ADF’s Fall Symposium ‘99, “Airline Operation Control in the Next Millennium” Right Around the Corner

Join us in Daytona Beach with Embry Riddle Aeronautical University as Operational Control professionals from around the world unite to examine the realities of operational control today, the research efforts that are ongoing and the future that we are in the process of creating for the next millennium.

Representatives from all arenas of aviation will be discussing the dispatcher’s role in Operational Control. Be a part of the team that will help determine the future state of MISSION CONTROL as we prepare to enter the next millennium.

Featured Speakers from, the FAA, NASA, ATA, Academia & the airlines will meet at the 1999 ADF SYMPOSIUM to discuss and debate policy, procedures, infrastructure, and recommendations for the next century. Attending this event well worth your time!

The 1999 SYMPOSIUM Presentations and Discussions will feature:

* Lively Panel Discussion examining ATC Delays During the Summer of ’99

* The FAA’s, Airline, Industry, Government and Institutional Viewpoints on Operational Control

* Several Workshops to enhance the skills of the novice or the old timer.

Some Thoughts on the “Summer of ‘99” - Giles O’Keeffe

It has certainly been an interesting summer for dispatchers in the USA. One of the more difficult tasks that many of you have faced is the problem of route selection for your flights. Due to the apparent, and rather sudden, lack of airspace over the USA this year, it has been getting more complicated for dispatchers to figure out what route to fly. Once we do figure it out, then we have to decide what, if any, remark should be added to the ATC strip: NRP, WX AVOID ZXX, or whatever. It would be nice if we could file it, and add the remark: because the dispatcher says so! In effect, that is really what every flight plan we file does say; it is the route the dispatcher wants.

NOBODY has the right to change that route, unless the dispatcher agrees, in advance, to accept the change. Remember, the dispatcher has legal responsibility for the accuracy and the safety of that route. The FAA has told us on several occasions that the dispatcher is responsible for all the safety-related stuff.
The ADF Legislative team once again headed to our nation's capitol in September to fulfill prearranged commitments with the FAA.

(see related article from Mike Harkin).

This should have been a business trip like any other. As they rushed to catch oversold flights to IAD and DCA, and were whisked through the city by impatient cab drivers to reach the hotel, one significant difference weighed heavily on their minds: There was a hurricane in progress.

Hurricane Floyd was headed towards the east coast as our Legislative Team raced through the skies in an effort to reach their destination first. By 3 a.m. that morning, as had been expected and dreaded by this team of airline dispatchers, Floyd reached landfall at Cape Fear, North Carolina, just over 200 miles south of their location.

By first light, every television station in the area was broadcasting closed facilities due to the pending hurricane headed towards them, and yes, the federal government closed as well.

As the team hailed a cab for their first meeting, winds were gusting in excess of 100 mph just miles away...All air traffic had been cancelled for the remainder of the day and night in and out of Washington's Regan National Airport. The Portsmouth, VA water supply system had shut down. Approximately 1 million people lost power to their homes. Rescue efforts were underway as reports of people trapped on top of houses and cars due to floodwaters poured into FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency).

The streets of the capitol were strangely free of traffic as the cab whisked along. The most hazardous moment encountered by our dispatchers happened as one of our team attempted to open the cab door, only to have it violently slammed shut by the winds. A second attempt proved more successful, and a watchful eye was kept on the smallest member of the team as her raincoat filled with wind as Floyd attempted to recreate "The Flying Nun" (as it was so noted). By 15:00 that afternoon, Floyd had tired of his rains. By 17:00, winds had fallen to 29 knots, and the ADF had survived another trip to Washington, D.C.

By first light, every television station in the area was broadcasting closed facilities due to the pending hurricane headed towards them, and yes, the federal government closed as well.

--- I don't know.
The year 1999 has proven to be a very exciting time for ADF. We have enjoyed unprecedented access to elected government officials and media exposure. The ADF governmental team has visited with the Chairman of the House Aviation sub-committee, the majority leader of the Senate, various FAA officials, and NTSB officials. By all measures, we have succeeded in placing the ADF in a respected position within the industry and as a group whose viewpoints are sought on a variety of issues.

Additionally, ADF President Steve Caisse testified before the House Aviation sub-committee this summer on a host of issues that further solidified the ADF as a leader in the aviation community.

The ADF continues to work with members of the media on a variety of topics. We expect articles in the near future that will not only highlight our profession, but will explain in detail our role within the nations' airways.

Crew on 737-200 Accident Aircraft Did Not Lower Flaps

Crash investigators in Argentina are focusing on lack of flap deployment before the takeoff roll and slow pilot reaction to alarms that alerted them to the problem involving the Aug. 31, 1999 crash of a LAPA 737 in Buenos Aires. Argentinean investigators quoted in the Buenos Aires daily Clarin say the flight data recorder clearly shows that flaps were not deployed.

Alarms sounded at the start of takeoff, and the pilots did not abort until 46 seconds later, well after rotation speed and after they could stop the aircraft. After the Captain questioned whether the 737's trim was correct, the co-pilot called out the V1 and V2 decision speeds, which indicate the aircraft was at the calculated lift-off speed.

But the 737 did not lift off, possibly because of lack of flap deployment. Afterward, the engines were throttled back and the cockpit voice recorder reveals sounds of impact as the 737 left the end of the runway. Investigators say there is no evidence of engine failure noted so far in the investigation which is continuing.

Popular ADDS Meteorological Web Site Updated

A DDS - Aviation Digital Data Service (adds.awc.kc.noaa.gov) Development continued over the summer on the very popular and useful ADDS web site.

Most of the development team's work has centered on designing and creating a Java applet that allows a user to click a series of points on a map and obtain a "cross-section" of data for the chosen flight route. Data to be viewed include temperature, humidity, and winds as well as the latest products (funded by the FAA's Aviation Weather Research program) of Icing and Turbulence. This Java applet and other enhancements will be demonstrated at the ADF's Annual Symposium in Daytona Beach, Florida this coming October.

The ADDS team has deployed a prototype to their Beta testers now and expect to have it fully available to all by the end of this month and advertised from the ADDS front page. "We'll give a nice tutorial to those interested next month in DAB," said Mr. Greg Thompson, Webmaster of the ADDS site.
None of the ARAC Issues Committees of primary interest to ADF members has met in the last six months. The August meeting of the ARAC Executive Board was cancelled due to lack of agenda, as was the May meeting. Hopefully we will get to meet the new Director of the FAA Office of Rulemaking at the November 1999 meeting. While many operational type issues are currently being addressed by other FAA advisory groups or internally by the FAA, ARAC remains active in the manufacturing and certification issues areas.

The new Dispatcher Certification Rule continues to wind its way through the maze at 800 Independence Avenue. Currently the FAA hopes to have the final rule published in December 1999 or early in the year 2000. The Fuel Planning and Management Advisory Circular has once again been bumped out of the list of current priorities and is again on hold as FAA resources are devoted to other priorities.

Other items of interest reportedly being discussed at the FAA include...... A 1977 FAA Legal Interpretation on the requirement for rapid and reliable communications requires just that... Direct pilot dispatcher communication in four minutes or less. A 1964 FAA Legal Interpretation on the issue of rapid and reliable communications that indicates that the rule is based on "normal conditions" but not an absolute rule applying to every (emergency) condition.

The Interpretation does indicate that the current state of the art in available communications must be a determining factor in the application of this FAR. The FAA Draft Policy for approval of service providers of internet weather for aviation use including air carrier operations has been completed. Discussion indicates that after final policy approval, providers would be certified as an approved source using the policy and then each carrier POI would include authorization of specific approved providers in the carriers operations specifications upon application by the carrier. As always, this is not official until its final......if then.

