

**MASSDOT AERONAUTICS DIVISION  
MASSACHUSETTS STATEWIDE AIRPORT SYSTEM PLAN (MSASP)  
PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM (PMT) MEETING #3  
MEETING NOTES**

Thursday, February 11, 2010 (10 AM – 12 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 (by phone)	MassDOT Aeronautics, Manager of Aviation Planning
William Benjamin	Former MAC Commissioner
Paul Nelson	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning (OTP)
Flavio Leo	Massport
Russ Maguire (by phone)	Massachusetts Airport Management Association (MAMA)
Dean Saucier (by phone)	National Business Aviation Association (NBAA)
Craig Dotlo (by phone)	Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA)

**Absent PMT Members:**

Michelle Ricci	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Arthur Robert	Massachusetts Office of Business Development (MOBD)
Dan Wolf	Cape Air / Regional Airline Association
Harold Bevis	Delta Airlines / Air Transport Association (ATA)

**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
James Miklas	Wilbur Smith Associates
Marc Champigny	Louis Berger Group
Nick Stefaniak	Louis Berger Group
Joe Brevard	Planners Collaborative

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

## 2. MEETING PURPOSE

The main purposes of this meeting were to:

- Report to PMT on the progress of the overall study, with particular focus on those activities conducted since PMT Meeting # 2
- Provide a status update on the Inventory effort, including presenting preliminary findings of the airport, pilot, and business surveys
- Present the final Airport Role stratification factors, naming convention, and definitions
- Present for discussion a proposed structure for defining Facility and Service Objectives in conjunction with airport roles
- Introduce the Aviation Demand Forecasting task
- Present the schedule for next phases of the study, including completion of surveys, response to comments on the findings presented at this meeting, initiation of system adequacy analysis, and system adequacy analysis

## 3. MEETING HANDOUTS

The following handouts were provided to the attendees:

- Meeting Agenda
- PowerPoint presentation of meeting material
- Tables: Airport Role Stratification
- Table: Proposed Facility and Service Objectives

## 4. MEETING AGENDA TOPICS / POINTS OF DISCUSSION

### A. Meeting Opening

Chris Willenborg opened the meeting discussion with a statement of appreciation for all who helped to create good response rates for the inventory, pilot and business surveys.

Bob Mallard (Project Manager) reminded the group that:

- (1) The purpose of the Plan was to help the State provide a safe and efficient airport system that accommodates and supports demand, supports economic and transportation needs, and maximizes funding resources; and
- (2) For the PMT to serve as advisors to ensure that the MSASP is responsive to the key issues facing the airport system.

Bob briefly reviewed the study progress, referring to a PowerPoint slide prepared for that purpose. He informed the group that *Tasks 1 & 2, Goals and Issues* are complete and that

*Tasks 3 and 4 Inventory and Role Analysis*, respectively, are nearly complete. He reported also that *Task 5 Aviation Demand Forecasts* is underway. Additionally, Bob said that the project's "special studies" regarding Pavement Assessment and Employment are underway.

## **B. Inventory / Data Collection**

Marc Champigny reported that all airport visits were complete and that a few follow-ups with airports for additional data remained to be done (approximately six were still required). Inventory database construction is nearly complete.

Marc reported that the online Pilot Survey had produced 1,589 respondents through January 2010 and that the survey will continue through February 27, 2010. He noted that the pilot survey has a response rate of 65% when compared to the total of 2,445 aircraft registered within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Marc also stated that through the pilot survey, over 700 individual comments were received. Generally, Marc provided a high-level briefing of the preliminary findings of the pilot survey, including discussions of the following (please refer to presentation for specific details):

- General Comments
- Aircraft Statistics – General
- Aircraft Statistics – Required Aviation Services
- Aircraft Statistics – Recommended Improvements

Marc then reported on the status of the Business Survey in which 2,101 surveys were mailed out on January 6, 2010 to businesses within the Commonwealth. He noted that the mailing list was generated through a 3<sup>rd</sup> party vendor and represented business having characteristics (i.e. size, sales volume, business type, etc) that typically utilize aviation resources. Marc also stated that a copy of the business survey has been made available for download and mailing through the project website. As of January 31, 2010, the total number of responses was 126, and the final closing date of that survey has yet to be determined. Marc concluded by providing some preliminary findings from those survey respondents.

