Stakeholders Feedback Review

Presented to:  TALPA Update Meeting
By: ARP, AFS, ATO, AIR, NATCA
Date: July 11, 2017
Feedback Collection & Review

- Input at conferences, meetings, media, etc.
- Comments made to the TALPA email box
- Convened FAA TALPA Implementation Team to Review
  - Aircraft Certification
  - Office of Airports
  - Flight Standards Service
  - Air Traffic Procedures
  - NOTAM Policy and NOTAM Manager Offices
  - NATCA
- Team proposed resolution(s)
“Patchy” or % for Taxiways & Aprons

• **REQUEST:** Add a capability for airports to report either “patchy” or % coverage on taxiways and aprons

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – Not a performance issue

• **RESOLUTION:** Agreement to add the capability to report “patchy” contaminants on taxiways & Aprons
  – “Patchy” would still mean 25% or less contamination
**REQUEST:** Clarify the FAA position on reporting Mu

**DISCUSSION POINTS:**
- Mu recognized as a useful indicator for airports
- Mu does not correlate to aircraft performance
- Removal of Mu from RCAM would create other issues
- Covered in Change 1 of Winter Ops AC

**DECISION:** FAA maintains its position of not reporting or sharing Mu information with pilots/airlines
Reporting Contaminants by Thirds

• **CONCERN:** If the RwyCC of the last third of the runway is low (for example, 5-4-2), but the runway is long and the last third is not needed for landing and rollout, that one low code can keep the flight from landing.

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  - It is carrier policy to determine how the RwyCC is used.
  - The airport is not deciding who can land, and who can’t.
  - The RwyCC is a decision-support tool, not a decision-making tool
  - Other factors, such as a crosswind, also influence decision to land

• **RESOLUTION:** Carriers clearly define their policies in SOP(s) and educate pilots about it
REQUEST: Clarify how a displaced threshold is factored into the RwyCC.

DISCUSSION POINTS:
- The RwyCC describes the entire length of the runway, even when there is a displaced threshold.
- It is up to the pilot to factor the displaced threshold into their landing decision.

RESOLUTION: Educate pilots that the RwyCC describes the entire runway length, so they Must factor in any displaced threshold.
Relaying the FICON NOTAM

• REQUEST: Add FICON to digital ATIS.
• DISCUSSION POINT: The NOTAM system and ATIS system are not electronically linked.
• RESOLUTION: We are unable to pursue this suggestion.
ATIS Information Inconsistency

• **ISSUE:** Information available on the ATIS is not consistent across the NAS as relates to FICON.

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – Aircraft operators seeks the same ATIS format and information across the NAS.
  – What perimeters are there for RwyCC only versus complete FICON read back of the NOTAM by controllers

• **RESOLUTION:** ATO and NATCA working to refine policy guidance and standardization of minimum ATIS requirement, and to address whole FICON read back.
Braking Action

• **QUESTION:** Can the RwyCC and vehicle braking action report be combined, especially for the first flight of the day?

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – Vehicle braking can be used by the airport as in indicator of runway condition trending.
  – Vehicle braking cannot be reported on runways.
  – Vehicle braking cannot be used to upgrade a RwyCC.
  – The airport Must have the proper equipment in order to upgrade.

• **ANSWER:** RwyCC and vehicle braking cannot be combined
Braking Action

• **ISSUE:** Some airlines require a braking action of a certain level along with a RwyCC of a certain level. Not all ATC facilities are aware of this requirement and don’t relay the pilot braking action reports.

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – It is airline policy to decide what indicators to use when making a landing decision.
  – Holding aircraft can monitor the tower frequency
  – Pilot braking is also available by request
  – ATC relays pilot braking as provided by aircraft operators

• **RESOLUTION:**
  – Ensure airline policy is clear and relayed to pilots
Runway Assessments

• **ISSUE:** Airport is conducting such frequent runway inspections that aircraft must be sent around, sometimes into icing conditions.

