

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
NEW ENGLAND REGION**



**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
WRITTEN REEVALUATION AND
RECORD OF DECISION**

**AIRSIDE IMPROVEMENTS PLANNING PROJECT
CENTERFIELD TAXIWAY**

**LOGAN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS**

APRIL 20, 2007

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
WRITTEN REEVALUATION AND
RECORD OF DECISION**

Airside Improvements Planning Project
Centerfield Taxiway

Logan International Airport
Boston, Massachusetts

I. INTRODUCTION

This Written Reevaluation and Record of Decision documents the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) additional evaluation of environmental impacts and FAA's decision with regard to approval and potential federal funding of the proposed Centerfield Taxiway at Boston-Logan International Airport. The proposed Centerfield Taxiway, located between Runways 4R-22L and 4L-22R and depicted in Figure 1, was previously environmentally assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Airside Improvements Planning Project. The EIS is comprised of a Draft EIS (February 1999), Supplemental Draft EIS (March 2001), and Final EIS (June 2002). The EIS assessed a number of airfield development projects proposed by Massport as the airport proprietor. In addition to the proposed Centerfield Taxiway, these projects included (1) construction and operation of unidirectional Runway 14-32, (2) reconfiguration of the southwest corner taxiway system, (3) extension of Taxiway Delta, and (4) realignment of Taxiway November.

As stated in the Draft EIS: "The Centerfield Taxiway is intended to cure existing deficiencies by: (1) reducing taxiway congestion, thereby enhancing the general safety of airside operations, and (2) facilitating more efficient movement of aircraft between terminal areas and runways during takeoff and landing procedures." (Draft EIS, page 3-29) Aircraft taxi noise levels were assessed at seven noise monitoring stations using five metrics. The Draft EIS concluded that "The noise from ground taxi operations is significantly less than the noise from in-flight operations, which includes the noise from both takeoff ground roll and application of thrust reverser on landing." (Draft EIS, page 6-48) Section 3.10.1.2 of the Final EIS (p. 3-150) concludes that the Preferred Alternative results in more noticeable reductions of ground noise levels relative to the other three alternatives evaluated.

The Supplemental Draft EIS states that by reducing aircraft delays, particularly north of Runway 15R/33L, "the Centerfield Taxiway would reduce both ground noise and air quality impacts associated with ground operations. The Centerfield Taxiway would also alleviate congestion in the vicinity of Terminals B and C, and it would enhance the general safety of airside operations." (Supplemental Draft EIS, page 3-28)

Figure 1



The Final EIS addressed public concerns as to whether the Centerfield Taxiway would increase the potential for runway incursions at Logan. A “runway incursion” is “any occurrence at an airport involving an aircraft, vehicle, person, or object on the ground that creates a collision hazard or results in loss of separation with an aircraft taking off, landing, or intending to land.” FAA’s Flight Standards Division and Office of Runway Safety conducted a more detailed review of safety issues. The Final EIS documents this review and the conclusion that no decrease in safety would occur and that the proposed Centerfield Taxiway would enhance safety (Final EIS, pages 3-135 through 3-147).

On August 2, 2002, FAA issued a Record of Decision (ROD)¹ on the projects assessed in the EIS. FAA’s decisions relate to approval of projects on the airport’s official Airport Layout Plan and approval necessary to proceed with the processing of an application for federal funding. In response to community concerns with ground noise, air quality, safety, and enhancement of airside infrastructure, expressed during the EIS public comment opportunities, FAA deferred a decision concerning the Centerfield Taxiway and committed to conduct “an additional evaluation of potential beneficial operational procedures that would preserve or improve the operational and environmental benefits of the Centerfield Taxiway shown in the Final EIS.”² This additional evaluation was completed with the publication of *Logan International Airport, Additional Taxiway Evaluation Report, Per FAA August 2, 2002 Record of Decision, May 2006*, and this Written Reevaluation.

II. BACKGROUND

FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Projects*, permits discretion to re-evaluate proposed actions prior to an FAA decision. FAA exercised this discretion in its 2002 ROD when it made a mitigation commitment (p. 24) deferring a decision to approve the Centerfield Taxiway subject to additional evaluation of taxiway operations north of Runway 15R-33L. The additional evaluation conforms to the requirements of Paragraph 103 of FAA Order 5050.4A³. The terms of FAA’s commitment (Mitigation Measure 3) are reprinted as Attachment 1 to this Written Reevaluation. This Written Reevaluation documents FAA’s fulfillment of this mitigation commitment.

Among other things, Mitigation Measure 3 specifies that FAA will take into account the concerns of residents of East Boston (Bayswater and Constitution Beach) and Winthrop (Court Road) with regard to the Centerfield Taxiway and use of Taxiway November (see Figure 1.) Mitigation Measure 3 also specifies the objective of the taxiway evaluation:

¹ *Record of Decision, Airside Improvements Planning Project, Logan International Airport, Boston, Massachusetts*, Federal Aviation Administration, New England Region, August 2, 2002.

² *Ibid.* p. 3.

