



RNAV STUDY UPDATE MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 30TH, 2020 AT 5:00PM

RingCentral Virtual Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Members Attending		Members Absent	
Arlington	Frank Ciano	Bedford	Heidi Porter
Belmont	Myron Kassaraba	Beverly	Gloria Bouillon
Boston 3 – Fenway	Maura Zlody	Boston 1 – East Boston	John Nucci
Boston 4 – Roxbury	Joanne Keith	Boston 2 – South Boston	Dave Manning
Boston 6 – Roslindale	Alan Wright	Boston 5 – Hyde Park	Irene Walczak
Braintree	Sandra Kunz	Boston 7 – South End	Steven Fox
Cambridge	Bill Deignan	Brookline	Heather Hamilton
Canton	Jim Aufiero	Chelsea	Roseann Bongiovanni
Hingham	Brendan Concannon	Cohasset	Ralph Dormitzer
Hull	David Carlon	Concord	Vacant
Lynn	William Bochnak	Everett	Tony Sousa
Malden	Christopher Webb	Lexington	Vacant
Marblehead	Charles Gessner	Lincoln	Vacant
Medford	Peter Houk	Melrose	Peter Navarra
Milton	Tom Dougherty	Randolph	Gerard Cody
Nahant	Robert D’Amico	Revere	William Legault
Quincy	Frank Tramontozzi	Salem	James Mercurio
Swampscott	Alice Stein	Scituate	Vacant
Somerville	Wig Zamore	Watertown	Vacant
Winthrop	Jerry Falbo	Weymouth	Gene Castignetti
		Worcester	Vacant

Other attendees:

- Dr. R. John Hansman
- Sandro Salgueiro, MIT Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics
- Matthew A. Romero, MCAC Executive Director
- Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, MCAC Counsel
- Stephanie Ackley, MCAC Administrative Assistant
- Ken Knopp, Deputy Regional Administrator, FAA
- Reggie Davis, Regional Ombudsman, FAA
- State Representative Jonathan Hect
- Steven Gingras, State Representative Madaro Office
- Zoe Iacovino, Senator Jehlen’s Office
- Anthony Gallagher, Massport



Attendance Roll Call

The meeting commenced at 5:10 PM, and attendance was taken by roll call.

Welcome & Introduction

The Chair welcomed all guests to the meeting, and thanked guests for their participation. He briefly discussed the meeting agenda, and that the RNAV Study Update is the only item being presented at the meeting. This meeting was an information only, and no votes were taken during the meeting. Elected officials were welcomed to make comments, along with all of the CAC members.

RNAV Study Update Briefing – Professor R. John Hansman

The Chair welcomed Dr. Hansman to the meeting, and Dr. Hansman provided his presentation. He started by discussing the Block 2 Procedures. Mr. Falbo asked if Runway 22 departures are limited to the Hull area, and Dr. Hansman explained that they depart over Hull, that there is benefit to the Hull area, and that there does not seem to be any other impact outside of the area.

He then proceeded to the Runway 33 Departures Procedure Presentation. Mr. Houk asked why there is a concern with controller-based dispersion during higher traffic periods when historically Logan Airport has had much higher traffic than it does now than in the past. His concern was that he understands objections from the stakeholder group that are about flyability and safety and planes that can't make certain turns, interference of arrivals and departures in the airspace, but when you discuss increased controller workload and potential for errors, there is opportunity to reject every modification we suggest. Dr. Hansman agrees with Mr. Houk, however, there are options to put these recommendations forward. There are two concerns, one being the traffic level increase, and the other is the controllers are less practiced at the procedure since they do not do it as often. He thinks it is a fair position and expect to present this procedure at a low traffic level, however we can ask for the traffic to be as high as possible. Mr. Houk followed up on why controllers are being phased out of the operations. Dr. Hansman explained that part of the objective is for predictability and therefore safety. Mr. Houk asked if there is actual data to show that it is safer, and Dr. Hansman explained that yes, and that there is evidence of less opportunity for error. He added that any procedural change will go through a safety analysis within the FAA process. Mr. Deignan expressed his disappointment, and that the low frequency option is going to give some communities some benefit at night, but others will see an uptick as a result. He wondered if there is something that could be modified to change this, including airspace changes. Dr. Hansman explained that the diverging headings are doable if there is an airspace change, but it requires and airspace change which is another big deal. This is a bigger deal than a procedure development and is an escalation. Dr. Hansman explained that this process was to uncover what the problems were so that both the communities, FAA and stakeholders understand what it would take to get one of these procedures applied. Mr. Deignan would like to see whatever options are available to be pursued. Mr. Kassaraba explained that he is beyond frustrated, primarily with the process, although he appreciates the work that MIT has done. His understanding is that when that RNAV study was started 4 years ago that there was a commitment to the Congressional delegation and to the communities an Massport that there would be participation by the FAA. It seems that 4 years later, there is guessing on what might be possible, throwing ideas against the wall for the FAA to react to, and so far, shoot down. It seems like in other places, like Charlotte, there has been ability to increase flight path width or dispersion, and they stated that this was a problem that is occurring nationally. They expressed desire to come up with a solution, and asked the FAA why communities are left guessing what might be possible rather than



