

MASSDOT AERONAUTICS DIVISION**MASSACHUSETTS STATEWIDE AIRPORT SYSTEM PLAN (MSASP)****PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM (PMT) MEETING #2****MEETING NOTES**

Thursday, December 10, 2009 (1 PM– 3 PM)

MassDOT Aeronautics Division Offices

The Logan Office Center

One Harborside Drive, Suite 205N

East Boston, MA 02128-2909

1. MEETING ATTENDANCE**PMT Member Attendees:**

<i>Member Name</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Chris Willenborg	MassDOT Aeronautics, Administrator
Denise Garcia	MassDOT Aeronautics, Manager of Aviation Planning
William Benjamin	Former MAC Commissioner
Craig Dotlo (via phone)	Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA)
Flavio Leo	Massport
Russ Maguire	Massachusetts Airport Management Association (MAMA)
Paul Nelson	Massachusetts Executive Office of Transportation (EOT)
Michelle Ricci (via phone)	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Arthur Robert	Massachusetts Office of Business Development (MOBD)
Dean Saucier (via phone)	National Business Aviation Association (NBAA)

Absent PMT Member Attendees:

Harold Bevis	Delta Airlines / Air Transport Association (ATA)
Dan Wolf	Cape Air

Other Meeting Attendees:

Steven Rawding	MassDOT Aeronautics, Aviation Planner
Katie Servis	MassDOT Aeronautics, Environmental Analyst
Bob Mallard	Airport Solutions Group (ASG) - Study Project Manager
Pam Keidel-Adams	Wilbur Smith Associates – Project Team Member
James Miklas	Wilbur Smith Associates – Project Team Member
Marc Champigny	Louis Berger Group – Project Team Member
Nick Stefaniak	Louis Berger Group – Project Team Member
Jeremy Martelle	Louis Berger Group – Project Team Member
Joe Brevard	Planners Collaborative – Project Team Member

A copy of the sign-in sheet is attached to these meeting notes.

2. MEETING PURPOSE

The primary purposes of this meeting were to accomplish the following:

- Provide the PMT with a status report on the progress of study tasks since PMT Meeting 1
- Present the Study Team's proposed approach to accomplish the next phases of the study
- Present information with respect to the next phases of the study to the PMT for their review and consideration
- Solicit comments and other input from the PMT with respect to the next phases of the study

The progress reporting focused on the status of the Inventory/Data Collection phase of the study. Progress on this task focused on the following areas:

- The status of the Airport Inventory task
- The expected date for completion of the inventory and database element
- The status of the pilot and business surveys

The main point of focus that the Study Team presented for PMT reaction and comment was the Team's preliminary approach to determining the specific existing roles of airports within the statewide airport system. The areas of focus for the airport roles discussion were:

- The potential range of factors that can shape the airport roles for Massachusetts
- The Team's preliminary findings concerning the proposed airport role stratification
- The proposed naming convention for the airport role groupings

3. MEETING HANDOUTS

At the meeting, the following handouts were provided to the attendees (copies are attached to these meeting notes):

- Draft Memo on airport roles (7 pgs)
- Draft MSASP role analysis (3 pgs)
- MSASP PMT Mtg #2 PowerPoint Presentation

4. MEETING AGENDA TOPICS / POINTS OF DISCUSSION

A. Meeting Opening

Bob Mallard (Study Project Manager) called the meeting to order. He said that the PMT's input has been very helpful. Chris Willenborg made remarks about the agency's new

location at the Massport offices, and noted that he will be presenting a study status to the Massport board. He also noted that it is now a defined policy that all project deliverables and/or elements for public distribution must be reviewed and distributed directly by MassDOT. Chris then stated that the goal for PMT Meeting #2 was to provide the Project Team with input on the key issues that would be presented during the meeting.

B. Presentation

Slides #1 - #7: Bob Mallard started the PowerPoint presentation, briefly reviewing the study process, status, inventory and surveys. Marc Champigny (Project Team lead for Inventory effort) said that a good response had been received from pilots; they had received over 1,100 responses to date and estimated that approximately 150 pilot surveys had been received from Hanscom alone. Forms for the business survey would be mailed by 12/18/09. With respect to the airport inventory survey and site visits, Marc said the Team is pleased at the generally positive response to the 18-page survey instrument; 26 of 37 airport managers had responded already. Good prior public outreach has played a significant role for this high degree of participation. Bob Mallard noted that this was in large part due to the exceptional efforts of MassDOT Aeronautics, MAMA, NBAA and AOPA.

