

Portland International Jetport Noise Advisory Committee Meeting



**Maine's
Home
Airport.**

Date	Start	End	Next Meeting	Next Time	Prepared By	Company
06/06/2024	6:00 PM	7:15 PM	10/10/2024	6:00 PM	K. Glidden P. Bradbury	PWM

Committee Members Attended	Absent
Deborah Napier– Stroudwater Neighborhood Association	Tom Ainsworth- Stroudwater Neighborhood Association
Shaun Patten- FAA Air Traffic	Michael Wood – Scarborough Representative
Julie Shane – South Portland Representative	Mike Foley – Westbrook Representative
Jennifer Lavanture – Peaks Island Resident Rep.	Tim Bryan – United Airlines
Natalie West – South Portland Councilor/Rep.	Tom Ainsworth- Stroudwater Neighborhood Association
Steve Dalzell- FedEx Cargo Representative	Susan Gillis – Cape Elizabeth Town Councilor
	Mark Collins – FAA Air Traffic Manager
	Dr. Jeremy Morton – Western Promenade Representative
Procedures Subcommittee	Regina Phillips – Chair, Portland City Councilor
Ann Pringle- Portland Representative	
PWM Representatives	
Paul Bradbury – Airport Director	
Katherine Glidden – Customer Experience Manager	

Non-Member Public Attendees	
Basil Klosteridis, Peaks	Stephen Cooney, Portland
Vicki Flanagan, Peaks	Triss Critchfield, South Portland
	Lee Harvey, South Portland
FAA Representatives	

DRAFT

1. Welcome / Hybrid - Zoom Meeting Information / Process

Quorum was not met

2. Opening Questions/Public Comments

- a. None

3. Approval of Minutes for the January 25, 2024 and April 24, 2024 Meetings.

- a. Quorum not met- will approve minutes at our meeting on October 10, 2024.

- b. Jennifer Laventure noted grammatical and typos in the minutes and will forward to Paul.

4. Review of Passenger Statistics & Q3/Q4 Operations Levels by Paul Bradbury.

- a. Enplanements are up 7.4% in April 2024 over April 2023. 2019 remains the record for April, but we're getting closer. Q1 has been slower to recover than summer/fall Q2 and Q3.
- b. Capacity is up 19.6% (166,345 seats) over the next 6 months of 2024 for June through November- attributed to larger aircraft
 - i. Natalie asked if this was due to bigger planes or more planes?
 - ii. Paul stated bigger planes with higher passenger capacity.
 - iii. He noted that Tom Ainsworth has asked for information specific to noise sensitive hours that will be reviewed later in the meeting.
 - iv. Paul stated 180,292 outbound seats are available in September- more than June and very close to July's capacity- may drop some as airlines match to advance sales.
 - v. After the all-time record in 2023 increased capacity for sale in 2024 sets up for another record year.
 - vi. April had increased load factor on decreased capacity, in March we saw increased load factor on increased capacity over 2023.
 - vii. Departing flights for the 2nd Quarter 2024 were 14.3% lower than 2019.
 - viii. Deborah Napier- January minutes- if boardings exceed 1.1 million in 2 of 4 years we have to go back to the planning board. How does this differ from what you were just talking about with 2.1 million enplanements in 2023?
 1. Paul- we estimate enplanements will exceed 1.1 million in 2024 which will trigger the requirement to submit an updated Traffic Movement Permit Application to City of Portland Planning. The 2009 City of Portland Planning Board Site Plan Approval for the terminal expansion included a condition that if in 2 out of 4 years enplanements exceed 1.1 million, the Jetport will be required to submit an update traffic movement permit application. The Jetport did not exceed 1.1 million enplanements until 2023, so we have not yet reached this threshold.
 2. Deborah - Asks about 2.1 million pax noted in previous NAC meeting minutes. Paul clarified that is total passengers, the sum of enplanements and deplanements.

