

**Boston Logan Runway 27 Advisory Committee Meeting
11/14/07
DRAFT**

Meeting Notes

MEETING DATE: November 14, 2007 (6 to 9PM)

LOCATION: Volpe Transportation Center, Cambridge, MA

TO: Runway 27 Advisory Committee (RWY 27 AC)

FROM: Terry English, FAA Eastern Service Area, System 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 - Steve Kelley, Terry English, Joe Bellabona, Barbara Travers-Wright, Jon Harris, Gary Hufnagle; Massport – Frank Iacavino, Flavio Leo; MITRE – John Brandt, Elizabeth McQueen; CAC – John Stewart (South End), Alan Wright (Roslindale), Mona Thaler (Brookline), Anastasia Lyman (JP/Historic Perspective); Interested Parties – Elizabeth Corcoran-Hunt (Rep Rushings Office), Kathy Hanson (Claremont Neighborhood Association) (See also attached sign in sheet).

S.Kelley opened the meeting. Meeting began with introductions. Steve introduced T.English as the new FAA point of contact for the RWY 27 flight track monitoring efforts.

S.Kelley reviewed the draft meeting minutes with the group for acceptance. There was one change noted to correct typo in 1st par 2nd line (tp to to) and to change the 9/27/07 meeting date to correctly reflect the 2006 calendar year. S.Kelley also requested attendees to update the list of RWY 27 members and interested parties (names and email addresses) that had been distributed to the group. Added to the list was Barbara Travers-Wright (BarbaraTravers-Wright@faa.gov) and additional email addresses for Mona Thaler's thaler@vinfen.org and mothaler@hotmail.com.

There was also discussion that the RWY 27 AC should consist of other CAC representatives affected by RWY 27 departures such as: Milton, South Boston, Dedham, West Roxbury Hyde Park, etc. It was agreed that Sandra Kunz should be contacted by email regarding who else should be invited from the CAC to participate in the 27 AC meetings.

A.Lyman agreed to continue to be the RWY 27 AC lead to coordinate with the CAC representatives to reschedule any RWY 27 meetings. She said that evening meetings would work best.

MITRE gave their powerpoint presentation that contained flight track information from January to June 2007. Refer to ppt presentation on FAA website dated September 2007.

J.Stewart made a comment that he has yet to hear from the FAA and Massport about the accuracy of the radar data. The FAA responded that the radar is verified on a daily basis. J.Brandt also pointed out that the MITRE flight tracks coincide with the runway ends that are surveyed.

J.Stewart commented on the slides in the ppt presentation by MITRE. He said that identifying whether or not an aircraft missed the gate by 100 feet or less is misleading and a “useless statement” as that level of accuracy is not there to be sure. It was clarified that this information was to best be used for pilot educational purposes. J. Stewart agreed that relativity was good, but that it didn’t need to be presented by 100 feet. It was agreed this type of presentation was not necessary, because the WYLYY procedure would not be adjusted based 100 feet misses anyway.

F.Iacovino reported that Massport was seeing the same trends as MITRE in terms of the number of aircraft and general compliance with the gates. Massport’s gate compliance numbers are slightly lower, however, as the set of radar data they use is slightly different (ASR9 only). MITRE uses official FAA radar which includes many input systems

There was discussion about why the group was still using two sets of data (MITRE and Massport). A.Lyman asked why we couldn’t just use MITRE’s data. S.Kelley clarified that MITRE was only providing additional flight track information for this project to ensure reliable data. It is expected that Massport’s new noise system will be more accurate for this type of analysis and can be used in lieu of the MITRE data in the future. The plan is to do another comparison between the MITRE and Massport data a in six months after Massport’s new system is online.

J.Bellabona reported that FAA conducted an operational test with Northwest Airlines in March 2007 on moving the GARVE waypoint further to the south. There weren’t enough tracks to evaluate during this test. As a result, it was decided to conduct an additional test in November 2007 (11/1 – 11/07) with Northwest Airlines and RWY 27 was never used.

J.Bellabona explained that in order to change the WYLYY procedure again, the FAA will need to have a lot of justification, which is why the tests had been planned, but to no avail. J.Bellabona also explained that changing the procedure could make things worse overall, even if a short operational test indicates an improvement. He also said that the FAA safety office will have to conduct a safety analysis on a procedure waiver, which would likely be required for future changes to the WYLLY. If disapproved, then we are

back to “square one”. S.Kelley reminded all that the FAA could not build this procedure today even if we wanted to because of the new criteria. The procedure is grandfathered.

J.Bellabona also stated that he could request that the procedure be flown using American and Northwest Airline simulators using either B752s or MD88s which are the worst performers for the WYLYY procedure. When asked, J.Bellabona confirmed for A.Lyman and M.Thaler that one simulator run should give the FAA enough data to determine feasibility.

M.Thaler asked what could be done in the near future. It was discussed that the option to request Northwest to conduct another test after two failed attempts was not an option at this time as there is a substantial amount of work involved (e.g. pilot briefings) to prepare for the test. Another option would be to wait for aircraft such as the MD88s to retire from the fleet. The third option is to conduct simulator tests of moving the GARVE waypoint.

There was consensus that waiting for aircraft such as the MD88s to be replaced with newer aircraft was too far down the road and that we should proceed with the simulation with the understanding that even if simulation indicates increased compliance with the gates, there are many other hurdles to get past such as: required waivers and the safety analysis. In addition, even if simulation supports a modification to the WYLYY procedure (e.g. GARVE waypoint), it is not a guarantee that if implemented, it will result in a 68% overall compliance rate.

M.Thaler stated that the best scenario would be to conduct an operational test and a simulation and asked if there was anything that the citizens could do to help with this. J.Bellabona indicated that Northwest Airlines was the BOS contact for all RNAV.

It was agreed that the FAA would proceed with simulation for moving the GARVE waypoint and possibly coordinate another operational test. J.Stewart requested an IOU on what it will take to erect signage for the 27 departures.

The next meeting was scheduled for May 13, 2008 at 6PM at Volpe.

Action Items:

1. Contact Sandra Kunz about additional CAC members that are potentially impacted by the 27 departures and should be invited to attend the RWY 27 AC meetings (FAA).
2. Coordinate a simulation run and possibly another operational test for moving the GARVE waypoint further to the south (FAA).