Segment Two – "Champions" Status Reports

Deicing/Anti-icing/Runway Contamination

Tom Fahey, Delta Airlines, Inc.
Friends/Partners Aviation Weather, Orlando, FL
22 October 2009

Deicing/Anti-icing/Runway Contamination Rate the Progress in the Last Year

- Gov't & Industry Coordination on Weather Info
 & Deicing/Anti-icing Operations
- Runway Contamination
 - Multiple Choice re our Score
 - (A or B) Major Progress Addressing Wx Related Deice Issues
 - (C) Status Quo
 - •(D of F) Major step(s) backward
 - It is Always a Matter of your Perspective

Runway Contamination

PAVED RUNWAY CONDITION ASSESSMENT TABLE

Airport Estimated Runway Condition Assessment Pilot Reports					
Runway Condition Assessment – Reported		Downgrade Assessment Criteria		(PIREPs) Provided To ATC And Flight Dispatch	
Code	Runway Description	Mu (μ)	Deceleration And Directional Control Observation		PIREP
6	• Dry	-			Dry
5	Wet (Smooth, Grooved or PFC) Frost 1/8" or less of: Water Slush Dry Snow Wet Snow	40µ or higher	Braking deceleration is normal for the wheel braking effort applied. Directional control is normal.		Good
4	At or below -13°C: • Compacted Snow	39-36µ	Brake deceleration and controllability is between Good and Medium.		Good to Medium
3	Wet (Slippery) At or below -3°C: Dry or Wet Snow greater than 1/8" Above -13°C and at or below -3°C: Compacted Snow	35-30µ	Braking deceleration is noticeably reduced for the wheel braking effort applied. Directional control may be slightly reduced.		Medium
2	Greater than 1/8" of: • Water • Slush Above -3°C: • Dry or Wet Snow greater than 1/8" • Compacted Snow	29-26µ	Brake deceleration and controllability is between Medium and Poor. Potential for hydroplaning exists.		Medium to Poor
1	At or below -3°C: • Ice	25-21μ	Braking deceleration is significantly reduced for the wheel braking effort applied. Directional control may be significantly reduced.		Poor
0	Wet Ice Water on top of Compacted Snow Dry or Wet Snow over Ice Above -3°C: Ice	20µ or lower	Braking deceleration is minimal to non-existent for the wheel braking effort applied. Directional control may be uncertain.		Nil

Weather Info & Deicing/Anti-icing Ops An Industry Rep's Perspective

Background

- Apr 2007, ATA/FAA Ground Deicing Work Group & Meteorology Subcommittee formed.
- Summer 2007 Subcommittee Agreed:
 - The Current method of using visibility to estimate snowfall was not the most accurate method.
 - But existing current method was sufficient for the time being.
 - Subcommittee would work to implement Liquid Water Equivalent (LWE) method to est. snowfall intensity.
- Sometime in 2008, independent of the subcommittee, FAA contracted both NCAR & a Canadian org. to compile existing stats on reliability of snowfall intensity est. using visibility.

An Industry Rep's Perspective Developments w/in last 12 Months

- Dec'08: Failed attempt to finalize Subcommittee's Charter, pending 18 months
 - Until agreement on a Charter, there was no benefit to continue to meet.
 - Behind scenes, unbeknown to industry, work continued on FAA rqsted stats.
- Apr'09: FAA requested to meet to discuss snowfall intensity measurements.
 - Canadian org & NCAR presented stats they had prepared.
 - FAA announced plan to reverse subcommittee's 2007 agreement & require airlines not to use the officially published METAR snowfall intensity observation.
- May-Aug'09: Industry failed to speak with one voice on the issue.
- End of Aug'09: FAA issued, via the web, the Apr discussed requirement.
- Oct '09: Official FAA 2009-10 Winter Ops Requirements were published.

RESULT: REQUIRED - Commercial Carriers must calculate snowfall intensity using FAA table & not official snowfall intensity in METAR. NOT REQUIRED – If FG or BR included in METAR, Ignore Table.

Gov't & Industry Coordination on Wx Info & Deicing Ops