3. Julie- If we go back to the traffic plan- the NAC doesn't have anything to do with that?
 4. Paul- This is the 2009 site plan permit for the terminal expansion. This requires an updated traffic permit with counts at intersections for throughput.
 5. Julie- will noise be taken into account?
 6. Natalie- Clarifies vehicle traffic, not planes.
 7. Paul- Yes vehicles, not planes. We cannot limit air traffic- Congress controls airport noise through Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA). Federal government is the sole regulator of aircraft noise and interstate commerce. We can't restrict the use. We are referencing the Portland Planning Board on vehicular/transit traffic landside roadway systems. The Jetport is currently working on the parking expansion project site plan permit, which is similar.
- ix. Paul- further discussion of operational trends that were provided in the meeting packet.
1. 2024Q2 down over 2019Q2 operations (14.3%)
 2. 2024Q2 up over 2023Q2 operations 6.5%
 3. 2024Q3 up over 2019Q3 operations 3.6%
 4. 2024Q3 up over 2023Q3 operations 19.8%
Historically is down even more— recalling the graph on passengers volumes vs operations.
 5. 2024Q4 down over 2019Q4 operations (7.5%)
 6. 2024Q4 up over 2023Q4 operations 27.8%
 7. Answering Tom Ainsworth's prior meeting question on operations during noise sensitive hours 10:00 pm - 7:00 am.

% Change 2024 v 2019	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
Departures	8.2%	-12.7%	-7.0%	-10.2%	-4.7%	12.5%
Arrivals	6.2%	-23.4%	-26.5%	-18.2%	-12.5%	5.9%
Operations	7.2%	-17.9%	-17.1%	-14.2%	-8.5%	9.3%
12MRA	2.5%	0.0%	-2.0%	-2.7%	-3.6%	-4.1%
% Change 2024 v 2023	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
Departures	-13.8%	-18.5%	-5.6%	0.3%	6.2%	-6.7%
Arrivals	-7.7%	-16.2%	14.0%	29.3%	12.6%	1.9%
Operations	-10.9%	-17.5%	2.5%	12.5%	9.1%	-2.9%
12MRA	18.3%	11.7%	8.4%	6.8%	3.6%	1.0%

- a. The 12 month rolling average for flights during noise sensitive hours is down 4.1% compared to 2019
 - i. Julie- is this because of the Taxiway Project? Did airlines decide not to fly?

- ii. Paul- No due to smaller planes using the short runway at night. Southwest is running cover flights due to weight restriction, especially when the runway is wet
 - iii. Julie- What is a cover flights?
 - iv. Paul- Extra flights also filled to half capacity to get all pax in and out with weight restrictions due to weather- otherwise we would leave 60 passengers in Baltimore
 - v. Deb- What does it mean when we say Delta and American chose the 100 night closure and they make up 50% of the traffic.
 - vi. Paul- Once we reach 50% interest based on airline market interest
 - vii. Julie stated it says 100 not 100 nights
 - viii. Paul- will correct that
 - ix. Deb- no it does say 100 nighttime closures- ok so they're putting in their vote for which they prefer
 - x. Paul explains majority (based on percentage of seats each airline controls in the market)
- b. Deb- does this include private planes and FedEx
- i. Paul- no. Jet aircraft and commercial operations only
 - ii. Deb- we hear smaller jets that are extremely noisy- do you have figures on those.
 - iii. Paul- we have only scheduled commercial flight data. Because the aren't scheduled public flights we have no data looking forward for smaller general aviation operations
 - iv. Deb- what about comparing 2023 vs 2024?
 - v. Deb- per Tom these aircraft still cause noise, it's loud in the middle of the night and it sounds like smaller prop planes
 - 1. Paul- we'll see in the next data set- Vector picks up all jet aircraft operations except military, and includes private aircraft