³ Order 5050.4B became effective April 28, 2006 (during the production of the underlying taxiway report) and replaces its predecessor Order 5050.4A. Both Orders 5050.4A and 5050.4B contain Written Reevaluation paragraphs numbered 103 and 1400 respectively. Essentially, under either Order, the responsible FAA official must prepare a written reevaluation to determine if the EIS remains adequate and current and whether substantial change has occurred requiring a supplemental document.

“to assess potential beneficial operational procedures that would preserve or improve the operational and environmental benefits of the Centerfield Taxiway as shown in the EIS.” Finally, Mitigation Measure 3 specifies in considerable detail the scope of work of the taxiway evaluation, stating it would be conducted in two phases. The first phase would focus on addressing operations on Taxiway November and the second phase on the Centerfield Taxiway. Following this, FAA would determine “whether a decision [to approve] can be made based on the data analysis contained in the EIS and evaluation, or whether further documentation [Supplemental EIS] is necessary before such a decision can be made.” In accordance with paragraph 1402 of Order 5050.4B, a Supplemental EIS would be published if “Significant, new changes, circumstances or information relevant to the proposed action or its environmental impacts become available.”

III. REEVALUATION

This Written Reevaluation is based on information contained in *Logan International Airport, Additional Taxiway Evaluation Report, Per FAA August 2, 2002 Record of Decision, May 2006*. This report was prepared under contract to FAA with substantial input from FAA. FAA independently evaluated the report, accepts it as an FAA document, and incorporates it by reference herein.

Consistent with Mitigation Measure 3 of the 2002 ROD, the consultant-prepared report covered a Phase 1 evaluation of Taxiway November and Phase 2 evaluation of the Centerfield Taxiway. Community involvement was an important element. FAA and the consultant worked with six representatives of affected neighborhoods, three appointed by the City of Boston and three appointed by the Town of Winthrop.

For Phase 1, a participatory process developed nineteen candidate actions pertaining to ground operations in the northern end of the airfield under existing conditions (affecting primarily Taxiway November.) The study process thoroughly evaluated each of these and based upon this evaluation report concluded “there are no appropriate taxi/queue restrictions, or other alternatives, that would provide significant environmental and/or operational benefits beyond those shown in the Final EIS.”⁴

Phase 2 of the process modeled operational alternatives for the proposed Centerfield Taxiway and Taxiway November. Two alternatives, covering how the Centerfield Taxiway would operate north of Runway 15R-33L, addressed community concerns and bracketed the range of potential environmental effects. Noise and air quality analyses concluded “the environmental differences between the two alternatives are small enough such that there is not a significant environmental benefit to using one alternative over the other. No operational action could be identified that would yield environmental benefits.” Pages 36-39 of the report present a summary of the noise and air quality findings. The analyses are consistent with those performed for the EIS. A comparison of

⁴ *Logan International Airport, Additional Taxiway Evaluation Report, Per FAA August 2, 2002 Record of Decision, May 2006, p. 35.*

the noise and air quality findings of the EIS with those of the additional Taxiway Evaluation Report does not change any of the conclusions that were reached in the EIS.

Three meetings with community representatives were held during the study, with the report provided to them shortly after the last meeting on May 18, 2006. Briefings on findings were made at these meetings, with community representatives providing feedback.

FAA concludes that the data and analysis contained in the EIS with regard to the environmental impacts of the proposed Centerfield Taxiway are still adequate, accurate, current and valid, and that FAA has fulfilled its mitigation commitment, as detailed in the 2002 Record of Decision on the Airside Improvements Planning Project, “to assess potential beneficial operational procedures that would preserve or improve the operational and environmental benefits of the Centerfield Taxiway as shown in the EIS.” In addition, FAA finds that there are no substantial changes that have occurred since the 2002 ROD and, therefore, no supplemental documentation is necessary.

FAA will make this Written Reevaluation available to its mailing list and those who commented on the Draft Written Reevaluation. It will also be available electronically on FAA’s public Web site. (www.faa.gov/airports_airtraffic) Finally, FAA will also provide the Environmental Protection Agency with notice of availability for *Federal Register* publication.

IV. FACTORS CONSIDERED IN FAA’S DECISION REGARDING THE PROPOSED CENTERFIELD TAXIWAY

FAA’s Record of Decision (ROD) of August 2002 covered unidirectional Runway 14-32, reductions in landing minimums for certain runway ends, and certain taxiway improvements, but deferred a decision with regard to a new Centerfield Taxiway. This Record of Decision completes FAA’s decision making with regard to this last Airside Improvements Planning Project element. It documents aviation safety, aircraft delay, air traffic control efficiency, and environmental factors considered by FAA, based upon the analysis in the EIS as well as analysis in the additional taxiway report and responses to public comments set out in Attachment 2 to this document.