Flavio Leo asked a question concerning how the analysis of the data compensated for possibility of skewing within the survey response sample. Specifically, he was concerned by the distribution of the responses (for both pilots and businesses) within the state and the potential for their concentration in particular areas/regions. Pam Keidel-Adams responded that the response samples for the both surveys will likely be skewed toward larger metropolitan areas (where businesses tend to locate) and toward airports with a more motivated/active pilot population. She also noted that business surveys can be impacted by the fact that many businesses simply do not respond and/or wish to remain anonymous. She said that this could affect the size and representativeness of the samples and that the team is making an effort through outreach to increase the response rate,

especially through airport managers. Bob Mallard noted that the current response rate of 14% seemed low. Dean Saucier indicated that the national average was about 26%. Pam said that the IFR database, among other things, could be used to help improve the quality of survey sampling. Further discussions included the possibility of creative uses of a variety of databases that could potentially help to capture desirable information on business users, including the Commonwealth's aircraft registration database.

### C. Airport Roles

Pam Keidel-Adams reviewed the status of the Airport Roles, which had been updated and finalized since PMT Meeting #2. Based on comments received from the PMT (both at that meeting and subsequent to that meeting) and through discussions with MassDOT Aeronautics, she presented the primary elements for airport role consideration within the state aviation system. Included in this was an in-depth discussion of the four role factors utilized for the plan as well as their practical implications for stratifying the current aviation system. This was summarized in the Airport Role Stratification handout.

Pam concluded that while additional role factors can be added to define existing airport roles (and in fact, the team had produced several scenarios utilizing multiple role factors), she noted that when complete the stratification of the existing system should have a reasonable consistency among the airports. In essence, the results should make "sense."

Additionally, Pam reviewed the Airport Role naming convention for the system plan that was determined to be the preferred option during and following PMT Meeting #2. These included the following four Airport Roles:

- Commercial Service / Scheduled Charter
- Corporate / Business
- Community / Business
- Essential / Business

Flavio sought clarification that these airport roles as defined reflected how the airports currently operate within the aviation system, and that the airports' current defined roles were not necessarily an indicator of their future role within the aviation system. He also stressed the need to capture the historical operational roles of the system airports in order to possibly glean indicators of their potential future roles.

Pam agreed with Flavio's assessment and further noted that the existing airport role stratification should be viewed as a "starting point" or baseline for that future role analysis.

Flavio asked how the study would handle the assignment of those airports whose parameters fall in between the formal categories. The point was made that airport classification would be reflective of demand for different types of facilities. Pam stated

that, realistically, the reclassification of those airports whose parameters place them on the boundaries of categories will have to reflect the likelihood of changes in real conditions, such as population density and other factors.

Relating to this, Bob said some flexibility is inherently built into the approach that is being used. Bill Benjamin stated he liked the stratification and said that it is important that this study not preclude alternatives that could be useful in future development of the airport system. Agreeing, Flavio said that we need to make sure that we don't "paint ourselves into a corner." Bob stated that every effort will be made to ensure that language utilized within the study anticipates possible requests to change a classification by stating the ability of the plan to address possible future requirements.

#### **D. Facility and Service Objectives**

Pam reviewed the material on Facility and Service Objectives that she presented at the second PMT meeting, emphasizing that different facilities and services would be needed to fulfill the specific role of each airport, and the objectives address minimum needs but should not be construed as requirements or rules. A handout summarized the draft objectives for each of the four airport roles in terms of airside facilities (e.g., runway length, lighting, and NAVAIDS), GA landside facilities (e.g., hangars, apron, terminal building, and parking), and services (e.g., FBO, fuel, ground transportation, and security).

Katie asked about whether the availability of jet fuel as a service objective is consistent with the role definition for Corporate/Business airports. The point was raised that the ability of airports to accommodate jets is a factor in airport classification as well as a service objective. A short discussion followed on the classification value of: (1) the ability of an airport to accommodate jets, and (2) the availability of jet fuel at a particular airport. The concern was expressed that jet fuel availability could skew the assignment of categories because the availability of jet fuel could be driven by transient airport users.

Regarding Facility and Service Objectives, Katie asked what assumptions for hangar use are reflected in the assignment of airports to these classifications. Regarding facility and service objectives, it was felt that these need to be set at a level that is realistic in terms of what is actually reasonable and possible. Katie said that a breakdown of pilot survey results by airport would be very useful. Bill said that it was important not to "pigeonhole" the assignment process. Regarding the pilot survey, Katie said that a breakdown of results by airport would be useful, and Bob agreed.