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

having direct participation with the people creating these routes to come up with some way to decrease concentration and impact under and RNAV flight path. He would like to see the FAA do more than respond with “not feasible” when alternatives are presented and provide alternatives that could be implemented. Dr. Hansman added he would have liked to see the FAA do more than reject the proposed alternatives. If there is a lot of interest in the community for a specific option, they can look harder and possibly compel an airspace redesign or a waiver. He explained that the FAA has also become more conservative on waivers, and so that is an additional factor to consider. Mr. Houk asked a question pertaining to the controller-based solution being used during low traffic time, and if Dr. Hansman has a threshold of what constitutes low-traffic. Dr. Hansman explained that the baseline they used was 10 departures an hour as their low-traffic range. Mr. Houk pointed out that that could make a difference for people who are getting a heavy load of volume during the day and into the night.

Dr. Hansman discussed the Runway 27 Departures Presentation. Mr. Wright thanked Dr. Hansman for his presentation, adding that he had reviewed the slides and likes the modification to the waypoint move. He believes it will provide additional equity for Mattapan, Hyde Park and Readville. There will be an increase in traffic over West Roxbury and the lower south-east corner of Brookline and asked if Dr. Hansman could provide a population of people affected by the waypoint move. Dr. Hansman took this as a follow up. Ms. Keith asked if there is a hard number of flights to expect when moving the waypoint, and if the waypoint move from KIRAA to WYLYY will add volume to the route that is currently in place over Roxbury. Dr. Hansman explained that as aircraft depart from Logan, there is no change until they reach WYLYY. The plan would be to turn some of the aircraft earlier, to create dispersion.

Dr. Hansman discussed the Runway 22L/R Arrival Procedures. Mr. Carlon asked if in crossing a causeway, you are fairly concentrated because you are close to the runway end, but what is the estimate of the width of the gates at the causeway if it were an RNAV versus a PBN. Dr. Hansman explained that RNAV will be within less than a quarter-mile and RNP would be even better. With RNP, they are required to be tight, and these planes are tracking very accurately. Mr. Carlon asked if there is an estimate of what the volume would be when the Runway 22 is in use, how many planes would be flying this and where they come from. Dr. Hansman explained that this would mostly be traffic from the South, North and East. Traffic from the west would likely just enter the existing procedure. Mr. Carlon added that the older fleet are being flown less frequently, and the few areas that would be impacted should be even less as more RNAV capable aircraft are in operation. Dr. Hansman agreed. Mr. Carlon asked if there is an airline that would be willing to test the procedure, and Dr. Hansman said that this is likely. Mr. D’Amico added that the arrivals on 22L coming over the causeway has worked very well for Nahant, and that he is appreciative of the arrival procedure. He added that this has been a benefit for Lynn, Swampscott and the general area, and reiterated that he is very satisfied with the procedure.

Dr. Hansman discussed the Runway 4L/R Procedure. Mr. Dougherty thanked Dr. Hansman for his presentation. He asked if there could be an RNAV path that would intercept from the east side. Mr. Salgueiro, MIT, explained that 4.625 is the closest you can get on the RNAV, and what sets the distance is the tallest ground obstacle present on the approach path. There is a ground obstacle in Milton that is 990’ tall, and this pushes the intercept point, so the 4.625 miles is the closest path. Mr. Hansman explained that there are many things that go into consideration for these procedures. Mr. Concannon asked how the flyability and airline buy-in is weighed against the disbenefits that impact Hingham and other communities, and how the valuation takes place. Dr. Hansman explained that when you fly the procedure, the turn to the final approach is very close to the runway and from a safety perspective, airlines prefer being further out to ensure they are on track. There is resistance from pilots in operating the procedure, but he believes that it falls within the flyability criteria. This procedure is the minimal



