



# MEETING MINUTES



---

---

## DCA Design Group-3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting December 3, 2020

---

**Prepared By:** Emily Tranter, Primacy Strategy Group (Lockridge Grindal Nauen)

**Location:** Zoom Virtual

**PURPOSE OF MEETING:** Consensus-Driven Notional Designs for North

---

Flow RNAV Departures and South Flow RNAV Approaches.

**ATTENDEES:**

Name	Organization
Jim Allerdice	ABCx2
Emily Tranter	PSG
Tim Chambers	ABCx2
Ken Hartman	Montgomery
Janelle Wright	Montgomery
Bill Noonan	Montgomery
Rich Roisman	Arlington
James Phelps	Fairfax
Richard Hinds	DC
Ken Buckley	DC
Stavros Sidiropoulos	Vianair
Dimitrios Terzopoulos	Vianair

- Jim Allerdice opened the meeting and turned it over to Emily Tranter to review 11/12 notes
- Emily read and made corrections to the spelling of names
- Janelle asked and Jim explained what the VOR MON is
  - The Very High Frequency Omni-directional Range (VOR) Minimum Operational Network (MON) provides a conventional navigation backup service in the event of a loss of Global Positioning System (GPS) signal. See FAA webpage at the following URL: [https://www.faa.gov/about/office\\_org/headquarters\\_offices/ato/service\\_units/techops/navservices/transition\\_programs/vor\\_mon/](https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ato/service_units/techops/navservices/transition_programs/vor_mon/)
- Ken Buckley noted that he wanted the LDA-Z concerns about being flown to be noted in the November 12<sup>th</sup> minutes.
- Long discussion ensued regarding capabilities of airlines to fly RNP approach and impacts.
- Jim referred back to the Design Philosophy and noted we have to follow that. We do not have to agree here or in the next session about recommending the RNAV GPS approach until the TAA test is complete.
- Richard Hinds says there needs to be a timeline.
- Ken Hartman responded that's why we are working on the design process and we need to get through this so we can progress to putting forward a plan to the FAA. Let's discuss the strategy outside the design meeting.
- Richard Hinds thinks an RNAV approach is a major element.
- Jim Allerdice advises that he talked to Matt Fisher to run the following scenario (east departures using MARS) by him and he said he is willing to shepherd what we are going to show you through the MARS process criteria. Bad news—it's probably a 5 year process. This is something that is possible with criteria that doesn't exist yet. But according to Matt Fisher this design may be acceptable if the criteria is developed. MARS allows you to reduce standard separation on parallel courses.
- Dimitrios shared screen and began walking through the design.
- Jim explains what we are looking at and discussed background on the patterns and way points and issues TRACON has with various procedures. Jim indicates that we need input from group on where they would like the turns to move for FAA to consider.
- Janelle Wright asked to see the geography under the map
- Jim Allerdice noted that we can move left and right but we don't want to add too much mileage or we will get push back from airlines
- Richard Hinds noted that tracks should go closer to COVTO. They had opposed LAZIR-B because it made more noise for D.C. and says that 12/31 new plan doesn't mess with COVTO.
- Jim Allerdice stated that what we are trying to do is present a concept and we are relying on your expertise on where you'd like it to go
- Dimitrios zoomed in on turning points.
- Both Ken Hartman and Richard Hinds agree turns should be further to the NW.
- Bill Noonan says we still need data on LMAX contours.
- Vianair puts up the contour map so Bill Noonan can read and more easily interpret.
- When we "choose" Janelle Wright indicates we need a really good graphic to show where it was and where it's moved—and shows everyone will get a little bit of the traffic.

- Stavros suggests we show the grid before the contours. Ken Hartman says he likes the split—the inner jump point is too soon.
- Janelle Wright doesn't want to impact the same communities who are impacted by all the approach tracks.
- Conversations about the map and different adjustments discussed related to impact, who will get noise and how we show improvement.
- Ken Hartman asks how do we show the cumulative impact of all three? At some point we need to show before and after for community buy in.
- Many questions were asked about the current impact and percentage of use on AMEEE, DOCTR and SOOKIE
- Dimitrios began to show results of impacted area on geographic map. Improvements will be in green—deterioration is in red. Biggest change is 2 db.
- Janelle asked that we please keep having conversation to amend the STARS
- Bill Noonan noted that comparison does not seem to make a big enough difference or improvement with the comparisons we made.
- Janelle asked what if we looked at number of events above? Bill Noonan said we could estimate from here and it probably won't change much.
- Ken Hartman paused and asked for recap of what we need left. Jim indicated he could stay on another hour if folks want to and we will have an IOU to finish up procedure we are looking at now. We need to look at the GPS approach and we need to set up a date for the next meeting.
- The discussion moved to an arrival view—Jim noted that noise wise there will be a minimal affect but it will look different. Bill Noonan thinks that the altitude may make a difference.
- Richard Hinds asked if the document that Jim sent out had any impact on the TAA and Jim answered that no, it was apples to oranges.
- Dimitrios shared the RNP and LDA on screen
- Jim asked about the notional RNAV GPS approach and noted that the only thing we have changed is making DARIC the initial fix.
- He asked if there is anything else the group sees that could be changed that would make a difference? Noting it likely wouldn't be a huge noise impact but could change perception
- Dimitrios and Jim explain what they looked at and what they couldn't change based on existing waivers and P56 area.
- Finally looked at CULNA to HAPSO and thought most was flying over compatible land but may be a little difference made to neighborhood south of reservoir.
- The one thing we could do is shift that segment south a bit and it would be further over Canal Road but impact commercial Rosslyn a bit more.
- Richard Hinds asked if we could move HAPSO further down toward GW parkway.
- Jim said we could take a look at that and see if it fits within criteria.
- Janelle says it seems like that move would be keeping with the priorities
- Conversation continued with moving of the tracks to see what could be done.
- Dimitrios says that depending on what it does on the other end which Jim cautions we have to look at—moving HAPSO may be better than RNP because it's closer to river.
- Jim Allerdice indicates we will take a look at impacts
- Asks if folks want to take a look at calendars.

- Jim will send out suggested times as folks have jumped off the call.
- Jim will send Emily the recording to finalize notes.