This Notice To Airmen deals with airspace near Smyrna, Del.:

"EFFECTIVE SEP. 23 2200 UTC UNTIL SEP. 24 1100 UTC 1999. TEMPORARY FLIGHT RESTRICTIONS ARE IN EFFECT ... TO PROVIDE A SAFE ENVIRONMENT FOR PRISONER EXECUTION."

- Hmm... Safe for whom?
  And why do they need 13 hours?
MD-11 Crash Details Released by Hong Kong’s CAD

The Taiwan jetliner that crashed in Hong Kong last month attempted to land in crosswind gusts that exceeded the airline’s flight manual limits and challenged the aircraft’s limits, a crash report said on Friday.

Hong Kong’s Civil Aviation Department said in its preliminary report on the August 22 crash of the China Airlines MD-11 that cross-winds whipped up by Typhoon Sam were blowing at 28 knots, gusting up to 36 knots on the plane’s landing approach.

“The crew advised ‘runway in sight’ at around 700 feet above touchdown and were given a further wind check of 320 degrees at 28 knots, gusting to 36 knots,” the Civil Aviation Department said in the report.

“The maximum crosswind limit when landing on a wet runway noted in China Airlines Flight Operations Manual is 24 knots...The MD-11 Aircraft Flight Manual gives a maximum demonstrated crosswind limit of 35 knots,” it said.

The fiery crash that followed killed three people, but the rest of the 315 people on board miraculously survived. The report said, the McDonnell Douglas MD-11’s right engine struck the runway as the plane made a hard landing on its right main wheels. Fire immediately flared and the right wing broke off as the jetliner rolled over and ended up in an inverted position adjacent to the runway, it said.

The report did not contain information about the pilots’ cockpit conversations during the incident. The civil aviation authority said it found no evidence of wind shear at the time of the accident.

“The Hong Kong Observatory’s Windshear and Turbulence Warning System gave warnings of moderate turbulence but no wind shear alerts at the time of the accident, and there was no reports of wind shear from the pilots flying into or out of Hong Kong on that day,” it said.

During the two hours before the accident, there were four missed approaches and five diversions because of the weather, while 12 aircraft landed successfully, it said. A final report on the incident was expected to be completed within two years, the Civil Aviation Department said.

The flight data recorder and cockpit voice recorder had been analyzed by Britain’s Air Accidents Investigation Branch, while some of the plane’s wreckage, crucial to the investigation, had been sent to Boeing and the NTSB for detailed examination, the civil aviation authority said.

UCAR/COMET Aviation Safety & Airspace Performance Training; A Major Step Toward Safer Skies — Lawrence Astor

U CAR/COMET The COMET Aviation Training Alliance was formed to support the safety improvement goals of the NASA/FAA Aviation Safety Program. This program targets the national goal established by President Clinton in February 1997 of “reducing the fatal aircraft accident rate by 80% in ten years.” In this regard, the COMET Alliance’s training goal is “to produce innovative, impact-oriented, multi-media training environments targeted at pilots, controllers, and dispatchers”.

The Alliance is currently developing unique, multimedia training prototypes as the first step toward realizing a national training program. The initial goal is to evaluate the effectiveness of aviation weather/decision making training for regional airline pilots and dispatchers and for the general aviation community. This paper discusses this training initiative and pivotal project to improve pilot and dispatcher understanding and judgement. It describes the multimedia training architecture, initial weather content, and decision making scenarios being developed for evaluation. A recently completed training prototype will be demonstrated at the ADF Symposium in Daytona Beach, Florida.
The Morse Letter Concerning Acceptance of SWAP Routes

A very significant ruling was issued by the FAA in December, 1990 concerning the acceptance of SWAP routes by flight crews without the approval and concurrence of the aircraft dispatcher. This ruling, reproduced herein is especially relevant in the current ATC environment in which we are operating. This is the document reference herein in the Article by Col. Chuck Lewis. –ed.

U.S. Department of Transportation - Federal Aviation Administration
December 24, 1990
Mr. Glenn Morse
Air Transport Association of America
Eastern Regional Office
181 South Franklin Avenue, Room 601
Valley Stream, New York 11581-1190

Dear Mr. Morse,

This is in response to issue E13, Implementation of the Severe Weather Avoidance Plans, which is contained in the Northeast Corridor System Safety and Efficiency Review, Volume 1: On-Site Reviews dated June 12, 1989. The Office of Aviation Safety of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) advised our office that "The FAA General Counsel should provide the Air Transport Association with interpretation of Federal Aviation Regulation 121.663 as it pertains to this issue [Issue E13]."

Section 121.663 provides:

Each domestic and flag air carrier shall prepare a dispatch release for each flight between specific points, based on information furnished by an authorized aircraft dispatcher. The pilot in command and an authorized aircraft dispatcher shall sign the release only if they both believe that the flight can be made with safety. The aircraft dispatcher may delegate authority to sign a release for a particular flight, but he may not delegate his authority to dispatch.

The members of the flight standards team state, in Volume I of the Northeast System Safety and Efficiency Review, that issue E13, in pertinent part, is:
The Air Transport Association (ATA) also voiced concerns about [the] SWAP program implementation that results in an air carrier pilot being issued a new routing which calls for immediate departure when the aircraft is still at the gate. There appears to be a conflict with the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) which requires the air carrier’s dispatcher to be included in the rerouting discussion.

Additionally, in your supplemental letter dated April 24, 1990, you state:

In order to keep traffic moving, a revised routing is issued to the pilot. This may occur while he is number one for takeoff or at some other time during taxi to the runway.
The basic question is: During SWAP, may Air Traffic Control issue, and the pilot accept without flight dispatcher concurrence, a revised clearance with a new flight plan route in order to minimize delay and expedite the flow of traffic?

We have researched the history of FAR 121.663, but that research did not reveal any preamble language that assists in explaining the provisions in FAR 121.663. Therefore, the language of FAR 121.663 must be interpreted using the techniques of statutory construction.

A fundamental rule of statutory constructions is that regulatory language should be given its plain and ordinary meaning. The language in FAR 121.663 is clear in charging both the aircraft dispatcher and the pilot in command with the responsibility of mutually agreeing that the flight can be conducted safely. The implied intent of the regulation is to minimize judgmental errors by imposing dual responsibility for determining, at the time of dispatch, that the flight as planned be conducted safely.

Another fundamental rule of statutory construction is that a particular section of regulation should be read with other pertinent parts of that regulation and interpreted as a whole. Section 121.663 should be read in relationship with other pertinent sections in the FAR, and many of those pertinent sections are listed in your letter as "relevant FAR 121 regulations". Those pertinent sec-
tions would necessarily include weather conditions (e.g. FAR 121.599, Familiarity with weather conditions). (Flight Standards Service advises us that the weather conditions impacting the Northeast corridor that prompt implementation of SWAP are normally frontal in nature and, thereby, can be anticipated and predicted reliably.) Also, other pertinent sections that necessarily would be considered (many are listed in your letter in the specific sections discuss in this letter are not exhaustive) include fuel requirements in FAR 121.639 for domestic air carriers and in FAR 121.645 for flag and supplemental air carriers, as well as the additional factors for computing the required fuel in FAR 121.647.