Aviation Safety. The Centerfield Taxiway would enhance airfield safety by reducing the number and frequency of crossings of Runway 4L-22R, avoid use of an active runway for taxiing aircraft when Taxiway November is unavailable due to construction, snow removal, or equipment problems, and increase the margin of safety by providing opportunities to move runway crossings away from areas where aircraft are operating at higher speeds. Details of these safety enhancements are contained in Table 3.9-1 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. They are important factors in reducing the potential for runway incursions. As an example, a runway incursion can occur when a taxiing aircraft moves onto or across an active runway when an arriving or departing aircraft is intending to use that runway. A 1993 study of Logan Airport, *Runway*

Incursion Mitigation Plan, found that airport configuration was either a primary or contributing factor in nearly all incursions. Reducing runway incursions is a high priority for FAA. In response to public comments on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Final Environmental Impact Report, a more recent 2002 review of the use of the Centerfield Taxiway was conducted by FAA's Flight Standards Division and Runway Safety Office, along with Massport personnel. This group confirmed that the taxiway improvements, including a new Centerfield Taxiway, would enhance the safety and efficiency of Logan.

Aircraft Delay and Air Traffic Control Efficiency. The Centerfield Taxiway would provide multiple paths for routing aircraft to and from the ends of Runways 4L-22R and 4R-22L, enhance the efficiency of runway configuration changes, provide routing for the next generation of heavy aircraft with wider wingspans, permit the implementation of national ground delay programs without delaying aircraft not involved in such programs, facilitate the return of departing aircraft to the terminal area when required by equipment malfunction or de-icing (without delaying other aircraft), and eliminate congestion in the terminal area due to gate push-backs and conflicting inbound and outbound traffic on Taxiway Kilo. Details of these improvements may also be found in Table 3.9-1 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Environmental Factors. The Final EIS identified aircraft ground noise and air quality as the only two areas of potential environmental impact from the Centerfield Taxiway. Aircraft ground noise analysis may be found in Section 5.2.7 of the Draft EIS. Table 3.10-2 of the Final EIS (p. 3-151) presents modeled ground noise impacts of four different aircraft fleets for those three noise monitoring stations closest to residences in East Boston and Winthrop. The projected noise levels from ground noise alone for the Preferred Alternative are lower than those for the No Action Alternative for all four fleets at each of the three stations. The reductions range from 0.2 dBA to 5.0 dBA, and average 2 dBA. Section 3.10.1.2 of the Final EIS (p. 3-150) concludes that the Preferred Alternative results in more noticeable reductions of ground noise levels relative to the other three alternatives evaluated. As with aircraft ground noise, air quality impacts were assessed based on three receptors in close proximity to residences in East Boston and Winthrop. Dispersion modeling results from Appendix M of the Draft EIS and Appendix F of the Supplemental DEIS indicate that there would be no significant differences in air pollution concentration from the Centerfield Taxiway. In all cases modeled air pollution concentrations were well within federal and state standards. The findings were validated in the Additional Taxiway Evaluation Report prepared for FAA's Written Reevaluation. Noise and air quality analyses concluded "the environmental differences between the two alternatives are small enough such that there is not a significant environmental benefit to using one alternative over the other. No operational action could be identified that would yield environmental benefits." Pages 36-39 of the Taxiway Evaluation Report present a summary of the noise and air quality findings.

V. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The Centerfield Taxiway was the subject of extensive community involvement as part of FAA's Environmental Impact Statement conducted between 1995 and 2002. Over 50 public involvement meetings were held throughout Boston and neighboring municipalities. Two large-scale public hearings were held at the conclusion of the EIS process.

A separate public involvement process was specified for the Centerfield Taxiway as part of FAA's 2002 Record of Decision, and FAA has complied with the details of this commitment, as specified in the 2002 Record of Decision. FAA issued a Draft Written Reevaluation on June 30, 2006. FAA opened a period during which it would receive public comments on the Written Reevaluation until August 21, 2006. After receiving requests to extend the comment period, FAA extended it to September 22, 2006. All of the written comments received on FAA's Draft Written Reevaluation have been considered in this Record of Decision, and Attachment 2, below, responds to those comments.

VI. DECISION AND ORDER

I have carefully considered the FAA's goals and objectives in relation to aviation safety and efficiency and various aeronautical aspects of the proposed Centerfield Taxiway discussed in the Draft, Supplemental, and Final EISs, including the purpose and need of the taxiway, potential alternatives, the environmental impacts of those alternatives, and potential beneficial operational procedures that would preserve or improve the operational and environmental benefits of the taxiway as shown in the EIS.

Under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the FAA, I find that the Centerfield Taxiway has been subjected to additional evaluation as required by Mitigation Measure 3, as specified in FAA's August 2, 2002, Record of Decision (ROD). I therefore direct actions specified in this ROD be taken. I am directing approval of the Logan International Airport Layout Plan, as modified to depict the Centerfield Taxiway specified in the Preferred Alternative of the Final EIS. I am determining that the Centerfield Taxiway is eligible for federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program and, potentially, the Passenger Facility Charge program without limitation. Under the authority delegated to me, I find that the federal actions stated herein are reasonably supported. I also certify, based upon the administrative record, that implementation of the Centerfield Taxiway is reasonably necessary for use in air

commerce, as required by 49 U.S.C. Section 44502(b). This decision and order constitutes the federal approval for the actions identified above and any subsequent actions approving a grant of federal funds to Massport.