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – There is danger in landing on an unsafe runway.
  – There should be an LOA between the airport and the tower regarding how they will conduct runway inspections.
  – This may have been a “growing pains” situation

• **RESOLUTION:** Tower and airport review their LOA to insure it accurately represents how they are operating with TALPA in place.
Runway Assessments

- **ISSUE:** A large change in RwyCC (3/3/3 to 5/5/5) in 3 minutes leads a dispatcher to ask about FAA guidance on timing of runway assessments.

- **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  - Each airport establishes via their ACM and LOAs what their processes will be for assessing and reporting runway conditions.
  - The FAA does not advise any set time interval for runway assessments.
  - This may have been a “growing pains” situation.

- **RESOLUTION:** Airline discuss with airport what their SOP is for conducting runway assessments and reporting on runway conditions.
Conditions Not Monitored/Reported

- **CONCERN:** Does not address infrequently maintained airfields that do not have set operational hours

- **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  - Airports can put their recurring schedule information in the 5010/ or AF/D

- **RESOLUTION:**
  - Stakeholder feedback will determine additional guidance needed to be added to AC
RCAM Versions

• **ISSUE:** Since there are two versions of the RCAM (Airport and Pilot) it is confusing.

• **RESOLUTION:** ARP and AFS will make sure they specify Airport or Pilot RCAM in publications
  – AFS: AC 91-79A
RCAM Contaminant Codes

• **COMMENTS:** Multiple comments that the RCAM is either too conservative, or not conservative enough.

• **DISCUSSION POINT:**
  – Comments provided are usually very general, lacking any specifics as to Airport, Time of Day, Weather, Runway Conditions, etc.
  – Without specific information, the FAA is unable to evaluate input related to accuracy of the RCAM

• **RESOLUTION:**
  – When providing comments on correctness of RCAM, share as many details as possible so we can evaluate RCAM accuracy
  – This is also why submitting relative pilot braking observations in a FICON is so important.
RwyCC Upgrades

• **COMMENT:** Airport Field Condition Assessments and Winter Operations Safety AC doesn’t explain the rationale for RwyCC upgrades correctly.

• **RESPONSE:** The FAA believes that the information in the AC accurately describes the upgrade process.
Alaska-Specific Issues

• **ISSUE:** There are several issues that are specific to the state of Alaska.

• **RESOLUTION:** There is a separate working group working on Alaska-Specific Issues, which includes FSS and NATCA.
Training (Topics for Pilots)

- **COMMENTS:** Multiple reports of pilots being unfamiliar with TALPA and how it works.

- **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  - How a carrier decides to apply TALPA should be part of their SOP
  - The RCAM doesn’t restrict operations except for NIL
  - The RwyCC is a contaminant-driven value
  - If their manufacturer never provided performance data for their aircraft, then pilots/carriers can use generic factors
  - Pilots should give words (Braking Action Reports); get numbers (RwyCC)
  - TALPA is a decision support tool, not a decision making tool

- **RESOLUTION:**
  - AFS working with NBAA to provide a PowerPoint briefing on TALPA similar to “Climb via”
One-Direction Reporting

**COMMENTS:** Several comments either in favor of or opposed to reporting only in one runway direction.

**DISCUSSION POINTS:**
- We intentionally restrict reporting to one runway end.
- There may be a software way to restrict reporting to one runway end.
- If necessary, a pilot should be able to reverse the codes until the airport is able to issue a revised NOTAM.