5. Review of Flight Discrepancies Captured by the Excel Model presented at our April Meeting

- a. Paul - Referencing Julie's presentation from April's meeting, Vector picks up all non-military jet aircraft operations
- b. Vector did a software update that caused some changes to the columns- Julie is working to fix this, but currently only have through April 30, 2024,
- c. Julie had offered to send the presentation and data to the committee in the April meeting, no one stated they were interested in receiving it. Only sent to the 3 who requested it.
- d. Paul- this will be an exceptional tool. discusses Noise Line complaints and often times

those complaints are on flights following the procedure

- i. Difference between being annoying, and being out of noise compatibility compliance.
 - ii. Packaging to review with ATC
- e. Need gust component for windshear- Julie may be able to help based on data
1. Non compliance- often if a pilot reports windshear on HVA we will pull HVA option
 2. Need to get gust, vector, and metric info to Julie
 3. Julie- some excused for gusts but we don't want to get rid of all gusts. We need to assess so we don't remove too much data.
 4. Shaun- gust means different things to different pilots or aircraft. This will make it hard to draw a line. Some airlines won't take HVA at all.
 5. Julie- We can pull historical data.
 6. Paul- is it a directional issue for low level windshear landing runway 29 for HVA? we need to get a number in to get the data and make the discrepancy set smaller to focus on the real issues.
 7. Julie- non-compliance reports to narrow down the data. Calls are very subjective- all calls vs flights that met all the other conditions.
 8. Shaun- if you pull a number based on historical data that gives us a place to start. I'm not a pilot, so I couldn't tell you what gust component would cause windshear.
 9. Paul- off Western Prom- hill coming in on HVA, as soon as you start to have gusting conditions you get low level windshear.
 10. Shaun- we need to find the measure based on historical data, Mark is looking at the possibility of data beyond 45 days
- ii. Julie- goal is to compile twice a month so we shouldn't need to look back at data beyond 45 days.
- iii. Shaun- Love the data. We are talking about noise in the tower and know that Mark is interested. Raw data is helpful to improve awareness/performance
- iv. Deb per Tom- Pilots are requesting North/South runway even when the main runway is available. How are we managing/questioning? Are these requests being questioned?
1. Paul- First thing on ATIS is noise preferred runway- must call and listen to ATIS before departure
 2. Shaun- ATIS Pre departure. If they're arriving we won't challenge their need for North/South. Traffic/weather permitting they'll get the North/South runway if requested.
 3. Paul- Mark and Shaun started broadcasting to all departing for noise mitigation procedures.
 4. Shaun- broadcasting to all now on ATIS for any aircraft arriving or departing PWM
 5. Deb- Can we ask pilots why they want the North/South runway?
 6. Shaun- not possible. Not enough time.
 7. Jennifer- also a private pilot- reinforcing discretion pilot has to request a runway, especially if gusting is reported. Flag items that are most useful. Adding the gust component is important, but flagging for all gusts may create additional data that's distracting
 - a. Jennifer- Why do we have RNAV on HVA compliance special visual.