LaVerne F. Reid
Manager, Airports Division

April 20, 2007

Date

Right of Appeal: This decision and order is issued and these actions are taken pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Sections 40101 *et seq.*, Parts A and B, and constitute final orders of the Administrator that are subject to review by the appropriate Court of Appeals of the United States in accordance with the provisions of 49 U.S.C. Section 46110.

ATTACHMENT 1

MITIGATION MEASURE 3 FROM AUGUST 2, 2002, RECORD OF DECISION, AIRSIDE IMPROVEMENTS PLANNING PROJECT

3. Deferral of Decision to Approve Centerfield Taxiway Subject to Additional Evaluation of Taxiway Operations North of Runway 15R-33L.

FAA is deferring any decision to approve the Centerfield Taxiway pending additional evaluation of taxiway operations north of Runway 15R/33L. Although the analysis in the EIS states that the Centerfield Taxiway has environmental benefits and does not adversely impact noise or reduce air quality in the areas adjacent to the northern portion of the airfield, residents of the East Boston (Bayswater and Constitution Beach) and Winthrop (Court Road) neighborhoods closest to the existing Taxiway November and proposed northern end of the Centerfield Taxiway have specifically expressed their concerns about the Centerfield Taxiway. Residents of these neighborhoods have also expressed concerns regarding the use of Taxiway November and have questioned FAA's compliance with the existing "good neighbor" policy regarding queuing aircraft on Taxiway November¹⁰. Given these concerns, FAA will conduct an additional evaluation of taxiway operations in the northern portion of the airfield to assess potential beneficial operational procedures that would preserve or improve the operational and environmental benefits of the Centerfield Taxiway as shown in the EIS. FAA will not make any decision concerning the Centerfield Taxiway until after the evaluation and appropriate environmental review have been completed, as detailed below. It is intended that any procedures or operating restrictions would not limit use of the Centerfield Taxiway in the event of emergencies, key equipment outages, or scheduled maintenance that requires the closure of taxiways at the north end of the airport

Section 3.9 of the Final EIS describes the operational and safety benefits of constructing the Centerfield Taxiway. Section 3.10 describes the environmental impacts of the Centerfield Taxiway and concludes that the deferral of a decision on the Centerfield Taxiway would have no measurable impact on the environmental assessment of the remaining improvements of the Preferred Alternative.

The taxiway evaluation would be conducted in two phases. Phase 1 would address operations on Taxiway November and Phase 2 would address taxi operations on the Centerfield Taxiway. Phase 1 would begin by developing a clear understanding of the concerns that the neighborhoods surrounding the approach ends of Runways 22L and 22R have regarding operations on the existing taxiway system north of Runway 15R/L. Specifically, this first part of Phase 1 would have the following tasks:

¹⁰ FAA Order BOS TWR 7040.1, "Noise Abatement" states that whenever possible "No more than five turbojets, including one in position, shall be cleared beyond Runway 15L. Only one turbojet is allowed to be held on November Taxiway between Runways 22R and 22L." The limit applies to aircraft north of Runway 15L/33R, the 2,600-foot runway. Under this policy, there is no limit on the number of aircraft between Runway 15R-33L and Runway 15L-33R.

- Identify and review federal and state policies, regulations, and directives related to community concerns with taxi operations north of Runway 15R/33L. These include, at least, noise, air quality, and visual impacts.
- Meet with representatives from neighborhoods surrounding the north end of the airport to better ascertain their concerns, solicit potential actions to address their concerns, and discuss operational difficulties in meeting current policy.
- Review neighborhood concerns in the context of relevant federal and state policies, regulations, and directives in order to determine which relate to neighborhood concerns.
- Assemble and review recent field monitoring results (e.g., noise and air quality impacts) and analyses of taxi operations, their impacts, or potential mitigation measures north of Runway 15R/33L.
- Conduct further field studies, if warranted, to document existing impacts associated with taxi operations (e.g., noise monitoring, air quality).
- Review the results of field studies to determine whether existing conditions approach or violate applicable regulations and what actions are warranted to mitigate the impacts of taxi operations.
- Identify other candidate actions (beyond those suggested by the communities) that can mitigate impacts most appropriately. These actions will focus primarily on operational measures within the control of the FAA (e.g., taxi procedures) but may also include other actions that could address neighborhood concerns (e.g., physical changes to the airport, airline schedule, or gate management actions).
- Review candidate actions and assess them at a high level to determine their effectiveness in addressing neighborhood concerns and impacts to safety, efficiency, capacity, cost, or other consequences.
- Develop a detailed plan, if warranted, to implement promising actions. The evaluation could be terminated if current conditions related to neighborhood concerns do not exceed federal or state standards or if candidate actions are not expected to be effective, safe, or within reasonable cost.

Any decision with regard to approval of the Centerfield Taxiway, including appropriate beneficial operating procedures, will be made following completion of a Phase 2 Scope of Work and evaluation. A written re-evaluation will be conducted by FAA as to whether the decision can be made based upon the data and analysis contained in the EIS and evaluation, or whether further environmental documentation is necessary before such a decision could be made. Any such written re-evaluation will conform to the requirements of paragraph 103 of FAA Order 5050.4A.