**RESOLUTION:**
- Airports need to be aware that they should only issue a FICON for the runway direction in use. ATC will not reverse RwyCCs for opposite direction landings.
- Pilots should be aware that they will be getting a NOTAM for only one runway direction, which can be reversed.
- Add information into AC 91-79, on applying LDA RwyCCs only.
- NOTAM Manager to explore restricting reporting to one runway end.
Wet Reporting

• **COMMENT:** Several comments that reporting of WET conditions should be required

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – There is a performance impact
  – ***Pilots don’t know if the airport they are flying into reports Wet conditions, so don’t know if they should expect a Wet or Dry runway***

• **RESOLUTIONS:**
  – FAA will continue to encourage all airports to report Wet via outreach.
  – Carriers can “encourage” the airports they fly into to report Wet conditions and make airports aware of the impact to their operations.
  – Investigate publishing a list of airports that Do/Do Not report Wet
  – Investigate “one button” to NOTAM the entire airport as Wet
  – Investigate ability to NOTAM Multiple runways as Wet instead of via individual NOTAMs.
Wet Reporting

• **REQUEST:** Provide the ability to report both “short-duration” wet runways and “long-duration” wet runways.

• **DISCUSSION POINT:**
  – In some locations, rainstorms are of short duration and dry quickly
  – Performance impact is the same

• **RESOLUTION:**
  – We are not going to distinguish short-duration Wet conditions from long-duration Wet.
  – Proposed NOTAM Manager solutions on previous slide would make it easier to report Wet conditions.
Slippery When Wet, then Wet

• **COMMENTS:** Several comments opposed to the current procedure for reporting runways that fail their friction test (Slippery When Wet) and then becomes Wet

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – Reporting of Slippery When Wet runway is already required in Part 139.339(c)(2)
  – If a NOTAM is not issued to report “Slippery When Wet” for failed friction test; some pilots will not know that a Slippery When Wet is a possibility

• **PROPOSED SOLUTION FOR AUDIENCE:**
  – When a runway fails a friction test, issue a NOTAM saying “Slippery When Wet” without a code
  – If it rains on a runway already NOTAMed as “Slippery When Wet”, when the airport issues a Wet NOTAM, NOTAM Manager would recognize the runway as already below the friction level, and issue a 3/3/3 instead of a 5/5/5
NIL Conditions

• **ISSUE:** Confusion over whether a NIL taxiway or apron should be closed

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – TALPA did not change this
  – NIL on a Taxiway or Ramp is unsafe, therefore should be closed, not reported as NIL

• **RESOLUTION:**
  – This will be clarified in the NOTAMs for Airport Operators AC and Airport Field Condition Assessments and Winter Operations Safety AC
NIL Conditions & Remainder

• **ISSUE:** There is confusion about whether remainder contaminants, especially ice, affect the RwyCC.

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – For reporting purposes, the remainder is not considered part of the primary portion or “majority” of the runway, but Must not present a hazardous situation because it is still available for use.

• **RESOLUTION:** NOTAM Manager Office will be asked to cover this topic with a demonstration on their monthly conference calls.
Less than or equal to 25% Contaminated

• **ISSUE:** It is confusing to some that in some conditions there is a code with a contaminant description, and other times just a contaminant description.

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – ARC felt that there was not a performance impact unless over 25% of the runway was contaminated
  – We have briefed that if you have a RwyCC, then an aircraft operator may have to take a performance penalty
  – Practical implementation may be too confusing

• **PROPOSAL FOR AUDIENCE:**
  – Should we have a RwyCC whenever reporting contaminants?
Less than or equal to 25% Contaminated

• **COMMENT:** It would be more accurate to have the RwyCC “trigger” be any third of the runway over 25%, not the entire runway over 25% contaminated.

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  – With a revised “trigger”, a pilot would not be surprised by a third that seems worse that the RwyCC
  – Would require retraining

• **QUESTION FOR AUDIENCE:** Should the 25% rule apply to any third, not the entire runway?
NOTAM Manager

• **REQUESTS:** Several requests for changes to the NOTAM Manager user interface

• **DISCUSSION POINTS:**
  - Potential to add some checks and error messages to prevent mistakes and violations of RCAM operating rules
  - Several NOTAM system items are in the queue to be fixed

• **RESOLUTIONS:**
  - Will request that process issues be discussed and demonstrated during the monthly NOTAM Manager conference calls.
  - Will investigate added checks and error message where possible
Conclusion

• Many improvements possible
• Must maintain our link to the science of airplane performance
• Use data as a basis for decisions
Questions?