCAC Enabling Act, and we are on track to spend an estimated \$305,000 due to reduced spending in the last quarter because of the COVID-19 impacts. The consulting by the Collins Center cost (\$25,000) will be deferred to FY21 Q3 and Q4. This work included reviewing airline incentives, and this work can not continue at the current time due to the pandemic and its impacts. The website redesign (\$6000) will also be deferred to FY21 Q3 and Q4. AAFCPA will be conducting its FY20 review and billed in the FY20 year. They will also be conducting the first Tri-Annual Audit once FY20 has concluded. He then reviewed the budget worksheet slides. He presented a motion to approve the Massport CAC Fiscal Budget on the basis and annual allocation estimated to be \$362,470.83. Mr. Navarra moved the motion, which was seconded by Mr. Kassaraba. The motion passed by roll call vote (with Ms. Zlody and Mr. Wright unable to participate in the vote.) Mr. Carlon thanked staff and Treasurer for their work on the budget and the changes they have had to make over the past few months.

Update from FAA

RNAV Study Block 1 Update

Mr. Davis presented a brief agenda on what the FAA planned to present, and then introduced Mr. Newton. Mr. Newton introduced himself as the Regional Flight Procedure Specialist, discussed the Block 1 Update and provided a brief presentation. He reviewed the information that was presented at the January 2020 MCAC meeting, to provide background information. He explained that three waypoints had to be moved in order to fit the criteria. They also made a waypoint crossing restriction to another waypoint. As a result of the COVID-19 public health emergency, the FAA implemented social distancing guidelines to protect employees and public health. These measures had interrupted the schedule and



coordination of the FAA instrument flight procedures. On Runway 33L, they were mandated to provide a procedure that was north of the peninsula and along the JetBlue RNAV procedure, and they have presented two options. They designed an RNAV GPS procedure and an RNAV RNP procedure, which he reviewed on the slides. The first option was to proceed with the revised RNAV R33 procedure and the RNAV RNP R33, which are two procedures with the RNAV GPS and RNAV RNP Procedure. The second option is to proceed with RNAV RNP procedure only. He doesn't anticipate to see these changes until mid-2021. Ms. D'Alessandro discussed that the FAA was proceeding at risk on this study and anticipated publication in September 2020 assuming that the official request came from MCAC and MPA. They have not received anything at the time. The pandemic has given the MCAC more time to provide feedback, and until the FAA receives feedback they will not proceed on the development of the procedure. Mr. Carlon added that the 15R requested Dr. Hansman review the modified procedure. Mr. Carlon's opinion is that there was minimal impacts on the communities that would have been impacted. He has reached out to these communities but has not been able to get the feedback. The also added that the committee has received the additional information that was requested regarding Runway 33, and our team is reviewing overnight flights to assess the fleet mix and what crafts are enabled with RNP capability. Once this is completed, we will circulate this with members and allow dialogue on which choice to support (RNP only or RNAV RNP).

Mr. Davis provided an update on Block 2. On May 15th, the FAA hosted a Runway 33 Working Group meeting. During that meeting, Ms. D'Alessandro committed to providing feedback on all the designs that Mr. Hansman and his MIT team had presented. On May 22nd, Dr. Hansman/MIT, Massport and the FAA met to discuss the Block 2 design proposals. Dr. Hansman and his team received feedback from the FAA on the design proposals. There were challenges on these designs, ranging from air traffic operations, to including a complete redesign of Boston airspace, aircraft performance, design criteria issues, and aircraft flyability issues. The FAA later discussed the designs internally and will provide written feedback to Massport and MCAC no later than August 15th.

Ms. D'Alessandro provided an update on the 4L Environmental Assessment. The FAA was asked to give an update on the process and the timeline. They did receive the letter from the MCAC requesting to delay the project, and thanked the Committee for voicing concerns. The FAA had carefully considered all of the reasons outlined in the letter, convened a group of specialists across the agency and a variety of different stakeholders to discuss if postponement would be possible. The FAA's decision is that they will not delay the Environmental Assessment and has provide the written response to the MCAC today. They do understand the concerns that were shared, and recognize that flights have dropped and that communities are impacted by the COVID-19 public health crisis, but that the Environmental Assessment and implementing the procedures is critical to increasing flight safety. It is an operational necessity for Boston Logan and the National Airspace System. They understand the challenges of a virtual workshop and encourage members to participate in the Florida Metroplex workshops to get an understanding of how these workshops will work. They are confident that they will be able to work with the communities that may not have access to participate in the workshops in a virtual environment. They commit to work with MCAC, Massport and the local congressional delegation in order to reach these communities.

Ms. Veronda Johnson introduced herself as the Project Manager for the Boston RNAV GPS Runway 4 Left Environmental Assessment. She provided an overview of the NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act of 1969). When the NEPA process begins, they complete a preliminary technical review and an environmental review. They determine with that proposed action with an internal review. For Boston Runway 4 Left, the public had concerns, and so they are proceeding with the Environmental Assessment.