ATTACHMENT 2

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON DRAFT WRITTEN REEVALUATION

1. Introduction

Over 300 comment letters were received regarding the Draft Written Reevaluation and Additional Taxiway Evaluation Report on the proposed Centerfield Taxiway. Each comment letter has been reviewed and evaluated by FAA. This attachment includes the letters and responses to various comments raised in each of the individual letters. The responses to each letter are arranged by general topic category. The substantive comment topics included the following general categories (in alphabetical order): air quality, air traffic, alternatives, capacity, community involvement, extension of comment period, general opposition, health, Massport mitigation commitments, natural resources, noise, operations, participation of the Advisory Committee, pollution, process, property values, public participation, regionalization, review process, runway incursions, runway vs. taxiway, safety, support, vibrations, water quality, and wildlife.

Each comment letter was given a number. The numbering was based on the date of the letter in two groups. The first group includes letters from agencies, officials and organizations; the second group includes letters from individuals. The letters themselves are included in Section 3, below. In response to several requests, FAA extended the deadline for public comments from August 21, 2006 to September 22, 2006.

Section 2 includes a table listing the comment letters showing their assigned number, the date, the name of the author(s), the author's affiliation or city/town of residence, and the comment topics in the letter.

Section 3 includes the comment letters themselves.

Section 4 includes the responses to the comments. These responses were prepared by the study team that prepared the Additional Taxiway Evaluation Report (May 2006). Additional input was sought and received from Massport for those comments that raised issues or questions about Massport obligations or activities or that otherwise required or benefited from the airport proprietor's perspective. All comments and the responses were reviewed by FAA in connection with its deliberations on this Record of Decision.

2. Table of Letter Numbers, Authors and Topics

This section includes a complete table listing all of the letters received, the number assigned to each letter, the name, affiliation (if any) and locality of each author, and the topics mentioned in the comment letter. Each of the topics listed received a response, which is given below the letters, in Section 4.

Table of Letter Numbers, Authors and Topics

Letter No.	Letter Date	Author Name, Affiliation and City/Town	Topic
Letters from Agencies, Officials and Organizations			
1	7/Aug/06	Jerome Falbo Town of Winthrop-Noise, Air Pollution & Airport Hazards Committee	Community Involvement Air Quality Massport Mitigation Commitments
2	10/Aug/06	Michael Morrissey Senator, Norfolk & Plymouth Districts Boston, MA	Air Traffic
3	10/Aug/06	Robert Travaglini, Senate President Anthony Petrucelli, State Rep. Boston, MA	Noise, Air Quality Capacity Community Involvement
4	11/Aug/06	Thomas Menino Mayor of Boston Boston, MA	Alternatives Noise Air Quality Safety
5	5/Sep/06	Karen Maddalena, Co-Chair, on behalf of Jeffries Point Neighborhood Association (JPNA) East Boston, MA	Noise Air Quality Safety
6	15/Sep/06	John Bertucci, James Regan and Christopher Anderson on behalf of the Officers of the Massachusetts High Technology Council (MHTC) Waltham, MA	Support
7	19/Sep/06	Harvey Maibor Town of Winthrop, Citizen Rep, Centerfield Taxiway Committee Winthrop, MA	Participation of the Advisory Committee and Community Involvement Air Quality Health, Noise
8	20/Sep/06	Suzanne Condon, Associate Commissioner, Center for Environmental Health Boston, MA	Air quality/ Health
9	21/Sep/06	Robert DeLeo State Representative Boston, MA	Alternatives Noise Air Quality/Health Operations

Letter No.	Letter Date	Author Name, Affiliation and City/Town	Topic
10	21/Sep/06	Thomas Reilly Council President, Town of Winthrop Town Council Winthrop, MA	Environmental Noise Air Quality Public participation
11	22/Sep/06	Congressman Michael Capuano U.S. Representative Cambridge, MA	Safety Health/Air Quality Capacity
12	22/Sep/06	Bryan Glascock City of Boston Environment Dept. Boston, MA	Noise Air Quality /Health/Pollution
13	22/Sep/06	Salvatore LaMattina, Boston City Council-District 1 Boston, MA	Noise Air Quality/Health
14	22/Sep/06	Congressman Edward J. Markey U.S. Representative Washington, DC	Community Involvement Regionalization Air quality Noise
15	22/Sep/06	Thomas Menino Mayor of Boston Boston, MA	Community Involvement Health
16	22/Sep/06	John Shea City of Boston,C32 Environmental Hazards Program Boston, MA	Air quality/Health Noise
17	22/Sep/06	Thomas Tinlin Boston Transportation Dept. Boston, MA	Safety Health Noise
Letters from Individuals			
18	11/Jul/06	Stephanie Pyne Winthrop, MA	Air Quality/Health Noise
19	14/Jul/06	Laura Hansen Revere, MA	Air Quality Noise Additional Air Traffic
20	16/Jul/06	Joseph Felzani Revere, MA	Runway vs. Taxiway
21	23/Jul/06	Ellen Baird Winthrop, MA	Air Quality Health, Noise Regionalization

Attachment 2: Responses to Comments on Draft Written Reevaluation, Centerfield Taxiway