- b. Julie- not able to get virtual gates set up to be able to tell exactly where the flights were going. AHVA (attempted HVA) captures any plane that comes overwater and may still cross land. We thought we'd be able to separate out the flights going over Peaks, South Portland, etc. We can't separate those out with the data we have. Trying to separate RNAV from the HVA number. We have data on flights that took the RNAV that were HVA eligible- Southwest can't take HVA but does give a number of flights to take HVA instead of RNAV. Can lump HVA in with RNAV, but need guidance
- c. Paul- Jennifer does that answer your concern?
- d. Jennifer- I have some concern around compliance/noncompliance with the Special Visual. If we're talking about compliance, the RNAV should be flown with high accuracy relative to a visual approach. Should be high percentage of compliance. Previously voted to provide recommendations that when HVA is available it be chosen over the Special Visual. Feels like we tried to no avail.
- e. Julie- we're not tracking RNAV compliance, just show how many took the RNAV. Special Conditions to take RNAV.
- f. Jennifer- can you explain the maps on the bottom left with the visual gate on the RNAV.
- g. Julie- Bottom is where the special RNAV Gate is located and that is where Zach set it up to capture all flights taking the Special RNAV.
- h. Jennifer- Using to determine compliance on the RNAV Special Visual or just to identify flights?
- i. Julie- Using an established procedure, Identifying the HVA by removing RNAV Visual Special. The goal is to get flights away from Peaks Island, not taking special RNAV, so added which RNAV could take HVA. For general HVA compliance we can't include RNAV flights because it's an established procedure.
- j. Jennifer- Are you tracking ILS arrivals?
- k. Julie- I didn't get the data. These are the only two gates
- l. Paul-There are the only two gates so the HVA and the AHVA
- m. Julie- Zach set up a virtual gate going from Fisherman's Point to Cushings Point- Any plane going through that gate is identified as AHVA.
- n. Paul- and it's a visual so we know it wasn't ILS
- o. Julie- It could have come in anywhere other than through that gate we can't tell where it came from. Need more gates to improve data on all those virtual gates. We had the Excel model set up for all this data but vector couldn't give us enough information to make it useful
- p. Paul- and after hours?
- q. Jennifer- Is this all arrival procedures? Is ILS classified in land or is this a subset?
- r. Julie- This all arrival procedures onto Runway 29, HVA was changed to AHVA because it's not what we thought we'd

- originally be able to get, land covers ILS or anything that doesn't go through the gate
- s. Julie- this is all arrival procedures onto Runway 29, and land to cover the ILS, the HVA was changed to AHVA because it was different than what we thought we could get and what people were used to. Covers any flight that doesn't cross that virtual gate falls into the land category
 - t. Paul- And then the land category not HVA eligible all weather conditions were ok short of the windshear so that's where that data might reduce discrepancies in the future.
 - u. Julie- Jennifer- did that answer your question
 - v. Jennifer- yes. We should have a follow up conversation offline.
8. Paul- after hours in the bottom right when the tower is closed- midnight to 5:45am
- a. Julie- Track preferred runway for night flights, from 10pm-7am. We take into consideration the after hours runway setting. We don't determine compliance with that in mind, but we do break those out from non-compliance report. So I have an after hours non-compliance report, and a non-compliance report for unknown reasons.
 - b. Paul - Were there more questions on the model?
Exceptional work, the ATCT involved and continue more progress (another subset or smaller meeting- Julie, Jen, Tom, Mark)
This makes this even better working with a smaller data set
We can do another offline with Julie and Jennifer, Mark, and anyone else
 - c. Deb- Tom would want to be involved.

6. Update on the Taxiway A Reconstruction Project

- a. Paul- this is the taxiway parallel to primary Runway 11/29
 - i. Removing 2 stub taxiways (E and D) and replacing with another one, new lighting. Going well so far with the weather cooperating,
 - ii. Meant to start Phase 5 on June 10, 2024 and we've already started Phase 5 at the time of this meeting.
 - iii. Acknowledge the challenges for residents North and South of the airfield.
 - iv. May be slowed down for delivery dates on taxiway lights, we are using our inventory and the contractor will reimburse us so we can keep the project moving.
 - v. Paul shares photos
- b. Paul- Shaun can speak to the complexity for runway preferences because we don't want to back-taxi on the runway unless we have to. If the winds are from the wrong direction we must back-taxi on the runway.
 - i. Shaun- very complex operation, requires multiple people in the tower, and slows down the whole operation.