Slides #8 & #9 - Airport Roles: Pam Keidel-Adams (Project Team lead for Roles effort) described the purpose of airport roles and the role factor selection process/considerations. She also explained how data were used to establish a baseline for assessing performance levels of the airports, and that this process needed to be as quantifiable as possible for input into the role-setting process.

Slide # 10 - Airport Roles: Pam made the point that the definition of role factors needed to be flexible and capable of being properly measured - they need to “make sense” to people. She identified the three role factors that have been proposed for defining airport roles within the MSASP. Those proposed preliminary role factors are:

- number of based aircraft
- runway length
- runway surface type (e.g. paved versus turf)

Pam asked the PMT for feedback on whether those proposed factors were sufficient for the purposes of this study. She also suggested that, as evidenced by other system planning efforts throughout the country, there could be significantly more role factors in terms of number and variety. However, while any number of factors could be utilized, the key result of their use is to appropriately stratify the airport system and establish a baseline that can be used to address necessary facilities and services. In essence, with respect to the PMT’s knowledge, familiarity and understanding of the airport system, the chosen role factors must result in a stratification that “makes sense” in that like airports are grouped together.

Dean Saucier suggested the Project Team should consider the number of instrument approaches in bad weather. The availability of types of fuel (JetA or Avgas) was also suggested as an indicator. Russ Maquire suggested that the number of commercially permitted businesses based at the airport would help to define roles; others suggested that it wasn't necessary to limit consideration to commercially permitted businesses (aviation-related or otherwise).

There was discussion of whether it would be better to stay away from numbers in the classification of airports, as some airports may be unhappy with their classification. Craig Dotlo emphasized the economic impact/benefits that airports bring to the area/region and that it would be ideal for the study to capture that in some form.

Pam agreed that there may be a need for additional factors to appropriately define the roles.

Slides #11 & #12 - Airport Roles: Preliminary results of the proposed role factors (based aircraft, runway length and surface) were presented in a GIS format. These data will be used to set the baseline for current conditions, but could be updated as more airport inventory data is collected. These data will also be important in terms of economic impacts. Chris Willenborg stated that categorization of roles is important in determining how limited resources are used; suggesting a transparent process for resource allocation among airports.

Slide # 13 - Airport Roles: Preliminary findings for the airport role classifications based on the previously described role factors were presented, particularly whether there is commercial service (Category 1) and what their primary runway lengths are and the number of based aircraft they have (Categories 2, 3, and 4). Pam referred people to the accompanying lists of airports in each of these categories and asked whether the lists make sense in terms of people's familiarity with them. The study should look at whether in the future some airports should move to a different category. Chris commented that a significant amount of deliberation went into establishing these role classifications. Pam noted that role factors do vary state by state, and that the MassDOT/Project Team/PMT needs to ask itself if we need more or less of these distinctions (e.g., the commercial impacts associated with each airport.)

Pam noted that this phase of the effort entails constructing a baseline that will be used later in the process of defining facility and service objectives. She also asked whether some geographic factor should be included in the performance measures for airports. These baseline factors could be expanded as the study progresses into assessing the airports. Factors such as fuel and instrument approaches can be considered at that later stage of the study.

Marc Champigny asked how the number of based aircraft will figure in the airport classifications that are likely to be defined by the FAA after reauthorization; however this question is still not been resolved. Should number of single and multi-engine planes or

the number of turbine-powered aircraft be part of this? Bob Mallard noted that fuel availability comes into the picture as well (e.g. fuel for piston vs. turbine-powered aircraft). There are also anomalies such as Provincetown or New Bedford that have commercial service using exclusively small aircraft (C-402). There was a discussion of how the number of operations should be considered.