Letter No.	Letter Date	Author Name, Affiliation and City/Town	Topic
22	24/Jul/06	George Barisano Winthrop, MA	Noise Air quality Safety Wildlife
23	25/Jul/06	Joanne O'Hara East Boston, MA	Air Quality Vibrations Noise
24	27/Jul/06	Donna Segreti Reilly Winthrop, MA	Health Air quality
25	27/Jul/06	John Vitagliano Winthrop, MA	Community Involvement Air quality Noise
26	28/Jul/06	Joseph Pike Winthrop, MA	Noise Air Quality Water quality Safety
27	28/Jul/06	Mary Berninger East Boston, MA	Air quality Safety Community Involvement Health Property Values
28	29/Jul/06	Ron Hardaway East Boston, MA	Safety Health Participation of the Advisory Committee Noise
29	31/Jul/06	George Hrono East Boston, MA	Air Quality Noise
30	8/Aug/06	Joseph Nucci Jamaica Plain, MA	Air Traffic Air quality Health Noise
31	14/Aug/06	Brenda Curry Winthrop, MA	Air Quality Health

Letter No.	Letter Date	Author Name, Affiliation and City/Town	Topic
32	14/Aug/06	<p>Form letters. Deadline for comments 8/21/06 Dawn Letterie, Winthrop; Sandra Lafrazia, Winthrop; Dawn Hurley, Winthrop; Alexandra Leonard, Winthrop; Krist Reynolds, Winthrop; Andrea Meala, Winthrop; Mary Forristall, Winthrop; Christopher Hurley, Winthrop; Judy Nee, Winthrop; Susan Ferrino, Winthrop; Judith Pantalieri, Winthrop; Marie Ferrino, Winthrop; John Snyder Sr., Winthrop; Isabel O'Hara, Winthrop; Isabel Silva, Winthrop; Robert Milne, Winthrop; James Williams, Winthrop; Eleanor Hargreaves, Winthrop; Mike Falvey, Winthrop; Kathleen Guillory, Winthrop; Grace Costa, Winthrop; Edwin Hargreaves, Winthrop; David Bolster, Winthrop; John Nee Jr., Winthrop; Gloria Capone, Winthrop; Rita Quirk, Winthrop; Charles Capone, Winthrop; Janet Ciulewicz, Winthrop; Charlotte Fobert, Winthrop; Matthew Gunn, Winthrop; Joseph Ferrino, Winthrop; Patrick Feeley, Winthrop; Paul Leonard, Winthrop; Rochelle Grigo, Winthrop; Lorraine Consalvi, Winthrop; Donna Leonard, Winthrop; Jim Letterie, Winthrop; Giovanna D'Aiello, Winthrop; Phillip Todisco, Winthrop; Maura Shutt, Winthrop; Dorothy Penta, East Boston; Nancy Williams, Winthrop; Paula Tierney, Winthrop; Joseph Ferrino, Winthrop; Marie Doucette, Winthrop; Jeanine Capone, Winthrop; Angie Tierney, Winthrop; Joseph Riccolerne, Winthrop; Joseph Ferrino Sr., Winthrop; Janelle Arigo, Winthrop; Tim Fife, Winthrop; Suzanne Hardy, Winthrop; Francine D'Andrea, Winthrop; Leo O'Hara, Winthrop; Richard Ferrino, Winthrop; Danta Genovesi, Winthrop; Joseph Riccobene, Winthrop;</p> <p>Letters received, but not able to read names 231 Court Road, Winthrop; 30 Temple Avenue, Winthrop; 30 Temple Avenue, Apt 2, Winthrop; 24 Temple Avenue, Winthrop; 175 Court Road, Winthrop; 135 Grovers Avenue, Winthrop; 104 Johnson Avenue, Winthrop; 19 Marshall Street, Winthrop; 231 Court Road, Winthrop</p>	<p>Noise Air Quality Extension of Comment Period</p>

Attachment 2: Responses to Comments on Draft Written Reevaluation, Centerfield Taxiway

Letter No.	Letter Date	Author Name, Affiliation and City/Town	Topic
33	16/Aug/06	Roberta Horn East Boston, MA	Safety Air Quality Runway Incursions
34	17/Aug/06	John Cramer Winthrop, MA	Appreciation for Extension of Comment Period
35	22/Aug/06	Robert Strelitz East Boston, MA	Alternatives
36	25/Aug/06	John & Judith Silek Winthrop, MA	Noise Air quality Health Extension of Comment Period

