

**BEVERLY AIRPORT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
JANUARY 9, 2023**

LOCATION: 50 L.P. Henderson Rd., Beverly Airport East Side

PRESENT: Commissioners Paul Trefry, Aaron Henry, Peter Gentile, Josh Doxie and Jeffrey Schlichte

OTHERS PRESENT: Steven Rawding

ABSENT:

PUBLIC: Ace Chase, Rachel Abeau, Peter Eichleay and Gardner Trask

RECORDER: Christine Martin Barraford

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Trefry called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00PM, which is being audio and video recorded as a hybrid meeting. Present were: Mr. Trefry-Y, Mr. Henry-Y, Mr. Schlichte-Y, Mr. Doxie-Y and Mr. Gentile-Y.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Trefry led those in attendance in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Public Comment

Mr. Trefry invited public comment.

Ace Chase of Wenham St. appeared before the Commission. He stated that he has lived in proximity of the airport for over twenty years as an owner of a business. In order to alleviate noise complaints and promote better relations with neighbors, he suggested that the Commission consider advising future developers and realtors selling, leasing or renting properties that individuals are advised in writing that the property is within a two-mile radius of the airport. The signed agreement will protect consumers from entering into such activities that may cause them stress over noise. He also suggested that the documentation apply to town officials including building inspectors.

Rachel Abeau of Echo Ave. appeared before the Commission. She commended ATF staff and the flight school for their professionalism on a number of occasions.

Peter Eichleay, President of FlightLevelAviation, appeared before the Commission. He reported that there was a fuel increase for 2022 over 2021 of 62,000 gallons of fuel. However, December saw a noticeable decline across the industry due to the economic uncertainty of the stock market and inflation. He is hopeful, however, that aviation activity will increase in 2023.

3. Acceptance of Minutes – December 12, 2022

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Henry and seconded by Mr. Doxie, it was unanimously voted to approve the above minutes. Roll call vote: Mr. Trefry-Y, Mr. Henry-Y, Mr. Schlichte-Y, Mr., Doxie-Y and Mr. Gentile-Y. Motion passed 5-0, unanimous.

4. Reading of the Financial Report – Mr. Rawding

Mr. Rawding reported the following revenues for December, 2022 as compared with December, 2021: a) fuel flowage fee revenue at \$5,909.30 represented a decrease of \$2,464.60; b) traffic count at 6,114 represented an increase of 1,054; and c) landing fee revenue at \$10,941.04 represented a decrease of \$638.70.

Total traffic counts for 2021 was 82,126 as compared with operations for 2022 of 83,960, showing an overall increase of 1,834.

Discussion ensued on the air traffic numbers for takeoffs and landings that are designated as FBO and general aviation. Mr. Rawding reviewed the daily to yearly numbers, and it was suggested that these numbers be presented each month. The FBO market may be sensitive to economic factors, but the general aviation market may not.

Year to date revenue is \$284,299.62 and revenue at \$256,682.52. As the winter season sets in there will be an increase in the snow and ice line item.

5. Airport Solutions Group Presentation – Mr. Schuster

Mr. Schuster reported that comments were received from the FAA on October 19th, which AG and Aviation have addressed. The master plan and airport layout plan were uploaded to the FAA website on October 27th for internal departmental review. Discussion ensued on the delayed response, which is expected by the end of the month.

In response to Mr. Doxie's question on the incorporation of EV stations, Mr. Schuster responded that other airports are instituting them, but there are currently none at Beverly. Discussion ensued on the emerging industry and its advances in aviation technology and its support by FAA. Mr. Schuster noted that in the event of significant changes, the master plan will be so updated.

Based on the October 21st email from Colleen Mailloux, FAA Head Planner for Massachusetts Airports, describing revisions to the CIP, the data collection for permit support for reconstruction of RW 17-34 and Taxiway E has been moved to fiscal year 2024.

The original CIP had the environmental assessment (EA) and environmental notification form (ENF) and permitting as one project. Based on the Mailloux memo noted above, the FAA decided to split the EA/ENF project in 2023 and then permitting to 2024.

The last aeronautical study for runway 16-34 and 9-27 was completed in 2010. To support the reconstruction and extension of Runway 16-34 the FAA is requiring the airport to perform an aeronautical study for both runways as a 2023 project.

The runway 16 localizer needs to be studied for potential relocation due to the proposed Runway 34 300-foot extension. This would put an end of the runway too close to the localizer exposing the localizer to jet blast. The airport will front the cost of the project through an FAA reimbursable agreement through the FAA grant process.

The cold storage building is on hold per MassDOT pending it being shown on the airport layout plan and as discussed in the master plan document.

ASG provides airport management services of Mr. Rawding two days/week.

6. Airport Manager's Report

Mr. Rawding reported that the winter operations readiness. He reported that twenty-year old equipment will need an upgrade but this is part of the master plan.