Section 121.647 requires that "(d) Any other conditions that may delay landing of the aircraft" be considered in computing fuel requirements. You state in your letter that "The various FAA facilities do make SWAP routes available to the airlines. However the routes are provided with the understanding that the airlines will not file them". Therefore, with knowledge of the SWAP routes, the dispatcher and pilot in command in calculating fuel requirements would consider, among other things, reported and forecast weather and anticipated delays (i.e., diversions to SWAP routes). Therefore, if the dispatcher and pilot in command have considered the SWAP routes during their flight planning, and, if both the dispatcher and pilot in command agree that the flight can be conducted safely, and if the fuel and all other pertinent requirements of the FAR are met, then the pilot may accept a new flight plan route. However, if the SWAP routes are not considered in the flight planning, then the pilot in command must refuse the ATC clearance, appraise the dispatcher of the new routing, analyze and discuss the new route with the dispatcher, and reach a joint agreement with the dispatcher that the flight may be conducted safely.

We trust this satisfactorily answers your inquiry.

Sincerely,
Donald P. Byrne
Assistant Chief Council
Regulations and Enforcement Division

---

**Calendar of Events of Interest to Dispatchers**

**OCT. 5-7** - Cargo Facts, 5th Annual Freighter Aircraft Symposium, Sheraton Hotel and Towers, Seattle, Washington, 206-587-6537, 206-587-6540, e-mail acmg@wolfinet.com

**OCT. 10-11** - International Air Transport Association, Passenger Services ‘99 Conference and Exhibition, Central Grand Plaza Hotel, Bangkok, 44-01-81-572-4934, fax 44-01-81-572-5463, web site iata.org/events


**OCT. 13-15** - RTCA, Annual Symposium and Exhibition, Sheraton Premiere Hotel, Tysons Corner, Va., 202-833-9339, fax 202-833-9434, e-mail dclarke@rtca.org

**OCT. 14-17** - United States Pilots Association, Fall Meeting, Branson, Mo., 417-338-2225, fax 417-338-8626


Britannia Airlines 757 Overruns at Spanish Airport

Approximately 70 people were injured when a Britannia Airlines 757-200 overran while landing at Gerona, Spain in heavy rain at the northeastern Spain city on September 14, 1999. The charter flight carrying 236 passengers and nine crew from Cardiff, Wales skidded into a field at Gerona airport just before midnight local time.

The Costa Brava Tourist Board said in a statement 68 people from the plane were taken to hospitals for treatment, although most had only minor injuries. Five were kept in hospitals under observation. The pilot was unable to stop on the slippery runway and was reported to have made two passes before trying to land. An official at Britannia in London said it was too early to determine the causes of the accident. The airport director said conditions contributed to the accident but it was too early to know the exact cause. "We'll have to make a complex investigation, but with the weather conditions as they were at that moment, then possibly that's something to do with it," he said.

In-Flight Medical Conferencing—One Dispatcher’s Thoughts

Recently, some airlines have been scrutinizing all of their operating costs in order to remain competitive. One of the areas of focus has been the cost of enroute diversions due to medical emergencies. In these instances, the crew would radio in to dispatch, confer about the passenger’s medical problem, and jointly, the Pilot in command and the dispatcher would decide on a further course of action. Often times the most prudent option would be to land at the nearest suitable airport in order to provide the earliest medical attention possible. In these instances, the crew would radio in to dispatch, confer about the passenger’s medical problem, and jointly, the Pilot in command and the dispatcher would decide on a further course of action. Often times the most prudent option would be to land at the nearest suitable airport in order to provide the earliest medical attention possible.

On occasion, it would be discovered that due to limited medical knowledge, aircraft had been diverted prematurely, or unnecessarily for non-life threatening, or minor medical problems. Many of the airlines have contracted with medical consultant firms to have the ability to confer with a Doctor during a radio patch, in order to bring a qualified practitioner into the decision making process. Dispatchers, have been told that this reduces the total number of off-landings and unnecessary costs to the airlines, and reduces the number of diversions due to medical emergencies. In these instances, the crew would radio in to dispatch, confer about the passenger’s medical problem, and jointly, the Pilot in command and the dispatcher would decide on a further course of action. Often times the most prudent option would be to land at the nearest suitable airport in order to provide the earliest medical attention possible.

On occasion, it would be discovered that due to limited medical knowledge, aircraft had been diverted prematurely, or unnecessarily for non-life threatening, or minor medical problems. Many of the airlines have contracted with medical consultant firms to have the ability to confer with a Doctor during a radio patch, in order to bring a qualified practitioner into the decision making process. Dispatchers, have been told that this reduces the total number of off-landings and unnecessary costs to the airlines, and reduces the number of diversions due to medical emergencies. In these instances, the crew would radio in to dispatch, confer about the passenger’s medical problem, and jointly, the Pilot in command and the dispatcher would decide on a further course of action. Often times the most prudent option would be to land at the nearest suitable airport in order to provide the earliest medical attention possible.

On occasion, it would be discovered that due to limited medical knowledge, aircraft had been diverted prematurely, or unnecessarily for non-life threatening, or minor medical problems. Many of the airlines have contracted with medical consultant firms to have the ability to confer with a Doctor during a radio patch, in order to bring a qualified practitioner into the decision making process. Dispatchers, have been told that this reduces the total number of off-landings and unnecessary costs to the airlines, and reduces the number of diversions due to medical emergencies. In these instances, the crew would radio in to dispatch, confer about the passenger’s medical problem, and jointly, the Pilot in command and the dispatcher would decide on a further course of action. Often times the most prudent option would be to land at the nearest suitable airport in order to provide the earliest medical attention possible.

On occasion, it would be discovered that due to limited medical knowledge, aircraft had been diverted prematurely, or unnecessarily for non-life threatening, or minor medical problems. Many of the airlines have contracted with medical consultant firms to have the ability to confer with a Doctor during a radio patch, in order to bring a qualified practitioner into the decision making process. Dispatchers, have been told that this reduces the total number of off-landings and unnecessary costs to the airlines, and reduces the number of diversions due to medical emergencies. In these instances, the crew would radio in to dispatch, confer about the passenger’s medical problem, and jointly, the Pilot in command and the dispatcher would decide on a further course of action. Often times the most prudent option would be to land at the nearest suitable airport in order to provide the earliest medical attention possible.

On occasion, it would be discovered that due to limited medical knowledge, aircraft had been diverted prematurely, or unnecessarily for non-life threatening, or minor medical problems. Many of the airlines have contracted with medical consultant firms to have the ability to confer with a Doctor during a radio patch, in order to bring a qualified practitioner into the decision making process. Dispatchers, have been told that this reduces the total number of off-landings and unnecessary costs to the airlines, and reduces the number of diversions due to medical emergencies. In these instances, the crew would radio in to dispatch, confer about the passenger’s medical problem, and jointly, the Pilot in command and the dispatcher would decide on a further course of action. Often times the most prudent option would be to land at the nearest suitable airport in order to provide the earliest medical attention possible.
Hazardous Material and Dangerous Goods: Should the dispatcher know? - J.C. Creighton