Letter No.	Letter Date	Author Name, Affiliation and City/Town	Topic
37	25/Aug/06	<p>Form letters. Deadline for comments 9/22/06 Kathleen Gill, Winthrop; Jane Howell, Winthrop; Clara Driscoll, Winthrop; Claire Sweeney, Winthrop; Jerome Falbo, Winthrop; Jane Kelleher, Winthrop; Carl & Juliet Bettano, Winthrop; Mr. & Mrs. Ralph Bosco, Winthrop; Ann Falbo, Winthrop; Dawn Carroll, Winthrop; Bruce Bartlett, Winthrop; Arthur Marcello, Winthrop; Linda Calla, Winthrop; Angela Boncore, Winthrop; Ernest Duval, Winthrop; Anna Brogna, Orient Heights; Luke Bettano, Winthrop; Robin Montesano, Winthrop; Rosalind Faretra Jr., Winthrop; Michele Shaver, Winthrop; Laurie Sigmund, Winthrop; Damila Foley, Winthrop; Gail Miller, East Boston; Jay Silva, Winthrop; Suzanne Sanford, Winthrop; Elizabeth Polino, Winthrop; Phyllis Chicarello, Winthrop; Marie Conti, Winthrop; Robert Harvey, Winthrop; Stephanie Locke, Winthrop; James Burke, Winthrop; Beatrice Stern, Winthrop; Candis Gillette, Winthrop; James Polino, Winthrop; Paula Blake, Winthrop; Harold Eccles, Winthrop; Judith Eccles, Winthrop; Ann Gorman, Winthrop; Jean Famiglietti, Winthrop; Ellen Lyons, Winthrop; Karen Berg, Winthrop; Susan Eccles, Winthrop; Jeannette Fallon, Winthrop; Arthur Cummings, Winthrop; Dave & Angela Hickey, Winthrop; Corina Boncore, Winthrop; Goldie Boncore, Winthrop; Christine Boncore, Winthrop; Mary Carver, Winthrop; Eugene Carver, Winthrop; Elanie Dillon, Winthrop; Judith Anderson, Winthrop; Sylvia Gray, Winthrop; June Briggs, Winthrop; Joseph Faretra, Winthrop; Thomas Faretra, Winthrop; Joseph Faretra Jr., Winthrop; Tricia Sullivan, Winthrop; Mr. & Mrs. Richard D'Avolio, Winthrop; Cheryl Tobey, Winthrop; Ruth Housman, Winthrop; Ann Carver, Winthrop; Anne Cargill, Winthrop; Marian Regan, East Boston; Karen MacDonald, Winthrop; Charles Briggs Jr., Winthrop; Marilyn Carter, Winthrop; Judith & John Silck, Winthrop; Mark Hughes, Winthrop; Rosemarie Russo, Winthrop; Audrey Megquier, Winthrop; Melanie</p>	<p>Noise Air Quality Extension of Comment Period</p>

Letter No.	Letter Date	Author Name, Affiliation and City/Town	Topic
		<p>Diamond, Winthrop; Carol Harvey, Winthrop; Mark Bettano, Winthrop; Joan Bailey, Winthrop; Dagmar Hathaway, Winthrop; Evelyn Wither, Winthrop; Eleanora Olivolo, Winthrop; Diana Bacigalupo, Winthrop; Marcello Moretti, Winthrop; Charlotte Streeter, Winthrop; Sheri Keith, Winthrop; Anthonia Jean Baptiste, Winthrop; Luciano Piccirillo, Winthrop; Dimitra Gardikas, Winthrop; William Crotty, Winthrop; Paul Ford, Winthrop; Loren Copp, Winthrop; Edmund MacNeil, Winthrop; Susan Burrill, Winthrop; Gerard Nocton, Winthrop; Ralph Cali, Winthrop; Patricia Hames, Winthrop; John Luti, Winthrop;</p> <p>Margaret & Robert Connors, Winthrop; Mark & Patricia Sweeney, Winthrop; Diane Montgomery, Winthrop; Anjie Preston, Winthrop; Sheila Fallon, Winthrop;</p> <p>Louis & Leslee Kfoury, Winthrop; Robert Massa, Winthrop; Eugenia Cerulli, Winthrop; Jennifer Singarella, Winthrop; Joan Singarella, Winthrop; Mark Simonetti, Winthrop; Joseph Boncore, Winthrop; Scott McGovern, Winthrop; Roger Hathaway, Winthrop; Barbara Butters, Winthrop; Priscilla Palmieri, Winthrop; Betty Stone, Winthrop; Dana Defazi, Winthrop; Doreen Wayland, Winthrop; Edward Lalla, Winthrop; Felice Iantosca, Winthrop; Christina Visconti, Winthrop; Peter Martino, Winthrop;</p> <p>David & Claire Hubbard, Winthrop; Carolyn & Paul Marks, Winthrop; Harvey Maibor, Winthrop; Frank Daloia, Winthrop; Cindy Sun, Winthrop; Leonard Adler, Winthrop;</p> <p>Anne Broder, Winthrop; Russell Sanford, Winthrop; Sherry Wallerice, Winthrop; Renee Perullo, Winthrop; John Wood, Winthrop; Dolores Fabiano, Winthrop; Patricia Sullivan, Winthrop; Michele Schonbacks, Winthrop; Kim Kennedy, Winthrop; Gloria Duval, Winthrop; Stephen Stoddard, Winthrop; Pat Boyle, Winthrop; Angela DiFlumeri, Winthrop; Romeo Moreira, Winthrop; Judith Buono, Winthrop; Nancy Peterson, Winthrop; Norma Gobiell, Winthrop; Anne Marie Faria, Winthrop; John</p>	