- ii. Deb- This may be a silly question- SNA asks can the crew not use the loud beeping back up sound? May not be possible but it's loud and goes on for a long time in the middle of the night.
- iii. Paul- That's not for airport or aircraft - it is an OSHA standard for back up on construction vehicles, but will speak to the contractor..
- iv. Deb- figured not possible, but worth asking
- v. Paul- I can't imagine that any equipment is in reverse without actually backing up, but they could be backing to the milling machine. Any other questions on Taxiway A reconstruction? Thank you to SNA, Red Bank, and Brick Hill, we know this is challenging and especially annoying with windows open
 - 1. Hoping to beat the July 31, 2024 date.
- c. Natalie- Looking at the longer term- will this continue? Construction and shutdowns every few years?
 - i. Paul- These are once in a blue moon projects. Did the runway 2 years ago, supposed to be 9-10 years before the next closure, but the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) on TWY A for pavement degradation failed faster than expected so the Taxiway project had to commence sooner than originally planned.
 - ii. Runway and Taxiway were long term projects on our master plan, but were done in the intermediate time frame
 - 1. Short term- within 5 years
 - 2. Intermediate- 5-10 years
 - 3. Long term- 10+ years
 - iii. No future anticipated closures within 10 years, and we acknowledge that we said the same thing 2 years ago. This was a safety concern for the FAA and because of this the project became a priority and was moved up.

7. Update on the proposed overlay of the Harbor Visual Approach (HVA) procedure and replacement of the RNAV Visual Special approach by Paul Bradbury.

- a. Paul- 1 year ago we had the first report from Vianair doing the work on the RNP
 - i. Vianair did a lot of work to make the RNP work without waivers.
 - ii. Vianair used a reasonable approach speed but it was slow to meet FAA requirements.
 - iii. Ultimately got the appropriate approach speed from the RNP .3 procedure development team at the FAA. They gave us the whole data set.
 - iv. Vianair worked with the data set which included a faster approach speed. The faster approach caused changes to bank angles, which required waivers.
 - v. Vianair took the approach speed and found we can't get the bank angles down enough to remove the need for waivers without crossing over Ferry Village, so it's not a viable option because the NAC agreed the new approach would stay over water.
 - 1. Paul said we are now considering a plan B that would create a new special instrument approach. Jim Allardice of Vianair is recommending we proceed with a new special instrument approach as opposed to a visual special. We are hoping Southwest will consider this opportunity.

2. Vianair meets with Southwest Airlines next week to see if they're interested in working on this project: A new Special Instrument Approach which overlays the Vianair procedure developed with our procedures working group.
3. Benefits over special visual- we'll overlay it on the procedure the working group created. It will take time but that is the plan.
4. Opening to questions
 - a. Jennifer- do we know the minimum on either the RNP where Vianair was able to draw it, acknowledging that it didn't meet the original criteria from the working group? And secondly on the special instrument?
 - b. Paul- do you mean do we have the minimums for weather?
 - c. Jennifer- yes
 - d. Paul- Jim does, I do not. I believe we recommended the Instrument because minimums would be lower. If we do the instrument it will be a greater incentive to remove visual RNAV special because it will be an instrument approach. We know that is desired by Peaks Island.
 - e. Jennifer- Clarifying- Only path to Special Instrument is an analogous process to what was done with the Special Visual in terms of having some non-FAA party develop the procedure and other airlines would need to sign onto it with an LOA? This would not be a published procedure?
 - f. Paul- That is correct, we believe this is the most expeditious. We would work with the FAA in hopes of them taking this as a published public procedure in the future. The FAA has been good, but currently this is a special which means it's not a published procedure. Any other questions? We could do another procedures subcommittee at the will of the NAC.
 - i. Vianair will work with Southwest to establish scope so it won't be free.
 - ii. We need a partner because Jetport can't build, establish, and maintain procedures as we don't fly planes. Has to be flown once a year.
 - iii. Southwest has done this, or we can hire another company to do this. Looking for a third party and we're hoping for Southwest because they have in the past.
 - g. Natalie- can we get updates?
 - i. Paul- will remind Jim that we need updates. He is busy with other projects, including another opportunity to work with Southwest.
 1. Why would an airline sign on? Shorter distance even though it's not a continuous descent approach. That idle thrust continuous descent approach is a longer distance so airlines may be