Picture This: A scheduled passenger flight from Europe to the U.S. loses communications on the North Atlantic (it happens!), turns toward the Canadian Maritimes and may make an emergency landing. You are unable to contact the flight and find out from Gander that the flight is squawking 7700. You receive a call from the Maritime airport CFR asking if the flight has any type of hazardous material or goods on board (HAZMAT), and if so, what is it and where is it, and how much of it. What do you tell them if it’s your flight at your airline? I’d venture to say that most of us passenger haulers would do a couple of “aw wahs” and finally tell the truth. “I don’t know.” Should you know? Most of the box haulers that use a dispatch system and licensed aircraft dispatchers have procedures in place that require the dispatcher to be notified when hazardous material is on a flight. In fact, their dispatchers have access to the computer load information telling them where the HAZMAT is located, what it is, and in some cases, whether it will mix. Imagine small, legal quantities of the stuff in a cargo hold that gets well shaken in a gear up landing. Now maybe the mix doesn’t tolerate water or foam being sprayed on it and causes a reaction that may be worse than the landing. There was a case of a scheduled cargo flight at a northeastern airport a few years back that burned to the axles. The first call on the dispatcher’s emergency checklist was about HAZMAT on the aircraft (there was some). If this happens to your flight, you may be able to call your air freight department and get the information, provided they are open. If it’s during normal business hours there should be someone in the company to call to ask whether HAZMAT was shipped on your flight. Problem is, by the time you find them and get the information, the need may be over. How about our flight diverting into the Maritimes? Guess what? The station air freight office in Europe closed and went home after your flight departed. I guess my position is that a dispatcher should know when hazardous materials or goods are on board one of his/her flights. And it further should be a part of the dispatch release. Something as simple as “REMARKS: HAZMAT ON BOARD.” Imagine the captain when he looks at that statement on the release and finds he has no Form 917, Manifest of Dangerous Goods. Knowing the HAZMAT in on board now provides another check and balance between the dispatcher and captain. In addition, the dispatcher should have computer access to the aircraft loading information on where, what, and how much. We don’t package it and we don’t load it, but by knowing when it’s on board, we increase the safety of flight in an emergency and provide a check for the captain by putting HAZMAT information on the dispatch release. So now you know when the stuff is on board. How do you get information about it? The last thing you want is to have the 50-pound HAZMAT manual to dig in! There’s a company in Arlington, Virginia called CHEMTREC that is an information clearing house for transporting, packaging, labeling, storing, and cleaning up HAZMAT spills or accidents. CHEMTREC is a free service provided by the chemical manufacturers. If you have a problem, they’re an 800 phone call away. 24-hours a day. They have practically every chemical comp-
JetBlue Airways Receives 75 Slots at JFK

JetBlue Airways, the nation's most heavily-capitalized start-up airline applicant, was today granted exemptions from slot limitations at John F Kennedy International Airport to operate 75 take-offs or landings, to be phased in over three years.

JetBlue, which received its Department of Transportation certification on August 31, plans to commence operations in early 2000 and serve up to a dozen cities with 10 aircraft by the end of its first year of operations. JetBlue promises to offer safe, reliable, and comfortable service - with new jets, leather seats, and satellite television monitors at every seat.

The company's fleet will comprise up to 82 new Airbus A-320 aircraft valued at more than $4 billion. JetBlue's new aircraft will seat 162 passengers in a single coach cabin. The company has not yet announced its final route structure but is considering service to 44 cities: Atlanta; Boston; Burlington, VT; Canton/Akron; Charleston, SC; Chicago; Cincinnati; Cleveland; Columbia, SC; Columbus, OH; Dallas/Fort Worth; Dayton; Denver; Flint; Ft. Lauderdale; Ft. Myers; Grand Rapids, MI; Greensboro, SC; Greenville/Spartanburg; Houston; Indianapolis; Jacksonville, FL; Louisville; Memphis; Milwaukee; Minneapolis/St Paul; Nashville; New Orleans; Norfolk; Orlando; Pittsburgh; Portland, ME; Raleigh/Durham; Richmond; Rochester, NY; Salt Lake City; Savannah; Syracuse; Tampa; Washington, DC; and, West Palm Beach.

The United States Department of Transportation has certified that JetBlue Airways Corporation's management is fit, willing and able to provide scheduled air service and it has issued the company a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. This certificate will become effective when JetBlue Airways completes its Federal Aviation Administration certification process, which is currently underway.

Controllers Blame ATC Delays on the Airlines in NATCA Press Release

In the war to be the most profitable air carrier, passengers are held hostage - captives at the gate, waiting for a crack in airline's inefficient scheduling system. Their own hub and spoke system is a major source of delays. With dozens of planes simultaneously taxiing for takeoff or queuing above a metropolitan airport’s finite amount of airspace and number of runways, the laws of physics kick in. Only a handful will be able to depart or arrive at any given time. What happens to the rest? They sit and wait. However, other airline-generated factors contribute to delays as well. Padding schedules is another trick big carriers use to dupe passengers into believing their trip is progressing. Knowing the terminal areas will be jammed with planes at peak times, airlines often build a buffer into schedules, so overbooking won’t be reflected in their on-time percentages. For example, a flight from Washington to Atlanta only takes about an hour instead of the scheduled two hours.

Competition among airlines makes the problem even worse. When one airline offers a profitable flight, then the others counter with the same times. One commercial carrier claimed a loss in excess of $1 million by scheduling a departure at 12:05 p.m., rather than exactly matching the time of a competitor’s noon flight. The airlines would rather have passengers sit on the tarmac with no space to take off safely than lose money.

Airlines not only create congestion in terminal airspace and on the runways, but they also overbook the gates where planes dock. Often aircraft taxi around the concrete to deceive passengers into thinking they’re going somewhere, rather than waiting for the previous flight to clear out. Once a plane lands, (Continued on page 11)
The Boeing Next-Generation 737 family of airplanes recently received approval for 180-minute extended-range twin-engine operations (ETOPS) from the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). ETOPS provides the most direct routing between cities. With this approval, the Next-Generation 737 models are authorized to fly routes that are within three hours of adequate airports.

"By allowing airlines the ability to offer economical point-to-point service, long-range twinjets provide passengers more direct routes and shorter travel times," said John Hayhurst, 737 Programs vice president and general manager. These direct routes and shorter travel time can allow airlines to avoid large hub airports and route flying passengers more conveniently to their final destinations. To air travelers, it means more service options, greater choice in departure and arrival times, and more direct routings. ETOPS is nothing new to the Boeing 737 family. The 737-200 model was approved for 120-minute ETOPS in 1985, the 737-300/-400/-500 in 1990 and the 737/-600/-700/-800 received 120-minute ETOPS approval last year. In fact, 737 models have performed over 100,000 ETOPS flights to date.

Substantial testing was done during the development and flight-test phases of the Next-Generation 737 program, paving the way for 120-minute ETOPS approval in 1998. The airplanes entered service in early 1998. "The Next-Generation 737 airplanes are derivatives of the Classic 737s, and are powered by derivatives of the highly reliable CFM56 engines," said Hayhurst. "The increase from 120- to 180-minutes reflects the Next-Generation 737's high dispatch reliability, a fleet service history of 500,000 in-flight hours in just 20 months and high engine reliability rate."

Design improvements in the Next-Generation 737, such as new engines, a new auxiliary power unit (APU), and a new electrical system led to greater reliability and paved the way for granting 180-minute ETOPS certification.