It was suggested that state and local officials should be consulted, since the role categories have implications of for economic development, and public officials are concerned with the allocation of municipal and state funds. Someone also questioned how business is being facilitated by the airports, and whether the business is on the airport or nearby. Flavio Leo commented that the focus on facilities is a type of “gap analysis” that gets at the business question by focusing on what facilities airports need to serve the economic development goal. Chris noted that the business survey will provide information to address this point. The point was expressly made that the MSASP was a planning document and would not specifically drive funding allocations to the airports within Massachusetts. Bob Mallard said that the information collected on the number of airport employees also addresses economic impact. Operating budget is another indicator; however, Russ Maguire noted that airports like Norwood have low staffing but are very busy in terms of operations. Pam responded that we will use employment levels to address the economic significance of airports. There was general discussion about the utility of various variables to represent airport economic impacts, e.g., the number of people residing within various levels of drive time from the airport.

Bob Mallard commented that by-and-large, the categories in slide #11 seem to be pretty good representations of reality. He also noted the presence of six private airports in Category 3. Russ agreed that the preliminary categorization seems to reflect reality pretty well. The question was asked regarding how roles relate to the physical characteristics of the airport. Pam responded that role categories at this point are intended as a baseline and that analysis of the airport system may indicate that some airports are suited to serving a higher role if their facilities were upgraded to serve that role. Analysis of performance measures will shed some light on this.

Slide # 14 Airport Role Naming Conventions: There was discussion about what would be appropriate role naming conventions for the MSASP, for example, the implication of the terms such as “primary” or “community service.” Pam explained the origin and thinking behind the nomenclature in the alternative examples shown on the slide. She noted that North Carolina uses colors instead of role names to avoid the challenges and implications associated with defining specific role names. Numbers can be used in the preliminary classification, but it is useful to end up with names that indicate what the roles are. Pam asked the PMT whether there were items in the table of naming conventions that should be transferred to another category.

It was noted that “regional” is used by FAA to cover a broader area than is meant in the slide. It was also noted that from a geographic coverage point of view, it might be good to include terms such as western or eastern to subdivide categories. Bob said that the term “primary” (e.g. GA Primary) may be misleading or confusing when compared to

“Commercial Service” which are defined as “primary” airports in terms of funding. It was noted that some airports are important just to serve the public who love aviation, but Chris said to stay away from terms like “recreational”; however, terms like “community” are descriptive and important and can be used to address the bottom two categories. Bob noted that the middle two categories have a “business” connotation, which he liked, and suggested perhaps there could be different qualifying nomenclature added to each label to distinguish the two categories. In Massachusetts there has been some resistance to being labeled; it is better to err on the side of terms that recognize the airport’s importance. Bob also stated that he thinks that it is good to use descriptive terms rather than numbers.

Art Robert said that we’re trying to summarize a “capability set” for each airport that needs to consider their location in the state and their roles in the future as well as in the present. Pam responded that these current and future references will be addressed in the plan. It was also suggested terms like “business/community” and “community/business” could be used to indicate a difference in emphasis without ignoring either part of their role.

Dean said that every public use airport in Massachusetts is a business airport regardless of the types of aircraft that are used; so we should be sensitive to the fact that some airport operators think of their role in terms of the type of user rather than by type of aircraft; he recommends descriptive terms rather than numbers. Russ suggested commercial, corporate/community, and community/business for the first three categories. Chris said that he spoke recently in western Massachusetts and that there was strong interest by airport managers being involved in the process, including these naming conventions that will apply to their airports. Paul Nelson compared the relatively neutral terminology used to classify roadways (e.g., arterial and collector).

Pam noted that these classifications are important to setting priorities, but acknowledged that there may be some strong sensitivity among some airports if they don’t feel they have the priority they deserve.

Slides #15 & #16 - Facility and Service Objective slides: Pam described the process involved in the selection of the preliminary performance objectives categories as presented in the slide. Similar to that of defining airport roles, it is important to utilize appropriate nomenclature for distinguishing among airports, and these objectives need to be understood as addressing the minimums not the maximums that are appropriate for the airport’s role.

Pam listed the facility and service objectives proposed for use in the MSASP, and asked the PMT for input including the appropriateness of the proposed categories of facility and service objectives (for example, whether the presence of a control tower should be used as a distinguishing factor). It was suggested that restaurant facilities might also be included. Bob Mallard mentioned that Mass. state regulations (702 CMR 1-7) identify specific airport requirements and questioned whether this should be considered. Chris stated that he’d rather not base these objectives entirely on the state regulations although they need to be considered.