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

population exposure based on their study. Mr. Concannon asked if environmental or habitat obstacles would ever be considered in the analysis. Dr. Hansman explained that the limitations are generally for safety in airspace and is not sure if wildlife areas would be considered. Ms. Keith added a comment about the ROD, and that the committee may have missed an opportunity to review the other avenues or workarounds that would have presented themselves if the FAA was willing to adjust the ROD, and that this should have been something the committee looked into to ensure equitable changes for the impacted communities. Dr. Hansman did not take the ROD as a hard constraint when they ran their first analysis. Ms. Keith added that if the ROD is never reviewed, this may relieve the FAA of any mitigation responsibilities. Mr. Zamore supported Ms. Keith's point, and that it is important to understand the environmental disbenefit regarding current population and the Runway 27 ROD. Secondly, he feels that it is terrific that Dr. Hansman has found a way to not fly directly over downtown Lynn. He asked if the presentation helps to narrow options that are still available, or to what extent has this happened. Dr. Hansman believes that what has been presented are the best options at this point, but there are back-up options available. Mr. Wright added that he supports Ms. Keith's point, and that the ROD was not included in the analysis but understands the complexity in doing so. He feels that it is very important that the committee consider making a request to examine modifications to the ROD. After the ROD went into effect, there was considerable amount of controversy about the lack of inclusion for Roxbury and Dorchester, which was never concluded or resolved. He also added that Runway 27 ROD was based on population, flight and noise data from the 1080's. The population and technology have changed dramatically over this period of time, the noise profiles have changed, both in volume and engine configurations. The ROD is badly out of date and demands to be reexamined, but he does not know how the MCAC would start the reexamination process. He has suggested to City Council and the Mayor's Office that a legal effort be started to reexamine the ROD but has not gotten support at the time. He expects that once COVID-19 is in the past and the economy gets back to where it was pre-COVID, these communities will be subjected to an enormous amount of traffic again, and the noise that comes with that traffic is very disruptive to peoples lives on many levels. Mr. Falbo thanked Dr. Hansman on the work and effort in presenting to the committee, but he is disappointed at the rejections from the FAA. He asked what the next steps are. Dr. Hansman explained that they intend to move forward with a set of recommendations similar to the list provided, and that the MCAC will review and push forward with the options they choose. Mr. Houk pointed out that when the FAA made the decision to make predictability a property and deemphasize the role of the air-traffic controller, in other words hyper-concentrate these departure procedures, it created a structural problem that will be persistent until they figure out how to resolve it. The City of Medford has really changed in a big way and will not change back until the FAA teams up with the local round-tables and come up with something better than moving a few flights off during low traffic periods. He pointed out that this is a national problem that the FAA has created. Mr. Deignan agreed with Mr. Houk's points, but that he does not see the options presented as something he is willing to accept and would like to see more work done. Mr. Webb thanked Dr. Hansman and added that he would like to see more considerations to the 33L communities. The amount of traffic is obscene and would not vote on any of the options presented until there was more feedback. Mr. D'Amico would like to see adjustments to the arrivals on Runways 27, 33L and 15R; 27 out of the west, 33L out of the west, 15R out of the south, and all before they enter their downwind approach to those runways. He would like to see 4R departures to be closer to the center of the causeway. Mr. Carlon that the MCAC will gather the feedback, and forward it to Massport, the FAA and Dr. Hansman's team at MIT so that it is documents. We will then come up with a list of action items to move forward. We are nearing the end of this study, but there is still a fair amount of work to do, and the committee



MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

will stay focused on the feedback provided. Dr. Hansman understands the frustration on Runway 33. If there is something specific that should be reviewed, they will try to do it. If there are options on Runway 4 that membership finds agreeable, to let him know so they can analyze further. Ms. Stein added she feels it would be worthwhile to have MIT present a more holistic approach to also focus on environmental factors.

Public Comment

Cindy Christensen, Milton: Question about the 4R RNP. Her understanding is that the 4L visual is an RVFP, the JetBlue visual. She believes that the RVFP and the RNP are different procedures. Her question to Dr. Hansman was if these are in fact different, and if they are, is there advantage at looking at a visual RNAV instead of the RNP. Dr. Hansman explained that they are different, and the RNAV visuals are not FAA procedures, they are individual airline procedures. Right now, the FAA does not support published visual procedures.

Darcy Devney, East Arlington: Question about the 33L SID/Controller-based dispersion. The low traffic period is only about 17% of the time, and mostly at night. She is concerned that this won't help even 17% of the time because currently more than 1/3rd of the time the planes are flying over the 33L cities instead of going out to the ocean like they are supposed to between midnight and 6AM. Dr. Hansman explained that there are certain wind conditions, where the north-west wind are strong, and for safety reasons they have to use Runway 33. Ms. Devney added that she understands that but the result of that would not be 17% of the time, it would be more like less than 10% of the time. Dr. Hansman explained that they did an analysis of all of the runway use in 2019, and that number 17% is Runway 33 departures occurring during periods of 10 departures or less.

Gina Cassetta, Winthrop: 22L Approach Over-Water RNAV with the RNP overlay up from the South. She agreed and hopes it can be implemented. It would alleviate 53,000 people from some bit of noise. When those approaches come up from the south, they cross Marblehead, Salem, Lynn and Swampscott. It does not alleviate all the noise or pollution coming from the 22L, but it alleviates half coming from the south-east. She hopes this gets approved and added that being over-water gives pilots plenty of time to make their approach.

Adjournment

The Chair thanked everyone who participated, especially Dr. Hansman and his team. He called the meeting adjourned, since there was no quorum at the conclusion of the meeting. The meeting officially ended at 7:11PM.

Documents and Presentations:

Agenda

RNAV Update Presentation