The MassDOT Aeronautics has commenced its 2023 aircraft registration and will follow up with non-registrants to be in compliance. He has spoken with them with regard to the air space reviews of the new construction of Excelis in Cherry Hill. He is also following up on emergency fencing as needed.

6. Representative Input

Representative Sally Kerans appeared before the Commission. She expressed her dismay that the master plan has not yet been approved by the FAA. Mr. Trefry stated that a response is anticipated in the next ninety days at the latest.

She also noted that a resident that experienced a plane crash in her backyard in 2019 has not yet been compensated for the loss. Mr. Trefry responded that the Commission would take up the issue as a sidebar and facilitate at the state level.

Ms. Kerans asked that the Commission formally vote that the job description for the airport manager include a provision that enforcing the good neighbor policy is a condition of employment. Mr. Trefry responded that, while a topic of discussion with all applicants will be their ability to conduct outreach to the community in conjunction with establishing the good neighbor policy, there is no plan to vote to include this provision in the job description. Mr. Trefry will forward her comments onto the screening subcommittee, and the Commission will take into consideration her comments at a later time, but pursue the hiring process as it currently exists.

B. NEW BUSINESS

Noise Abatement and Good Neighbor Policy

Mr. Henry reported that he and Mr. Schlichte had individually made edits to the noise abatement and good neighbor policy. He had distributed the document to members for review and vote at a later time. He noted that the priority of the Commission to address the noise issue in better ways than in the past. In this way, the policy can be shared with the new manager and start from a position of common understanding and resolution.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Doxie suggested sharing the document with the flight schools as well as the public before a final vote is taken. He suggested a time period of three to six months. Mr. Trefry agreed to embrace as many stakeholders as possible including state representatives and ATC tower management to obtain relevant feedback. The document being updated is twelve years old and the community is entitled to the best policy.

Mr. Schlichte suggested that the noise subcommittee have ample time to review the policy with the Commission within the next two-week period in time for the next meeting. Follow-up can then be done with tenants and key planners and incorporate as many changes as possible and engage them in the process as much as possible before the final vote. This will ensure a ninety-day timeframe with still be through rather than the four-six month timeframe. Mr. Trefry suggested that the subcommittee agree on the changes and present to the rest of the Commission as its final recommendation based on their expertise.

Discussion ensued on the two policies running concurrently. Mr. Henry noted that the good neighbor policy is three pages long and the noise abatement policy is more substantial and robust. Mr. Schlichte noted that the noise abatement policy delineates certain specific procedures that he can take as a pilot to mitigate noise in the community and how safely to do so with a clear mission to be held

accountable. The good neighbor policy on the other hand is a holistic mission statement of the airport to promote the atmosphere of good neighbors. While there is value in maintaining a published good neighbor policy, it does not come with the concrete actions that the noise abatement policy dictates. Its purpose is to raise the level of compliance that historically has not been honored.

Once the noise abatement policy is drafted, Mr. Schlichte and Mr. Henry will discuss the one policy effective for home and visiting pilots. The one united agreement is critical to promulgating a clear precise message that is unequivocal in its expectations and compliance. One collective document will go a long way to not only guide the experienced pilot in clear aviation language, but educate the non-pilot on the engagement and enforcement of noise abatement procedures published in office airport and FAA documents. Flight schools could then tailor a good neighbor policy reflective of the noise abatement policy.

Public Input

Gardner Trask appeared before the Commission. Given the technical complexity of the noise abatement policy, he advised that the good neighbor policy be a separate document to be advise the layman the terms conveyed to pilots. Mr. Trefry stated presented the flight schools have separate good neighbor policies, and a merger of these documents would be helpful as well.

Commissioner Comment

Commissioner Gentile asked if there were applicants for positions on the Commission. Mr. Trefry stated that five resumes had been sent to city hall and there was one candidate with experience who was under active consideration.

Mr. Trefry commented that the airport has been in the Salem Evening News every three weeks over the past four months. He has offered to go before the city council to discuss different topics, including the disposition of building 45. The Commission had voted to return \$159,000 to the city as its contribution for the renovation thereof, which never occurred. He will discuss having that money returned to the Commission as well as the topics of open seats on the Commission and providing an update on how the airport is running in the absence of an airport manager. Both Mr. Gentile and Mr. Schlichte suggested that Commission members attend that meeting as well.

Mr. Doxie commented that the Commission discuss the role of the airport manager as it relates to the Commission. Discussion ensued. Mr. Henry noted that, while the Commission did not have the authority to hire/fire the position, it had a clear policy of establishing a good relationship with the airport manager. This was particularly important at this time with regard to “getting on the same page” about promulgating the Commission’s position on the good neighbor/noise abatement policy.

C. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Schlichte and seconded by Mr. Gentile, it was unanimously voted to adjourn. Mr. Trefry-Y, Mr. Gentile-Y, Mr. Schlichte-Y, Mr. Henry-Y and Mr. Doxie-Y. Motion passed 5-0, unanimous.

The meeting adjourned ta 7:44PM.