Paul Nelson suggested that an appropriate facility and service objective is related to the location of an airport to the highway system. He also distributed a table showing the National Highway System airport highway connector levels required according to criteria for activity levels; these were the number of passengers/year for passenger activity and trucks per day for commercial airports. All of the commercial airports (except Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard) have NHS access.

Marc suggested that having a business and economic development plan should be an objective for the airports in particular categories. Pam responded that this could be included in the performance measures. Chris added that environmental compliance plans are also of this type of performance measure.

Pam concluded by saying that the assigned "homework" for the PMT was to revisit the various issues raised during the meeting and to submit comments and suggested changes back to the Study Team.

Slides #17 - #20 - Schedule and Next Steps: Bob Mallard reviewed the MSASP schedule, and suggested scheduling PMT Meeting # 3 for late January 2010 at the earliest, but more likely early February 2010.

The meeting concluded with the request that the Team submit additional responses to this meeting (including the "homework" mentioned by Pam Keidel-Adams) by December 24, 2009. This includes any additional thoughts on role factors, naming conventions, and facility/service objectives.

Copies of the meeting handouts are attached to these meeting notes.

MASSDOT AERONAUTICS DIVISION
AIP Project No. 3-25-0000-03-2009
MASSACHUSETTS STATEWIDE AIRPORT SYSTEM PLAN (MSASP)

PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM (PMT) MEETING #2
Thursday, December 10, 2009 – 1:00 p.m. (EST)

SIGN IN SHEET
(Please print clearly)

Name	Company / Organization	Phone Number	Email Address
Bob Mallard	Airport Solutions Group (ASG)	(781) 491-0083	rmallard@airportsolutionsgroup.com
WILLIAM BENJAMIN	SELF / PRT Commissioner	617 543 4127	WABEN@AOL.COM
STEVEN RAWDING	MASSDOT AERONAUTICS	617-412-3691	STEVEN.RAWDING@STATE.MA.US
MARC CHAMPIGNY	THE LOUIS BERGER GROUP	518-432-9545	mchampiony@louisberger.com
NICK STEFANIAK	THE LOUIS BERGER GROUP	518 432 9545	NSTEFANIAK@LOUISBERGER.COM
JEREMY MARTELLE	THE LOUIS BERGER GROUP	518 432 9545	JMARTELLE@LOUISBERGER.COM
JAMES MIKLAS	WILBOR SMITH	617-320-0701	JMIKLAS@WILBORSMITH.COM
Denise Garcia	MassDOT Aeronautics	617 412-3688	denise.garcia@state.ma.us
FLAVIO LEO	Massport	617-568-3528	fleo@massport.com
JOE BROVARD	Planners Collaborative	617 338-0018 x14	jb@thecollaborative.com
Russ Maguire	MAMA OWD Mgr.	781-255-5614	rmaguire@norwoodma.gov
Chris Willenborg	MassDOT Aeronautics	617-412-3650	christopher.willenborg@state.ma.us

MASSDOT AERONAUTICS DIVISION
AIP Project No. 3-25-0000-03-2009
MASSACHUSETTS STATEWIDE AIRPORT SYSTEM PLAN (MSASP)

PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM (PMT) MEETING #2
Thursday, December 10, 2009 – 1:00 p.m. (EST)

SIGN IN SHEET
(Please print clearly)

Name	Company / Organization	Phone Number	Email Address
Katie Servis	MassDOT - Aeronautics	617 412 3690	Katie.servis@state.ma.us
Pam Keidel-Adams	WSA	480-477-8651	PKEIDELADAMS@WILBURSMITH.COM
Arthur R. Robert	MOBID	617.788.3656	ARTHUR.ROBERT@state.ma.us
Paul Nelson	MassDOT Planning	617-973-7479	paul.nelson@state.ma.us
Michelle Ricci, by phone	FAA	781-238-7631	michelle.ricci@faa.gov
Dean Saucier, by phone	NBAA	860-292-1994	dsaucier@nbaa.org
Craig Dotlo, by phone	AOPA	914-631-4051	cldolto@aol.com