#### **E. Forecasting**

Marc Champigny presented the methodology to be used in the MSASP to make system forecasts of based aircraft, enplanements, and operations. Existing forecasts from recent airport master plans (less than five years old) will be assembled and combined with FAA TAF annual growth rates applied to airports without recent plans. These forecasts will be applied to baseline data from the MSASP inventory. Historical TAF annual growth rates

for based aircraft in the New England states since 1990 ranged from -1.1 percent in Massachusetts to +2.9% in Vermont. The forecasted average annual growth rate through 2030 is 1.02 percent for New England as a whole and +1.18 percent of Massachusetts. This would result in an increase from 2,513 based aircraft in Massachusetts in 2008 to 3,167 based aircraft in 2030.

## 5. CONCLUSION of MEETING

In the process of concluding the meeting, Bob asked whether the group should allow 1 week or 2 weeks for the PMT to get comments back to the project team; everyone agreed that 2 weeks would be appropriate for the PMT to offer comments on the proposed Facility and Service Objectives by Friday February 26, 2010.

Referring to the project schedule, Bob said that the latest version on the website was current as of February 8<sup>th</sup> and that any changes to that will be posted on the website in future updates. He said that both the pilot survey and the airport role analysis will be completed by 27 February, and that the planning process was right on schedule.

Bob said that the next PMT meeting would be held at the end of April or possibly early May.



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

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM (PMT) MEETING #3**  
**Thursday, February 11, 2010 – 10:00 a.m. (EST)**

**SIGN IN SHEET**  
(Please print clearly)

Name	Company / Organization	Phone Number	Email Address
Bob Mallard	Airport Solutions Group (ASG)	(781) 491-0083	<a href="mailto:rmallard@airportsolutionsgroup.com">rmallard@airportsolutionsgroup.com</a>
Pam Keidel-Adams	Wilbur Smith Associates	(480) 477-8651	<a href="mailto:pkeideladams@wilbursmith.com">pkeideladams@wilbursmith.com</a>
Katie Servis	MassDOT/Aeronautics	617 412 3690	<a href="mailto:Katie.servis@state.ma.us">Katie.servis@state.ma.us</a>
Chris Willenborg	Mass DOT / Aeronautics	617-412-3680	<a href="mailto:christopher.willenborg@state.ma.us">christopher.willenborg@state.ma.us</a>
Flavio Leo	MassDOT/Airport	617 568 3528	<a href="mailto:flco@massdot.com">flco@massdot.com</a>
Nick STEFANIAK	THE LOUIS BERGER Group Inc.	518 432 9545	<a href="mailto:NSTEFANIAK@LOUISBERGER.COM">NSTEFANIAK@LOUISBERGER.COM</a>
MARC CHAMPIGNY	THE LOUIS BERGER GROUP INC.	518-432-9545	<a href="mailto:mchampigny@louisberger.com">mchampigny@louisberger.com</a>
STEVEN RAWDING	MASS DOT/AERONAUTICS	617-412-3691	<a href="mailto:STEVEN.RAWDING@STATE.MA.US">STEVEN.RAWDING@STATE.MA.US</a>
WILLIAM BENJAMIN	FORMER MFC COMMISSIONER	617-543-4727	<a href="mailto:WLBEN@aol.com">WLBEN@aol.com</a>
Paul Nelson	MassDOT Planning	617-973-7479	<a href="mailto:paul.nelson@state.ma.us">paul.nelson@state.ma.us</a>
Joe Broward			

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

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM (PMT) MEETING #3**  
Thursday, February 11, 2010 – 10:00 a.m. (EST)

**SIGN IN SHEET**  
(Please print clearly)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company / Organization</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Denise Garcia – by phone	MassDOT-Aeronautics Division	617-412-3688	<a href="mailto:Denise.Garcia@state.ma.us">Denise.Garcia@state.ma.us</a>
Russ Maguire – by phone	Norwood Memorial Airport	781-255-5615	<a href="mailto:rmaguire@norwoodma.gov">rmaguire@norwoodma.gov</a>
Craig Dotlo – by phone	AOPA	914-631-4051	<a href="mailto:CLDOTLO@aol.com">CLDOTLO@aol.com</a>
Dean Saucier – by phone	NBAA	860-292-1994	<a href="mailto:dsaucier@nbaa.org">dsaucier@nbaa.org</a>