Letter No.	Letter Date	Author Name, Affiliation and City/Town	Topic
		<p>Diamond, Winthrop; K. Aldweib, Winthrop; Patrick Sheehan, Winthrop; Nicholas DelVento, Winthrop; Beverly Brody Barisano, Winthrop; Dorothy D'Onofrio, Winthrop; Janice Salvesen, Winthrop; Kjerstin Salvesen, Winthrop; David Mazzuchelli, Winthrop; Mary Hourigan, Winthrop; Peter Burke Jr., Winthrop; Peter Kapura, Winthrop; Daniel Kearns, Winthrop; Sherrill Indovato, Winthrop; Dolores Russo, Winthrop; Laurie Ferhani, Winthrop; Robert Gordon, Winthrop; Betty Chaewsky, Winthrop; Sheila Cox, Winthrop; Bob Famiglietti, Winthrop; Patricia Jarvis, Winthrop; Ronalo Matarazzo, Winthrop; Deborah Winters, Winthrop; Margaret Riley, Winthrop; Michael LaRosee, Winthrop; Jancie LaRosee, Winthrop; Patricia McGee, Winthrop; Leila Dzedulionis, Winthrop; Paul Leonard, Winthrop; Rosalind Faretra, Winthrop; Diane Porreca, Winthrop; John Krivit, Winthrop; Laurie Donahue, Winthrop; Mary Deminico, Winthrop; Guy Brandenstein, Winthrop; Lisa Tardif, Winthrop; Nancy Rodes, Winthrop; Anne McGonagle, Winthrop; Richard Dimes, Winthrop; Patricia Powers, East Boston</p> <p>Letters received, but not able to read names 242 Grand View Avenue, Winthrop; 89 Fremont Street, Winthrop; 614 Shirley Street, #2, Winthrop; 70 Cottage Park Road, Winthrop; 369 Winthrop Street, Winthrop; 80 Ingleside Avenue, Winthrop; 171 Cottage Park Road, Winthrop; 33A Sunnyside Avenue, Winthrop; 3 Seal Harbor Road, Winthrop; 1100 Governors Park #30, Winthrop; 72 Main Street, Winthrop; 33 Court Road, Winthrop; 34 Baks Street, Winthrop; plus 3 letters without an address</p>	
38	2/Sep/06	Stephen Nichols Winthrop, MA	General Opposition
39	5/Sep/06	Patricia Bosco Winthrop, MA	Air Quality Health Property Values Noise

Letter No.	Letter Date	Author Name, Affiliation and City/Town	Topic
40	5/Sep/06	Ralph Bosco Winthrop, MA	Air Quality Health Property Values Noise
41	5/Sep/06	Cheryl DeMarco Winthrop, MA	Air Quality Health Property Values Noise
42	5/Sep/06	Romeo Rodrigues	General Opposition
43	6/Sep/06	Ivan & Nancy Blecher Revere, MA	Noise
44	6/Sep/06	Carol Burns Winthrop, MA	Noise Air Quality
45	19/Sep/06	Renato D'Amico East Boston, MA	Air quality/Health
46	20/Sep/06	Thomas McNiff Winthrop, MA	Air Quality Health Safety Property Values Community Involvement Noise
47	21/Sep/06	Richard Gill Winthrop, MA	Air Quality Safety Noise
48	21/Sep/06	Peter Koff, Atty for: Ronald Hardaway, Thomas Bruno, Gail Miller East Boston, MA	Review Process Air quality/Health Noise
49	22/Sep/06	Carole Bourne Revere, MA	Operations Noise
50	22/Sep/06	Anna Brogna Orient Heights, MA	Air Quality Health
51	22/Sep/06	Allyn Christopher East Boston, MA	Air Quality/Health Vibrations Alternatives Noise

Letter No.	Letter Date	Author Name, Affiliation and City/Town	Topic
52	22/Sep/06	Peter Koff, Atty for: Ronald Hardaway, Thomas Bruno Gail Miller East Boston, MA	Safety
53	22/Sep/06	Mary Mitchell Winthrop, MA	Air Quality Water Quality Natural Resources Health Noise
54	22/Sep/06	Jack Nee Lincoln, RI	General Opposition
55	22/Sep/06	Richard Salini East Boston, MA	Air Quality Safety
56	22/Sep/06	Cindy & Jay Silva Winthrop, MA	General Opposition Air Quality
57	22/Sep/06	Pat Sullivan Winthrop, MA	Air Quality Health Property Values Noise
58	22/Sep/06	Terry Vazquez Winthrop, MA	Air Quality Health Water Quality Property Values Noise
59	23/Sep/06	Annmarie Silva Winthrop, MA	General Opposition
60	Petition	23 East Boston; 4 Chelsea; 2 Winthrop; 2 Revere; 3 Jamaica Plain; 1 Everett; 1 Mattapan; 2 Gloucester; 1 Framingham; 1 Weston; 1 Unknown	General Opposition

3. Comment Letters

All comment letters received are included in this section. They are organized in order of the letter numbers assigned; the numbering method is described in Section 1, above. Please refer to the table of letter numbers, authors and topics above. Many of the letters received were form letters. Only one example of each such form letter is included in this section.