The purpose of the EA is to determine if there will be significant impacts. If there are no significant impacts found, they will move forward with the finding. If the finding results in significant impacts, they then move forward to an Environmental Impact Statement. If that is the case, it would determine if there is a Record of Decision. For the Boston Runway 4 Left, they had a kickoff for the EA on October 2019, and it is being performed by an independent contractor Rovalis. They are currently doing noise modeling, looking at environmental resources and will do a public involvement outreach program. The draft EA public workshop will be expected in Fall of 2020. 30 days prior to the draft EA workshop there will be notification to the public of the workshop. The comment period will last 30 days. When the comment period concludes, Rovalis will receive the comments and develop responses for those comments. The FAA will provide an Environmental Assessment decision sometime early in 2021. These dates are tentative. Ms. D'Alessandro added that the workshop is typically done during the 30 day comment period so that members of the public have the opportunity to review the draft, attend a workshop, offer comments and have questions answered. Ms. Walczak asked why Runway 4L is being opened with all the extra traffic because in the past only 4R was to be used and 4L was for emergencies. The spacing between 4L and 4R has an issue and doesn't meet current requirements. There is a group of people that are impacted by both of these runways and no matter how you complete the assessment of impacts, because of the averaging of the DNL, there will be no significant impact found. She added that she believes that the FAA has never found Significant Impact for any of the EA's that have been performed. Ms. Johnson explained that the main reason they are starting with the 4L is for safety reasons, and that there is not an instrument approach for 4L, so they'd want to implement that procedure. Ms. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Almassy to further explain. Mr. Almassy explained that 4L is used today with a visual approach procedure only, and that in September 2019 there were 1876 operations to 4L. In March 2020 it dropped to 553 operations, and has continued to drop given the ongoing pandemic. Creating the instrument procedure approach allows air traffic controllers to laterally and vertically monitor the aircraft that were coming in. There is also the ILS 15R visual approach to 4L. The aircraft line up using equipment to 15R and when the airport is in sight, they circle and land to 4L. On occasion, aircraft aligns with a taxiway, and ATC has to catch this prior to landing, which is a safety issue. This safety issue is the reason to proceed with the 4L. Mr. Dougherty thanked the FAA for their presentation. He added that he and Mr. Romero participated in the Florida Metroplex workshop. He had noticed that in these workshops they had discussed so-called pre-meetings, and thought it was worth noting that the FAA has not had this intention so far regarding the 4L EA. He hoped they would consider that option for the impacted communities. Regarding the virtual aspects of the Florida workshop, it felt instructive. He added that the logistics were well handled but the limitations were clear and that questions are not being answered. For example, a participant asked a question regarding people without access to the internet because of the pandemic have no way to participate in these workshops and asked what alternatives the FAA proposes to accommodate these people. There was no ability for participants to drill down with more specific questions on modeling criteria. Regarding the 4L EA, specifically with the closely spaced parallel runways with 4L and 4R, the process for our local participants needs to be presented in a more participatory way. He added that he is disappointed in their conclusions and thanked the FAA for their thoughts. Ms. Walczak thanked Mr. Dougherty for his comments and agrees that they are on the same page regarding the 4L EA and its process. She would like to request a month regarding communication, given the ongoing pandemic and its limitations. She also asked the distance between the parallel runways in Atlanta versus 4R and 4L in Boston, as the two at Logan would be considered a safety issue. She finds it ironic that the 4L is being set up for safety when the 4L was supposed to be a visual approach for JetBlue only. They had the technology in their planes. She also added that the people that are impacted by the 4R and 4L have not been notified of any



changes and have no idea of the impacts it will have. The FAA had no ability to answer the question at the time and suggested that they follow up with Ms. Walczak. Mr. Carlon commented on the 4L EA, and thinks it is imperative of the FAA to provide more time for the public to digest the information prior to the workshops. Any community should have a reasonable amount of time to review the materials and prepare questions ahead of time to present at a workshop, as well as being educated in the subject matter being presented to them. Ms. Zlody emphasized Mr. Carlon and Ms. Walczak's suggestion to give people ample time to review the materials and prepare for a workshop of this nature. She had also attended one of the Florida Metroplex workshops, and noticed that the FAA did not present any of the material that they were referencing at the workshop, and expected people to have had these materials in advance by obtaining them individually. Mr. Almassy added that the Florida Metroplex constitutes of 106 procedure changes with a substantial amount of information to provide to the public. He appreciates the members that have participated in those workshops to better understand what to expect with the 4L EA. He added that since the 4L EA is only one procedure he is hopeful that they can spend more time in the workshop setting focused on the procedural elements of the document presented. He added that they did allow follow up questions with the FAA through the Florida Workshops. He has taken note of the requests for additional time to review the document prior to the workshop and will take that into consideration and may find a favorable response to that. He thanked the committee for their comments and wants to make these workshops as informative to the public as possible and do everything they can to get quality input for the Environmental Document.

