

**Boston Logan Runway 27 Advisory Committee Meeting
09/23/08**

Meeting Notes

MEETING DATE: September 23, 2008 (6 to 9PM)

LOCATION: Volpe Transportation Center, Room 120, Cambridge, MA

TO: Runway 27 Advisory Committee (RWY 27 AC)

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

Meeting Purpose: To review and discuss Runway 27 flight track operations and FAA's monitoring efforts as described in the 1996 Record of Decision.

Attendees: FAA – Jon Harris, Barbara Travers-Wright, Gary Hufnagle, John Silva, Jean LoGiudice, Terry English,; Massport – Frank Iacavino, MITRE –Elizabeth McQueen; CAC –Will Lyman (Jamaica Plain (JP)), Anastasia Lyman (JP/Historic Perspective); Interested Parties – Ann Hershfang (Alt to Anastasia), Kathy Hanson; (See also attached sign in sheet).

T.English opened the meeting and referred to the meeting agenda as a guide (see attached). Everyone present stated their name and affiliation.

T.English referred those present to the handout on the RWY 27 AC meeting rules and briefly reviewed them.

T.English stated that she had not received any comments on the November 14, 2007 draft meeting notes sent to the RWY 27 mailing list in May 08. She asked if anyone at the meeting had comments. There were none. She said that she would finalize the notes and have them posted to the RWY 27 website.

T.English provided those present with the most recent list of the RWY 27 AC members and interested parties. The shaded names on the list represented those individuals who did not respond as to whether or not they would like to remain on the list (see attached).

A. Lyman recommended that only CAC members who are impacted by RWY 27 departures be included as AC members. The others should be listed as “interested parties” except for CAC officers. Consensus was that this would be appropriate given the purpose of the committee. A. Lyman questioned why Bernice Mader was listed as an interested party and not as a member of the Committee due to her position as Chair of the CAC. T.English explained that Bernice specifically requested this.

The request to update the list was sent return-receipt. If the email had been opened and there was no response from that individual, T.English would remove that person from the list. T. English will contact by phone only the CAC members or political representatives if she did not hear from them in the next week or two. An updated list will be sent to all prior to the next meeting.

E. McQueen presented the MITRE flight track summary information from July 2006 to July 2007, with a focus on some of the more recent data for 2008 (see attached). The results are posted on the website as well.

Compliance was down from the previous year. MITRE looked at the various items (aircraft type, by carrier, etc) and could not find/ID “why” compliance percentages were slightly lower from previous quarters. The “bad performers” have for the most part stayed the same (e.g. MD80s series). There is “no strong story” to report regarding decreased compliance. There appears to be “early fan outs” (e.g. gates D and E) when compared to previous months. This wasn’t a large factor; however, in achieving the overall 68% compliance goal, but it is something the group should consider.

A. Lyman asked if Gate A’s earlier turns have increased as compared to past data. E. McQueen said that it is possible and explained the chart further.

W. Lyman asked why the spike in fanning in certain months. T. English said that she had already advised the TRACON of the early fan outs and asked if they would look into it.

A. Lyman asked when members of the public call noting “early fan outs” does Terry wait for data prior to calling the TRACON. T. English stated that the data/info for the facility is needed in order to give the facility opportunity to look at all factors; however, she has in the past communicated the public’s concerns to TRACON personnel about RWY 27 departures. A. Lyman requested that the data be reviewed sooner than just prior to the meetings to determine if there are any non-compliance trends that can be addressed internally closer to the time of the non-compliances.

E. McQueen noted that this is a new pattern that has been identified in the last set of data collected and analyzed. The TRACON is reviewing the data.

J. Silva asked if there was any correlation of compliance with number of operations per hour? Is it better or worse during high volume periods? E. McQueen stated that is not something that they looked into, but does not think so.

F. Iacovino commented that April is a very small set of data to work with. A. Lyman stated that that fact should make determining the reason for ‘early fan out’ non-compliance easier. She asked if the unexpected decrease use of RWY 27 due to the increased use of RWY 33 for departures would continue. G. Hufnagle stated that he believed that to be the case.

G. Hufnagle noted that this could be a pilot education issue, and he agreed to remind pilots of procedures for the RWY 27 RNAV departure SID. The next safety meeting is scheduled on 02 OCT. Gary will remind pilots at this meeting. Safety meetings are held quarterly and the next one after OCT will be in DEC. T.English will follow-up with G. Hufnagle after the quarterly meetings and pass info onto the rest of the RWY 27 AC. He also stated that it could be a controller education issue.

J.Harris noted that FAA is experiencing large controller turnover (retirements) and training for new controllers – now would be a good time to remind trainers about RWY 27 departure procedures/gates. G.Hufnagle said that he would advise the TRACON of the potential need for refresher training on noise abatement procedures for RWY 27, particularly because of the influx of new personnel.

A. Hershfang asked if there could be more frequent meetings and/or follow-up on briefings to pilots / controllers and see if those meetings are effective with regards to compliance. T.English stated that she will follow-up as much as possible

F. Iacovino discussed the Massport flight track data (see attached) and noted that the information is on the web site. He said that overall the details are very similar to MITRE's data. He also stated that most of the issues are at Gates A & B (west/above the corridor).