- willing to switch to the new approach.
2. Paul- last meeting it was asked who is on the RNAV Visual Special- currently Southwest, American, United, Delta, Frontier, and Republic which is an affiliate of American and United.
- ii. Julie- I don't understand flying and flight paths. If Southwest doesn't agree to be the third party? Do we get another airline or does it mean it's just done?
 - iii. Paul- if Southwest isn't interested, I will work with the FAA to find out who is interested in helping. And I've worked with the regional Bob...I can't remember Bob's last name.
 - iv. Shaun- Bob Jones
 - v. Paul- I was at the Eastern Stakeholder Engagement Meeting- FAA had representation from ATC and procedures and they want to help with this. Rules and regulations that are needed for safety.
 1. Working with us for RNP .3 which we think there is still a possibility of getting those waivers
 - vi. Ann- Sounds like a better approach than what Jim came back with before because it's an instrument approach.
 - vii. Paul- What Jim came up with before was the RNP- This is the tightest and most advanced- RNP .3 (so 3/10ths of a mile) is best
 1. Life Flight is doing .1 capability, but for a procedure like this the .3 is the best.
 2. Instrument will be better than RNAV Visual Special but not as good as RNP.
 3. Ann- How would you characterize the difference between this and RNAV Special Visual?
 4. Paul- if Southwest works with us it will basically be RNP. Southwest flies the RNAV Visual Special as an RNP- one track is right on top of the next when you zoom in on flight tracks
 - a. If fully built, similar- same questions come up- technical- will Southwest like that bank angle? I don't know the answer to those questions but we'll keep moving. RNAV Visual Special is idle thrust continuous descent with 25% or less bank angle on its entire arc. This one will be tougher.
 - b. Ann- Estimate for FAA approval

timeline if Southwest is in?

5. Paul- too many variables. The first step is to find a partner and then we can determine the timeline. Even if Southwest is willing, it doesn't mean they can make it work. We'll work with the FAA or other partner.
6. Julie- do we need NAC involved
 - a. Paul- From prior approval, NAC has weighed in, if we stay on the same path as NAC Approved, I can keep it moving and NAC members can be as involved as they wish to be. Assuming Peaks will want to be more involved.
7. Jennifer- This is drawn much like an RNP procedure- Is it fair to assume this will need equipment and operational certification?
 - a. Paul- That is my expectation but I can't confirm. The RNAV Visual Special did as well. If flying current RNAV Visual Special over Peaks, they should be able to fly the new procedures. Right now it looks like RNP based on the RNP we all built together and Vianair developed and they plan to use that to develop the Special Instrument Approach.
 - b. Jennifer- that makes sense. FAA isn't considering waivers for noise mitigation but I think there is also a safety argument as it's an instrument approach improving safety where it is currently visual. It will also improve efficiency of the air space. It seemed like there may have been a chance to go back to the FAA with that argument. Did we ever go back to the FAA to ask this?
 - c. Paul- There isn't agreement within the FAA. To Julie's point we'll get there with waivers we'll be able to do just what you said. Vianair is working on a procedure for DCA that they're trying to get through and they're being challenged with waivers even on that one. Some in the Procedures group believe a waiver is possible but to your

point and desires of Peaks- if we can build the Special Instrument Approach let's do that now. If not we will start as RNAV Special Visual then need to regroup and push for waivers.

- d. Jennifer- need to see the actual procedure with minimums will matter quite a bit
- e. Paul- This should be better than RNAV Visual Special, not my area of expertise but is the recommendation of Jim as the most expeditious.

v. Julie- Any status update on the Departure Procedure?

Paul- no publish date on RNAV departures yet

Julie- Why are we having trouble, is this normal?

Paul- honestly, no idea and I have no control over it.

Shawn- No update. Mark advised that we don't have any updates yet

Paul- can Mark reach out? Update would be beneficial. Acknowledging that Ann has an interest with Great and Little Diamond, and Peaks Islands and RNAV departures. It's not a huge improvement, but it's an improvement. No update but good question. Asked several times with no answer.

8. Closing Questions / Public Comment

- a. None

9. Next meeting date:

- a. Scheduled for 10/10/2024- Paul will send calendar invites with attachments as that makes it easier too.

10. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 pm.