The CFM56-7 engine type, which exclusively powers the Boeing Next-Generation 737-600/-700/-800/-900 and Boeing Business Jet models, has an engine reliability rate significantly better than required for 180-minute ETOPS. Sixty-two customers worldwide have ordered 1,198 Next-Generation 737s, with more than 300 currently in service worldwide. (Boeing Press Release)

David R. Bornemann Associates, Inc.
8133 Leesburg Pike, #500
Vienna, Virginia USA 22182
Phone (703)821-6848
Fax (703)821-3523
e-mail dbornemann@compuserve.com
or visit our website at www.drba.com

Total Flight Operations Automation

Providing Global Solutions for the World’s Airlines

✔ Schedule Planning ✔ Crew Training
✔ Crew Planning ✔ Dispatch
✔ Crew Scheduling ✔ Flight Following

Symposium Panel will Explore ATC Delays:
A highlight of this year’s ADF symposium will be a lively panel discussion on the topic of Excessive ATC delays during 1999. The panel will feature dispatchers, pilots, controllers, airline management, ATA representatives, FAA officials, TMU Management and ATCSCC personnel. Join us for a guaranteed lively and informative discussion.
ATA Calls on Government to Reduce ATC Delays

The Air Transport Association (ATA) today called on the federal government to "do its part" to improve air travel by reducing air traffic control delays. The ATA request came after major carriers provided new customer service plans with the Department of Transportation (DOT) as part of their industry-wide Customers First program.

Under an agreement reached with key members of Congress and with guidance from the Administration, airlines are undertaking a twelve-point program to improve customer service. The agreement includes two key dates: September 15, 1999, when plans were required to be filed with the DOT; and December 15, 1999, when the plans must be fully implemented. The lead time between the filing and implementation dates provides the opportunity for airline staff to receive training and address logistical details.

Congressional Sub-Committee Briefed on Wiring Issues with Older Aircraft

All aircraft wiring ages with time and it is not uncommon to find five to 10 insulation cracks per 1,000 feet of wire in active aircraft, a congressional sub-committee heard Wednesday.

An engineer who heads a company that has done testing for the National Transportation Safety Board, said the plastics insulating wire all aged, leading to problems ranging from minor troubles with instruments to fires and sometimes deaths. Wiring is becoming one of aviation's hottest safety topics, with a suspected role in two high-profile crashes in the last four years. There has also been increased research into the problem.

A Federal Aviation Administration official told a hearing of the House Transportation subcommittee that the so-called aging aircraft fleet would soon include heavily electronics-reliant aircraft of the 1980s such as the Boeing 757 and 767 and the Airbus A-300.

ADF’s Airline Delegates Are Becoming Increasingly Involved in Federation’s Nationwide Activities

Several months ago, ADF’s President announced a four-point plan to increase the involvement of ADF’s over 100 airline delegates in the organization’s activities. One of the points of this plan was to conduct an Officer-Delegate Breakfast at each of the ADF’s 4 yearly business meetings. In holding these exclusive delegate-officer breakfasts, ADF’s leadership will have the opportunity to spend 90 minutes of uninterrupted time with the delegates to discuss individually with them, questions, comments or items of concern. ADF conducted the first Officer-Delegate breakfast in Seattle last August. During the breakfast meeting, ADF’s leadership received excellent feedback from the delegates. Addressing the meeting, President Caisse commented “Our delegates know the needs of the membership better than anyone does. By listening more closely to their guidance, ADF’s leadership will be better postured to act on issues of concern to dispatchers across the country.”
Acceptance of SWAP Routes—The Legal Bottom Line— Col. Chuck Lewis

Perhaps one of the most controversial matters facing Airline Dispatchers in the performance of their duties is that of the Severe Weather Avoidance Plans (SWAP) conducted by the Air Traffic Control Central Flow Control Center. Much has been said about SWAP routes over recent years has left a lingering question in the minds of Dispatchers, “During SWAP, may Air Traffic Control issue, and the pilot accept without flight dispatcher concurrence, a revised clearance with a new flight plan route in order to minimize delay and expedite the flow of traffic?”

To find the answer to this question we need look no further than the interpretation of 121.663, by Mr. Donald P. Byrne, FAA Asst. Chief Counsel, provided to Mr. Glenn Morse, ATA Eastern Regional Office, Dated December 24, 1990.

After thorough research, Mr. Byrne very aptly and clearly addressed this issue and other relevant supportive issues. In his findings, Mr. Byrne pointed out: 1) The need for consideration of not only the section of 14 CFR in question, but of other pertinent sections of 14 CFR and to interpret them as a whole. This is a requisite to understand and properly interpret any section of 14 CFR. 2) 14 CFR 121.663 is clear in charging the PIC and Dispatcher with the “joint responsibility” of the operational control over the flight. “Operational Control” is defined in 14 CFR 1.1 as: the exercise of authority over initiating, conducting or terminating a flight. The exercise of which necessarily includes consideration of reported, forecast or anticipated weather conditions, fuel requirements, aircraft airworthiness, known and or anticipated ATC delays (i.e., diversions to SWAP routes), etc. 3) If the PIC and Dispatcher considered the SWAP Routes in addition to all other required factors during their flight planning, and they mutually agree that the flight can be conducted safely, then the PIC may accept the SWAP Route. However, if the SWAP Routes are not considered in the flight planning, then the PIC MUST refuse the ATC clearance, appraise the Dispatcher of the new routing, analyze and discuss the new route with the dispatcher and seek his concurrence that the along that route, may be conducted safely and in compliance with all sections of 14 CFR. If in the opinion of either the PIC or Dispatcher, the flight cannot be conducted safely along the proposed SWAP Route, the PIC and Dispatcher MUST refuse the ATC clearance.

In reviewing Mr. Byrne’s interpretation, the answer to the question is very clearly, “NO.” emphasis added. Dispatcher concurrence is required prior to acceptance of an ATC SWAP Route. To expand on this matter further, I offer a more common problem occurring of late. That being an ATC Reroute while the flight is en-route (airborne). The question then becomes: May the PIC, without the Dispatcher’s concurrence, accept a route different from the planned and filed routing on which the flight was originally released?

Before I attempt to answer this question, I would like to say a few lines of relative importance to provide a clearer understanding of the “Flight Operation / ATC System.” Speaking as an experienced Air Traffic Controller, Commercial Pilot and Aircraft Dispatcher, I must say that, just as with Pilots and Dispatchers, Controllers need a certain degree of latitude in performing their duties. The ATC system cannot become locked into specific routings whereby it is impossible to maintain aircraft separation standards and operating efficiency. That is why the filing of a flight plan with ATC is merely a request for a specific route and altitude. Although, dependent on a number of factors, ATC will do all possible to accommodate the requested route, there are no guarantees that your flight will receive a clearance over the filed routing. Further, in operating the aircraft, the PIC also exercises his latitude in maneuvering the aircraft in the best interest of safety. The PIC cannot be expected to continuously request the concurrence of the Dispatcher for every change in heading, altitude or airspeed. There simply would not be enough time to do so while blazing a trail through the skies at speeds of M.82 (460 KTS).

As you know, the Dispatcher exercises his latitude in determining the best route of flight, based on the aforementioned factors and cannot legally file and release a flight into known, forecast, or reasonably anticipated severe weather conditions, no matter how much the other parties may want it. Contrary to a misconception between Pilot and ATC groups, the PIC / Dispatcher “joint authority, joint responsibility” does not stop after push-back. Rather, it is continuous from preflight planning to block-in inclusive. The Dispatcher must monitor the flight while enroute and take any actions necessary in the interest of safety.