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

Mr. Doyle introduced himself and explained that he is actively involved in a lot of the current research programs within the division. He discussed the FAA Reauthorization Section 189, offering members to access the complete language on the FAA website (<http://www.faa.gov/about/reauthorization/>). He explained that the FAA wanted to provide an overview of community noise exposure, including history and use of DNL, as well as an overview and balanced discussion of applicable noise metrics along with their appropriate uses. He provided the committee with background on DNL and additional information on noise metrics and the fundamentals of DNL. In specific situations supplemental noise metrics can provide complimentary information to DNL. He added that no single noise metric can cover all situations, but that DNL provides the most comprehensive way to consider the range of factors influencing exposure to aircraft noise. Mr. Zamore asked a question relating to the WHO report on noise impacts. He asked if Mr. Doyle would agree with the concentration response functions that are made explicit in the comprehensive review of noise in the World Health Organization Europe. Mr. Doyle explained that his organization had commented on the report and had concerns with the methodology that they addressed in the report. He pointed out that the FAA is actively engaged in research to answer the exact questions. Trying to understand the economic consequences of environmental impacts is difficult to do for a range of reasons but the FAA is actively monitoring this domestically and internationally. Mr. Zamore added that it would be helpful to have a list of the people that the FAA considers experts, both domestically and internationally. He also asked about cumulative environmental impacts, and how the FAA is compliant with the cumulative environmental impact regulations. Mr. Doyle explained that the regulations are documented and reviewed and approved by OMV. All their requirements are approved through the federal government. Mr. Kassaraba explained that after living through the changes that were made with 33L and 27 Departures, he understands the rationale of DNL. In prior times DNL may have been effective, but at Logan Airport, where most configurations are utilized 15-20% of the time and with the addition of RNAV concentration, he cannot believe that the level of feedback that the FAA has received, that you can make the statement that the DNL metric is going to be reflective of



changes that have occurred of a highly concentrated runway. If the FAA isn't willing to acknowledge this point, they are not listening to the communities and the people who are under these concentrated flight paths in areas of dense population are communicating to you. Mr. Doyle thanked Mr. Kassaraba for his point, and further explained that there is no single perfect metric, and the burden they face is that it is difficult to find a well-balanced consistent way to assess noise nationally. Mr. Tramontozzi had submitted questions ahead of time and pointed out that the table provided in the presentation is inaccurate in its representation. Mr. Doyle explained that with the supplemental metrics, they are variable, and can be revised or modified to create a new metric. There is no strict limitation for some of these metrics and may work different from DNL. Mr. Houk added that DNL is an aged tool, and RNAV concentration is 6 or 7 years old at Logan Airport. He does not believe that DNL addresses frequency and time of occurrence. If you are under an RNAV, the frequency may have gone up since it was introduced, but DNL does not capture this. He feels strongly that DNL is a better tool to never have to perform an environmental impact study, and doesn't see how it is useful in dealing with some of the modern features of noise annoyance that are the result of the NexGen procedures. He asked why alternative metrics are not being used more to develop a more accurate portrayal of the soundscape surrounding the airport. Mr. Doyle explained that the FAA is diligently looking into this, but that DNL is the tool that gives them the most consistent way to evaluate for regulatory requirements across the country. Ms. Walczak pointed out the DNL does not consider all the forms of pollution, and it only focuses on noise. All the environmental impacts need to be considered, such as fumes and UFP. The pollution and population density need to be considered. Mr. Doyle agreed that noise is not the only pollutant out there, and explained that according to NEPA, they are required to look at emissions. Mr. Dougherty made a specific request for a complimentary noise metric to be included in the EA, rather than just the yearly DNL. He would like to see the DNL for "days used", and runway use DNL as a complementary measure in the EA as well as a "Number-Above" type of measurement so that the record of the EA would have that information included should there be a challenge to the methodology used. Mr. Ciano had submitted questions to the FAA prior to the meeting and wanted to follow up on the Section 189 and asked if the report has been completed. Mr. Doyle explained that he believed that it is still with Congress but will follow up with an exact answer. Mr. Romero added that the FAA had provided an overview of the Section 189 in January.

Update from Massport

Mr. Gallagher provided an update on Massport and that this year has been unprecedented year for the aviation industry. Passenger numbers are profoundly down in all aspects of Massport's operations, including aviation and cruise. They are working to remove any non-critical expenses, and have had to make challenging decisions, such as decreasing or suspending the Logan Shuttle, a hiring and wage freeze within the organization, and reduction and possible elimination of possible services. He appreciates the work that MCAC Staff has put in to create a revised budget.

Regarding COVID-19, Logan has implemented social distancing protocols, floor markings in terminals, touch-free payments and boarding, plastic shields, limiting occupancy in certain locations.

RNAV Study Update – Flavio Leo

Not covered due to time constraints

Fly Quiet Report Presentation – HMMH

Not covered due to time constraints

New Business



None

Public Comment

None

Adjournment

Mr. Carlon expressed that the meeting had passed the initial allotted time and asked if members would entertain a motion to adjourn. Mr. Dougherty made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded on Mr. Tramontozzi, and the motion to adjourn passed unanimously by roll call vote. The meeting was adjourned at 6:18pm.

Documents and Presentations:

Agenda

Draft Minutes from January 9th, 2020 MCAC General Meeting

Meeting Agenda Presentation

FAA Presentation