

**Boston Logan RY 27 Advisory Committee Meeting  
09/22/10**

**Meeting Notes**

TELECON/MEETING DATE: September 22, 2010 (11:00 AM)

TO: Runway 27 Advisory Committee (RY 27 AC)

FROM: Terry English, FAA Eastern Service Area, Operations Support Group

---

Telecon Purpose: To review and discuss Massport's most recent Runway (RY) 27 flight track data and FAA's planned modifications to the WYLYY 7 RNAV procedures.

Attendees: FAA – Jon Harris, Barbara Travers-Wright, Debbie James, Joe Davies, Alan Reed, Terry English,; Massport – Frank Iacovino,; CAC – John Stewart (South End) Judith Kennedy (Milton), Anastasia Lyman (Jamaica Plain/Historic Perspective); Federal State and Local Representatives – Cheri Rolfes (Senator Kerry's Office), Byron Rushing (State House), Maura Zlody (City of Boston, Environmental Department).

Summary: T.English opened the meeting by taking attendance. She reiterated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss Massport's most recent RY 27 flight track data (January thru August 2010) and FAA's planned modifications to the existing WYLYY 7 RNAV procedure. She stated that Massport's most recent flight track data and the existing WYLYY procedure have been posted to the RY 27 website for reference.

T.English recapped that the FAA has been monitoring and reporting on the RY 27 flight track data and procedure modifications since the RY 27 Record of Decision (ROD) was signed in 1996. The FAA goal has been to achieve 68% of flight tracks within the noise abatement corridor measured by Gates A-E. She noted that the last telecom held for RY 27 was on October 15, 2009. At that time, FAA (J.Harris) presented proposed changes to the then existing WYLYY 6. Proposed changes included eliminating the GARVE waypoint and replacing it with a vector altitude (VA) to course fix (CF) departure procedure. That procedure (WYLYY 7) was published and implemented on October 22, 2009. Since October, the FAA has been working with Massport to review flight track data as part of a post implementation analysis. T.English stated that she will send the October 15<sup>th</sup> notes with the draft September 22<sup>nd</sup> notes.

T.English asked all to look at Massport's flight track data for Gate A in the second table from November through August 2009. She noted that Gate A has been the focus of FAA analysis for the last several years due to aircraft overshooting the Gate to the west. Although the intent of the October procedure change was to better center the flight tracks to achieve 68% within Gate A, the change instead resulted in a shift of flight tracks from the west of the Gate A over the South End, to the east of the Gate A over South Boston.

She then referred to Jon Harris, the FAA RNAV developer to discuss how the FAA plans to address this.

J.Harris first provided additional background on the VA to CF leg that was published in October. He reminded all that at one time the FAA considered relocating the GARVE waypoint (WYLYY 6) to gain better adherence at Gate A. New FAA RNAV design criteria had, however, provided the FAA an option to consider a VA to CF or a Vector Intercept (VI) to CF leg procedure. The VA to CF is designed for an aircraft to depart runway heading and to turn to intercept the course (235 degree heading through corridor) after the aircraft reaches a certain altitude. The VI procedure is designed for an aircraft to depart runway heading and then turn to intercept the course (235 degree heading through corridor). J.Harris explained that flight simulations conducted by American Airlines last year concluded that a VA to CF leg will provide greater adherence to Gate A.

As noted in the table, however, the VA to CF leg resulted in more aircraft undershooting Gate A and flying more over South Boston than the South End. J.Harris explained that the undershoot problem was due in part to some pilots not reading the ATC departure clearance properly in their Flight Management System (FMS) boxes and therefore selected the Logan SID (non RNAV departure) instead. This created some of the undershoot problem. He credited Boston TRACON with recognizing this early on and conducting pilot outreach to correct it.

He explained, however, that the primary reason for the undershoot problem stemmed from aircraft reaching that certain altitude and beginning their turn to intercept the course prior to the 235 degree heading identifying the corridor centerline. Overshoots are being caused by those FMS boxes (GE and Raytheon for example) that interpret the VA as a “flyover” point to a course and NOT a “fly by” point to a course. This meant that although an aircraft reached a certain altitude, it would continue straight ahead until passing the 235 degree course, and then begin a turn to intercept the 235 degree heading through the corridor, hence, overshoot Gate A. In summary, following post implementation analysis, J.Harris determined that the VI to CF should be a better option as all FMS will interpret coding of the procedure from a similar performance perspective.

J.Harris said that the new WYLYY 8 procedure is scheduled for publication and implementation on March 10, 2011. He said that he was not able to get an earlier publication date due to a congested publication schedule, but if one opens up he will try to get it published earlier.

T.English opened up the telecom for questions starting with J.Stewart

J.Stewart thanked FAA for the presentation. Contrary to Massport’s flight track data, he stated that he has not seen an improvement over the South End. He maintains that the original course as identified in the ROD provided the best benefit before the FAA changed it in 1998. He requested that the FAA go back to that procedure. He also noted that the monthly flight track graphics do not appear to coincide with the tables. He used

August 2010 as an example. The table lists 24% of aircraft to the east of the gate, when the graphic appears to show less than 24%. He would like an explanation.

T.English responded that flight track data has shown continuous improvement with the RY 27 gates since 1996 and that the FAA would not be going back to any of the previous procedures, especially non-RNAV procedures, which would have been the case prior to 1998. F.Iacovino said that he has received more noise complaints from South Boston since the WYLYY 7 was implemented in October 2009. F.Iacovino also said that he will look into why the graphic does not appear to represent the percentages listed in the table. T.English pointed out that the percentages in the table should be referenced first as the accurate data as they are calculated directly from Massport's system and have been validated by various outside consultants. F.Iacovino agreed. T.English also noted that the RY 27 AC members list has just been updated to include David Nagle as the CAC representative for South Boston. She said she will update the email list to include him once she gets confirmation from Sandra Kunz that she has an accurate list of all CAC members.

A.Lyman apologized for just joining the telecom, but was detained in traffic. She noted that there are clearly more aircraft to the east and southeast of Gate A than previously and asked FAA what the plan was to address this. J.Harris summarized what he had discussed earlier in the telecom re the VA and VI procedures and the different ways that FMS interpret this information. A.Lyman questioned if American Airlines would be able to fly the VI, since their simulator concluded the VA would be better. J.Harris said yes their FMS equipment correctly interprets coding of both the VA and VI leg segments and they shouldn't have any problem in flying the WYLYY 8.

There were no other comments related to the RY 27 procedure, however, J.Kennedy asked a general question about runway use. She wanted to know why there has been a time usage change on RY 27 departures whereby it is heavily used between 5-8AM and then from 10PM-1:00AM.

J.Davies explained that the airport traffic control tower supervisor selects the runway configuration based on various factors such as wind, weather, airport construction activity, traffic demand, etc. He said that factors sometime favor departing on RY 27 and other times on RY 33. He said that the decision is dynamic in nature depending on the operational conditions at the time and is non-community specific.

T.English thanked all for participating and noted that she would follow-up with the group sometime after the procedure is published in March 2011.

Action Items:

T.English to send meeting notes for October 15, 2009 and September 22, 2010.

T.English to distribute updated RY 27 AC list after September 30<sup>th</sup> comment deadline.

F.Iacovino to follow-up with group and why flight track graphics don't appear to correspond to tables.

#####