Let’s now turn to answer the question at hand. May the PIC, without the Dispatcher’s concurrence, accept a route different from the planned and filed routing on which the flight was originally released? The answer is necessarily dependent on the factors involved in that particular flight operation at the time. Following a properly fueled dispatch and take off, the requirement to maintain adequate enroute reserves of fuel is imposed upon the pilot-in-command and the dispatcher, by the provisions of sections 121.627(a) and 121.557. Under the provisions of section 121.627(a), the pilot in command may not allow a flight to continue to an airport to which it is dispatched if, in the opinion of the pilot in command or dispatcher, the flight cannot be completed safely. 121.557(a) authorizes the PIC to deviate from the conditions of the dispatch release to the extent necessary for safety in an emergency. When the PIC exercises this authority, FAR 121.557(c) requires that the PIC keep both ATC and the aircraft dispatcher fully informed of the progress of the flight. In that event, continuation of flight would be considered use of “emergency authority” under 121.557. FAR 121.557(c) requires that when emergency authority is exercised, a written report be forwarded to the administrator (POI), through the director of operations, within 10 working days. (Continued on page 14)
Greetings! ADF members!

I would like to take a minute and tell everyone about CDM and some of its programs. But first I encourage everyone to find out about CDM and how to participate. CDM is open to all airlines and you participation is welcome and needed.

The date for the next general meeting is October 13 and 14th at TRW FairLakes in Northern Virginia near Dulles airport. How do you participate? Simple, start showing up and become involved in the process.

CDM is a unique program as it is allows AOC types (real dispatchers) to help shape the future of Free Flight by working in concert with the FAA and DOT to find solutions for today and tomorrow’s traffic flow management problems. Sound exciting? CDM needs your help and participation in shaping the future.

CDM is comprised of three core technologies, GDP-E, CR-Collaborative Routing and NAS status

- Ground Delay Enhancement

GDP-E Enhanced Ground Delay Programs are based on information sharing that gives FAA traffic managers and participating airlines a dynamic picture of air traffic in order to more efficiently manage constrained airport resources and reduce delays.

GDP-E is currently in prototype operations and is scheduled to go into full production on January 1.

- Collaborative Routing

CR-Collaborative Routing is about shared decision-making and distributed airspace planning. This process will enhance safety and make efficient use of constrained enroute airspace resources. AOCs will help manage airspace constrains due to traffic congestion and severe weather events.

- NAS Status Information

CDM has identified data elements that are critical to the safety of flight. Some of the items include weather data, braking action, field conditions just to name a few. Currently this information resides in many different locations and NAS Status’s goal is to identify and compile this information resource so it can be made available to the AOC's and FAA in real time through a central data repository.

In conclusion, CDM is about applied technologies, scientific research, and problem solving to find new ways to help solve traffic flow management problems.

Let’s face it, more and more aircraft are being deployed and the skies are becoming increasingly congested. This is your opportunity to be part of the solution.

ADF has been actively involved in all phases of CDM development, however we need more participants as the vital program continues to grow and mature. Please visit the CDM web page:

http://www.metsci.com/cdm/

for more information.

Mike Baker
Southwest Airlines
CDM-Industry co-chair
michael_s_baker@yahoo.com
214-792-6395

CDM is a unique program as it allows AOC types (real dispatchers) to help shape the future of Free Flight by working in concert with the FAA and DOT to find solutions for today and tomorrow’s traffic flow management problems.

(Continued from page 13)

Therefore, absent an “emergency” condition, if the new routing issued by ATC would result in a fuel burn higher than originally planned, or the proposed route would require the flight to penetrate areas of known, forecast or reasonably anticipated severe weather, the PIC MUST inform the dispatcher of the changed routing and seek his concurrence that the flight along that new route can be conducted safely, in accordance with all parts of 14 CFR, and receive from the dispatcher appropriate amendment(s) to the Dispatch Release.

When heavy payloads are carried aboard an aircraft, the fuel load may have to be limited. In addition, the weight at which an aircraft can be released is limited by takeoff, enroute terrain clearance, and landing performance limitations. If due to such reasons, the flight is fuel critical and cannot accept any deviation from the planned route of flight, the Dispatcher should make an applicable notation in the remarks section of the Dispatch Release to include the need for immediate notification should ATC change the routing. If the situation would allow additional fuel to be carried aboard the aircraft (Contingency Fuel) to address anticipated ATC reroutes, then the flight should be planned and fueled accordingly.”
ADF continues to work with various government agencies to move quickly to require all United States based charter and supplemental airlines utilizing passenger aircraft with 10 seats or more and all United States based cargo airlines flying aircraft with maximum gross weights over 20,000 pounds to fully comply with the principles of the "Single Level of Safety" program and as defined in FAR Part 121, including the requirement for positive operational control under the authority of licensed aircraft dispatchers. As ADF participates in meeting concerning the need to apply the Regulations of FAR Part 121 Domestic/Flag to Supplemental Operators, we are often told to; "Show us the accidents that indicate this regulation additional regulation is necessary." With numerous regulatory issue under consideration, the FAA must evaluate the relative need of each action and decide which rules need to be enacted. It was a string of commuter aircraft accidents in the early and mid 1990's which lead to the application of the "Single Level of Safety" to the Part 135 operators. The public outcry following these accidents forced the FAA to act swiftly. ADF believes that the questions being asked are indeed valid. Sadly, there have been a string of accidents that ADF believes do demonstrate the need for positive operational control in the Supplemental world. In response to the "Show us the Accidents" request, "ADF will begin to examine notable air carrier accidents where we feel that a system of positive operational control and joint responsibility could would have made a difference. While some of the accidents we will examine may involved individuals functioning in flight following/dispatch roles, none of the accidents involved the true joint responsibility and accountable of the Dispatcher/Pilot In Command relationship as it exists in the FAR Part 121 world.

On March 31, 1993, an Evergreen International Boeing 747-121 was cleared for takeoff from the Anchorage International Airport. In issuing the takeoff clearance, the tower stated; "Previous departure reported SEVERE turbulence on climb out...". Shortly after takeoff from anchorage, the airplane flew into an area of severe turbulence, while climbing through an altitude of about 2000 feet. The number 2 engine and engine pylon separated from the airplane. The flight crew declared an emergency and the flight return to anchorage, where an uneventful landing was accomplished. The investigation revealed that a strong easterly wind interacted with mountains east of anchorage, which produced mountain wave activity. The aircraft encountered severe or possibly extreme turbulence. There was evidence that this resulted in dynamic multi-axis lateral loadings that exceeded the ultimate lateral load-carrying capability of the number 2 engine pylon, which had already been reduced by the presence of a fatigue crack near the forward end of the pylon's forward firewall web.

NTSB Probable cause
"The lateral separation of the no. 2 engine pylon due to an encounter with severe or possibly extreme turbulence that resulted in dynamic multi-axis lateral loadings that exceeded the ultimate lateral load-carrying capability of the pylon, which was already reduced by the presence of the fatigue crack near the forward end of the pylon's forward firewall web".

While the NTSB seemed to miss the point, dispatchers will recognize that commencing takeoff with reported severe turbulence on climb out is a situation of non-compliance with several FAR's. Everyday, dispatchers delay, divert or cancel flights to avoid severe turbulence. No doubt in this example, a system of positive operational control would have stopped this departure from ever occurring. Time and time again, it has been shown that the team of pilot and dispatcher make the best decisions, In this case, the captain, acting alone, obviously did not make the best or safest decision based on the outcome.

Airline Dispatcher Career Training
FAA Aircraft Dispatcher License - 6 Weeks
S2795 Complete - Includes FAA Exam Fees & ETOPS Training Course
Course Tuition Financing is available! Day & Evening Classes
E-Mail:info@airlinedispatcher.com
or airdisp@flash.net

Internet: airlinedispatcher.com
Tel +1 817 281 2290, 24 Hr Fax Line +1 817 281 1190

Call or fax us now for information and a brochure on this challenging airline career!