T.English introduced J.Harris as the new POC for the BOS RWY 27 RNAV initiatives. J.Bellabona is working on New York airspace redesign projects, but will be available as a backup for RWY 27. The action item from the last meeting was to further study moving the GARVE waypoint in the WYLYY RNAV procedure to achieve better compliance at Gate A, but that new information had revealed that a different procedure modification may work better.

J.Harris discussed the two options that FAA is considering. These included a (1) “VA (Vector Altitude) to CF (Course Fix)”, and a (2) “VI (Vector Intercept) to CF”.

A VA to a CF leg is a procedure that specifies a vector to a specific altitude and a VI to a CF leg is a vector to intercept a course (e.g. 235 degree heading). American Airlines (AA) agreed to conduct the simulations initially designed by FAA. The aircraft used in the simulations was the MD80 series, which has been identified as one of the worst performing aircraft for staying within the RWY 27 corridor.

The time line is as follows:

- FAA provided information to Honeywell mid-JUL
- At Honeywell - 35 days to code
- Honeywell provided data for FMS system 01 SEP
- AA conducted simulations
- Received results of the simulations on 16 SEP

The initial conclusion is that the results of the simulation are promising. Although AA had provided J. Harris with a graphic of the simulation results, this is not easily understood by the general public, and therefore, he did not provide a handout.

J. Harris said that RNAV is in a dynamic state and constantly moving forward. Part of the RNAV 18 Step process is meeting with “users” (airlines) and working as a team to create these procedures.

AA is very conservative and for liability reasons, they are not willing to conduct live (with people and cargo) tests of these procedures. The plan is to ask NW and/or Jet Blue to conduct live/real flight tests. The goal is to make the 09 AUG 2009 publishing date for these procedures. The new RWY 27 RNAV procedures will be published with the Phase 1 RNAV BONS alternatives. It will, therefore, no longer be named the WYLYY.

T.English summarized the action items from the meeting (see below). She also said that she was not going to set a “next meeting” date, until she had more information from J.Harris on the progress of the revised RWY 27 RNAV procedure. She will keep the RWY 27 AC advised on progress by email during the interim.

She also noted that MITRE has completed the task of evaluating flight track data for RWY 27 (as a follow-up to the FAA Airspace Lab analysis) and will no longer be providing track analysis support to the RWY 27 project. MITRE will be packaging their RWY 27 flight track analysis tool so that it may be used by anyone who has access to national radar offload data. T.English said that this information could be used in the future by either Massport or the FAA.

Massport will provide the RWY 27 flight track reports once their new system (AirScene) is up and running. E. McQueen and F. Iacovino noted that Massport’s new system will be just as accurate as the offload data that MITRE has been using for their analysis. The system is expected to be available to use for RWY 27 analysis by the end of this calendar year. Massport will not be providing the in depth analysis (e.g. compliance by aircraft type, airline) that MITRE and the ATA lab have provided in the recent past. T.English said that this would not be necessary on a regular basis. If there is a need for detailed analysis, she would again request FAA Airspace Lab involvement.

T.English also briefly mentioned that there are RWY 27 measures being proposed for the Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS). She acknowledged, that although it was not the purpose of the 27 AC to discuss these measures, the CAC members in the Runway 27 AC should clearly communicate to the CAC and/or BOS/TAC what is happening within the RWY 27AC and to express their desires. She noted that several of the 27 proposals contradict each other. She also noted that in making decisions on RWY 27 for the BLANS, the group should acknowledge the current status of the 27 departures and not the ROD goal, since there are no guarantees that this can be achieved.

T.English acknowledged that J. Silva will be retiring in January 09, and that this may be his last RWY 27 AC meeting. She thanked him for all of his hard work and the technical expertise that he has contributed to the project over the last 12 years.

Meeting Adjourned @ 8:00PM.

Action Items:

1. Finalize 11/14/07 meeting notes and post to website.
2. Finalize RWY 27 AC/Interested Parties member list by contacting any CAC members and/or political representatives by phone. Provide this list to the RWY 27 AC prior to the next meeting.
3. G. Hufnagle will use quarterly Safety Meetings to remind pilots of RWY 27 RNAV SID procedures. T.English will follow-up with Gary on this and provide email updates to the RWY 27 AC.
4. J. Harris will work to further refine the RNAV procedure for RWY 27 by working with American Airlines and coordinating flight tests with Northwest Airlines and/or JetBlue with an ultimate goal of publishing the new procedure in August 09. J. Harris will report progress to T.English who will update the RWY 27 AC.
5. E. McQueen will transfer the RWY 27 flight track monitoring tool to the FAA and Massport for future use.
6. F. Iacovino will provide an update on when AirScene is completed so that they can begin to produce RWY 27 flight track data. He expects this will occur by the end of this calendar year.
7. T.English will provide updates to the RWY 27 AC by email as they become available and coordinate a meeting date when it is warranted.

###