

REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 1

John M. Graham
McDonnell Douglas Corporation

The working group immediately agreed that technology is frequently not the problem. In most cases one or more technical approaches are available, feasible, and possible. Solutions are not found and implemented because of limitations of institutions and organizations.

Institutional barriers prevent progress for a variety of reasons. Aviation as a whole is often segregated into specialized realms between which there is little interaction. People doing air traffic control, airport operation, avionic equipment design, ground equipment design or airline operations do not work with each other regularly, do not share problems, have different goals, and--worse yet--do not even recognize the mutual isolation. The FAA is inherently a conservative institution which avoids risks and fears failure and so has difficulty in pushing programs to success. Industry organizations are fragmented by diverse interests, are indifferent to common problems, and often compete for self-serving narrow objectives. Deregulation has intensified competition so that immediate financial goals are emphasized to the exclusion of medium- and long-term needs.

The FAA and all the diverse industry groups must talk to each other, understand their mutual problems, agree to common goals, and work together toward their realization. An independent, technically competent, continuing industry group is needed to promote cooperation, to develop needed action, to follow up on implementation programs, and to encourage and support the FAA, even in the face of risks and possible failures. Several possible model action groups and potential sponsors were considered. The methods used by the RTCA in their special committees were considered to be good models even though too narrowly focused on aircraft systems for this purpose.

It is suggested that the functions of the existing Industry Task Force on Capacity Improvement and Delay Reduction be expanded. The Industry Task Force would prepare guidelines for working group procedures, determine needs for specific working groups, draw up specific terms of reference appropriate to long-term goals for each working group, and select their chairpersons. It would review and approve the conclusions and recommendations of the working groups, would present them to the FAA and other agencies for implementation, and would follow up programs to push them to completion. The people on the Industry Task Force should have broad technical knowledge and sufficient clout to be effective. The Industry Task Force should find a shorter and more convenient name.

The Working Groups would work toward goals achievable in one to a few years within specified terms of reference. The members should be technically competent, active workers "with dirty fingernails." FAA people would be invited at the specific request of a working group to participate and to supply technical staff assistance. The groups would consider all relevant areas, including certification, safety, benefits, noise, tests, and implementation.

They would coordinate with air traffic services, airworthiness regulators, airport operators, airline operators, and equipment designers. Each group would meet regularly several times yearly.

The Industry Task Force and its Working Groups will need the support of an established agency with a continuing budget for secretarial assistance and coordination. The support agency must be independent of the FAA. It is suggested that the Transportation Research Board undertake this function.

A number of possible areas were nominated for work. Priorities are not assigned to them, nor are all (or any) of them necessarily endorsed. The tentative list is as follows:

- o Wake Vortex
- o Noise
- o Reduction in Runway Spacing Requirements for IFR Parallel Runway Operations
- o Airport Task Forces
- o Data Collection
- o Pursuit of Terminal Automation (Metering and Spacing)
- o Surface Surveillance and Guidance
- o Optimum Airport Configuration(s)
- o IFR Converging Runway Operations to Low Minimums
- o IFR Triple Runway Operations
- o MLS Applications
- o Rotorcraft Operations
- o New Airport Studies

Participants

The members of Working Group 1 were:

John M. Graham,	McDonnell-Douglas Aircraft Corp.
Session Leader	MIT Lincoln Laboratories
John W. Andrews	The MITRE Corporation
John N. Barrer	Consultant
Joseph D. Blatt	FAA, System Studies and Advanced Concepts
Malcolm A. Burgess	Division
E. H. Haupt	National Business Aircraft Association
Raymond J. Hilton	Air Transport Association
John E. Lebron	The MITRE Corporation

R. J. Lefevre
Siegbert B. Poritzky

J. Donald Reilly
Peter Schauffler
Arnold M. Sloane

Allied Pilots Association
FAA, Office of System Studies and
Cooperative Programs
Airports Operators Council International
Transportation Research Board
Port Authority of New York and New Jersey