Airline Flight Dispatcher Training Center

"World Leader in Airline Dispatcher Training"
900 Airport Freeway, Suite 138, Hurst, Texas 76054 USA
(Paid Advertisement)
On September 16, ADF President Steve Caisse along with Mike Harkin, Michelle Duquette, and Norm Joseph, attended meetings with FAA senior management, to address some long standing issues important to the ADF and the Dispatch profession. The first meeting was with Acting Associate Administrator for Air Traffic Services Steve Brown (Acting ATS1) and Peter Challen, Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Air Traffic Services (Acting ATS2). The ADF suggested this meeting to introduce us to the new leadership of Air Traffic Services and to offer the ADF’s expertise as the FAA looks for ways to resolve the current airspace difficulties. While the current airspace problems are obvious to even the least informed consumer, solutions to the problems would require experience and creativity that go beyond the obvious. The facts are that passenger traffic and aircraft acquisitions are going to continue to rise. The introduction of regional jets has changed the dynamics of higher altitude traffic management. New ATC technologies will have foreseeable long-term benefits but will have short-term transitional pains. While these factors add additional burdens to an already taxed system there are no real short-term prospects that will increase airport capacity. New airports or additional runways at existing airports cannot be built fast enough to solve these capacity issues. While the ADF team expressed its unwavering support for the goals and efforts to achieve the goals of Collaborative Decision Making, Collaborative Routing, and NAS status working groups, it is apparent that these efforts alone will not go far or fast enough to fully address the probable delays and schedule disruptions we all expect this coming winter and next year. If the summer of 1999 is any indication, an immovable high-pressure system covers the U.S. for the next 12 months, delays will continue to reach record highs. What was communicated to the senior management of Air Traffic Services was a simple first step to a very complex task. People need to communicate and work together. The front line Dispatchers and air carrier ATC coordinators (at those carriers utilizing that position), need to ensure a better understanding of their operational needs, roles, and regulatory responsibilities by Air Traffic Controllers, and Traffic Managers. Air Traffic Controllers need to ensure a better understanding of their operational needs, roles, and regulatory responsibilities by Dispatchers and Traffic Managers, and so on. Then we need to combine our efforts on short-term solutions and even experiment with new ideas on the daily operational levels as long as safety is never compromised. All members of this air traffic systems control “triad” search for solutions on a daily basis to benefit their carrier, sector flow, or terminal arrival/departure rate, but these efforts have never been discussed formally amongst representatives from the front lines. We recommended to Mr. Brown and Mr. Challen that a working meeting with members of the ADF, NATCA, and Traffic Management, supported by the FAA and ATA would open a much needed dialog and problem solving effort. This effort would be towards tactical solutions and not in conflict with the strategic efforts in place now. If nothing workable comes from this effort except a new regard for each parties roles, it would be an effort well worth making.

The next meeting attended that day was with Margaret Gilligan, Deputy Associate Administrator of Regulation and Certification (AVR2) and Nick Lacy, Director of Flight Standards (AFS10). This meeting was held at the request of Administrator Jane Garvey in response to an ADF request to discuss the status of our current focus issues. One of these being the FAA to mandate FAR 121 Domestic and/or Flag rules compliance by All Cargo and On Demand charter operators, also commonly referred to as “Single Level of Safety”. The second item was the establishment within the FAA of the positions of Principe Dispatch Inspectors. Both of these items had been discussed with others within the Administration and also Congress so Mrs. Gilligan and Mr. Lacy were familiar with the issues and our position, but this gave both sides the opportunity to discuss then in-depth. With regards to “Single Level of Safety” the FAA’s position is one of priorities. Any rule change initiated by the FAA requires a resource commitment that draws from other endeavors. They presently have other initiatives that at this time they feel have a higher priority. That does not mean that our position on the issue doesn’t have merit or will never be considered. What this does mean is that it is incumbent upon the ADF or other party to prove to the FAA that “Single Level of Safety” will have a more positive impact on aviation safety than others on a long list of initiatives, as to warrant the utilization of limited resources. They may also have to research the issue if the Congress eventually passes an FAA re-authorization bill which so far includes language which calls upon the FAA to study the role of the Aircraft Dispatcher and those carriers not presently required to have them under FAR Supplemental rules. The issue of dedicated Dispatch inspectors is one of philosophy and best use of assets. It is the opinion of the FAA that additional training of POI and air carrier inspector personnel through Dispatch licensing and training will benefit Dispatch, AOC, and certification best. The ADF’s position is that experienced Aircraft Dispatchers in eight regional offices and one at FAA HQ can better serve the FAA and the air carriers safety interests by taking the burden of Dispatch inspection off the POI’s shoulders. This will provide a greater consistency on the national level by having regional inspectors share information, develop certification standards and criteria, and giving experienced direction to air carriers which will elevate their professional standards through education. In the long run it would also reflect sound fiscal common sense by not requiring training for numerous individuals in order to support a system in which one experienced individual can accomplish more than five minimally qualified people and produce better results on behalf of aviation safety. The ADF’s legislative and FAA policy focus is an ongoing process in which we learn as much as the education we provide. It is our hope that these efforts will bring the role of the Aircraft Dispatcher and the benefits of Positive Operational Control to those in a position to directly effect our profession. It is also our desire leave all the people we meet with a sense that the ADF is truly an organization with one agenda and one agenda only, AVIATION SAFETY. We are pleased to say that we were successful in that pursuit.
QUALIFY FOR THE TOP FAA LICENSED AIRLINE JOB IN SIX WEEKS!
AIRCRAFT DISPATCHER

The Aircraft Dispatcher, sometimes referred to as the Flight Operations Officer or Flight Superintendent, is one of the most responsible and best paying careers in the airline industry. As "the captain on the ground", the Aircraft Dispatcher shares responsibility with the pilot-in-command in planning the safe and expeditious operation of the flight. Sheffield School is the world's oldest and most reputable FAA Approved Aircraft Dispatcher School. Established in 1948.

- Highest Job Placement in the industry
- Computerized training using Jeppesen's weather and flight planning systems
- Furnished apartments (not motel rooms) within walking distance of the school
- Full-time aviation educators (not part-time instructors)
- No "hidden charges" for books, exam fees, additional tutoring, or taxes

Delta, TWA, FedEx, UPS, GM, Ford, United Technologies, Gulfstream Aircraft Corp., Mobil Oil, Saudi Arabian Airlines, Aramco, FAA, Canadian Ministry of Transportation, and many others have used Sheffield School for Aircraft Dispatcher training for one reason - - Quality and Service.

What Our Graduates Say . . .

- "I was recently hired as a dispatcher in Philadelphia. I owe it all to Sheffield...having your name on my resume is what gave me the edge over the other applicants." - R.L., Bensalem PA
- "When I first decided to go to Sheffield I had no idea of your commitment to quality or to your graduates...I continue to be most grateful!" - D.T., Indianapolis IN
- "Who would have thought that after six weeks of intensive training at Sheffield, I would be in a well-paying field where I am always in demand?" - R.C., Sugarland TX

The ADF video "Night Approach to JFK".

A behind-the-scenes view of a day in the life of "the invisible airmen" who are FAA licensed as aircraft dispatchers. Our 20 minute presentation transports you through time...a glimpse of our embryonic state 60 years ago, dispatching the U.S. Mail and a few passengers to the present.

We are privy to the pre-flight planning and execution of our ADF Flight 121 by the two professionals, Dispatcher and Captain, who are jointly responsible for the safe conduct of every scheduled U.S. flight operating in domestic or international airspace worldwide.

ONLY $10.00 plus $3.00 s/h. CALL 800-OPEN-CNTL to order.

1999 ADF Annual Symposium
Daytona Beach, Florida
October 18-20, 1999

ADF Business Meeting and Receptions this year will be hosted by Embry Riddle Aeronautical University.

The Symposium "base hotel" will be the Adam's Mark Hotel, located directly on the beach. ADF has negotiated a special rate of $75 per night. Ask for the ADF Rate when you call. Call the hotel direct at 904-254-8200 for reservations.

More details concerning the Symposium will be forthcoming throughout the year on the ADF web site. (www.dispatcher.org)

If you are interested in speaking, attending or being a sponsor, please contact us at: ADF@valuweb.com
ADF Participates in ATPAC Meetings - Frank Hashek

The Air Traffic Advisory Committee (ATPAC) is sponsored by the FAA and has been meeting quarterly since 1975. As such, it is the FAA’s longest running advisory committee. ATPAC is composed of representatives of the FAA and delegates from member organizations. There are presently nearly 20 member organizations representing various sectors of the aviation community. This includes ATC union and management organizations, Pilot unions, user groups (AOPA, NBAA and others), NASA and the military.

Up until recently, there had been no representation for Dispatchers on this committee. ATPAC was chartered with the following responsibilities:

1) Review present air traffic control procedures and practices
2) Analyze new or significantly revised procedures
3) Review the adequacy of charts, diagrams and illustrations and their relevance to current, revised, or proposed procedures and concepts
4) Identify FARs that have an impact on present, new or significantly revised air traffic control procedures

ATPAC meetings are held quarterly for 4 days. On an alternating basis, two meetings annually are held at FAA headquarters in Washington, DC and two are held in the field.

ATPAC members may submit Areas of Concern (AOCs). ATPAC discusses the AOCs and if deemed appropriate makes recommendations for standardizing, clarifying and upgrading terminology and procedures. ATPAC is chartered to act in a solely advisory capacity to the FAA.

The FAA then acts on the suggestion, either giving reasoning for maintaining the status quo or presenting a Document Change Proposal (DCP).

AOCs designated as Safety Items are given priority.

All AOCs are reviewed at each meeting and the status is updated as one of the following:

1) Action completed
2) Deferred, pending
3) Withdrawn

The Executive Director of ATPAC is Eric Harrell, FAA Manager of En Route/Terminal Operations and Procedures Division. He has additional support staff from other areas in the FAA. The Chairperson is elected by the ATPAC members and presently is the AOPA delegate.

There were over 30 existing AOCs, and 3 new AOCs on the agenda at the July meeting. Some of the items discussed included: LAHSO, the International Automation Interface, Local NOTAM dissemination and availability, RVR reporting on METARs, a military request for an unlimited exemption for night time no-lights operation in MOAs, runway incursions and numerous other topics.

The ADF has an opportunity for input into the ATPAC process through membership on the committee. We can bring concerns to the committee for action. We have the opportunity to work and network with other leaders of the aviation community to support the concerns of Dispatchers.

ADF Participates in ATPAC Meetings - Frank Hashek

Send Email to the entire ADF Executive Board at once when you use the following Email Address:

ADF@valuweb.com
Unveiled: World's First Practical Individual Vertical Take-Off and Landing Aircraft

SANTA CLARA, CALIF. -- For thousands of years, people have dreamed of flying free like a bird with the wind in one's face. Now Millennium Jet, Inc. aerospace company is making this dream a reality, by developing the world's first practical open-air individual vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) aircraft. Serious applications exist for commercial, consumer, military, and paramilitary uses. Named SoloTrek™ Exo-Skeleton Flying Vehicle (XFV)™, it will transport an individual in a standing position for up to one and a half hours before refueling. Running on ordinary automobile gasoline, this aircraft will travel efficiently and quietly up to 80 miles per hour. SoloTrek XFV will also easily operate out of extremely confined spaces. Preliminary flight testing is scheduled for the second half of 1999. "SoloTrek XFV will become an essential tool in a variety of fields," explains Michael Moshier, founder and CEO of Millennium Jet. Previously recognized for earlier VTOL aircraft designs, Moshier is a former Navy jet air-craft combat pilot who brings over a decade of corporate leadership experience. "Planet-wide applications are vast, including uses in search and rescue, police departments, disaster response, recreation, commuting, developing countries, and more." Incorporated in Santa Clara, California in 1996, Millennium Jet is a privately held and funded company. It designs and develops small manned and unmanned VTOL aircraft. To learn more about SoloTrek XFV, visit www.solotrek.com.

This web site explains the technology, significance, history, executive biographies, frequently asked questions, employment opportunities, and more related to SoloTrek XFV.

Did you know that on average, an aircraft dispatcher will be responsible for more passengers and operate more flights in 4 years, than an average airline pilot will during an entire 30-year career?

Would you like to be a member of the Airline Dispatchers Federation?

Membership is open to all licensed Aircraft Dispatchers and Flight Operations Officers around the world. Simply complete the following and mail it with your check to the address at the bottom.

Name ________________________________ Airline Affiliation ________________________________

Address ________________________________ Apt. __________________________

City __________________________ State ______ Zip ______ E-mail__________ Phone_______________

☐ New Member ☐ Renew My Membership

ADF dues are $40.00 US per calendar year plus a one time initiation fee of $5.00 US ($10.00 will be passed on to IFALDA). Dues for individuals with NO airline affiliation are $25.00 US plus the $5.00 initiation fee. Please make your check payable to ADF and mail it to ADF Membership Service Center 700 13TH St. NW, Suite 950 Washington DC, 20005 USA. If you have any questions call Membership Services at 1-800-OPN-CNTL. Or complete the membership form on the ADF web site and mail to ADF! You can find it at www.dispatcher.org!

Would YOU Like to be More Active in the Airline Dispatchers Federation?

Elections for Officers will be held again this year at the Symposium at Daytona Beach in October. If you, or someone you know that is a member of ADF would like to be considered for one of the open executive positions simply tell your delegate or notify ADF yourself. The following positions will be up for election this year.

President

Vice President Operations

Treasurer

Vice President Administration
Airline Dispatchers Federation  
700 13th St. NW, Suite 950  
Washington D.C. 20005

Phone: 1-800-OPN-CNTL  
Email: ADF@valuweb.com

“Safety - Professionalism”

“Keeping the Dispatch Profession Informed”

Worldwide Dispatch Summit 2000

The Airline Dispatchers Federation (ADF), the European Federation of Airline Dispatchers’ Associations (EUFALDA) and the International Federation of Airline Dispatchers’ Associations (including IFALDA-Latin America) (IFALDA) announce that the world’s first joint meeting of the three professional associations representing the world’s dispatch and operational control professionals will be held in Chicago, Illinois, USA on May 14, 15, 16, 2000. The event has been titled “Worldwide Dispatch Summit 2000”. Make plans now to attend this once in a lifetime opportunity to meet with your fellow operational control professionals from around the world. Check the ADF web site for more information coming soon.

ADF Introduces a new Symposium Session for New and Soon-To-Be Dispatchers

This year’s Symposium in Daytona Beach, Florida will offer many levels of technology, concept and theory to our highly professional membership. And with the aviation volume expanding at the forecasted rate of 2-3% per year, the ADF is sensitive to the fact that there will be many new dispatchers evolving in our midst, as well as those curious about this critical role as they, for a myriad of reasons, join the civilian aviation world looking for positions other than that of pilot or mechanic.

To address this growing interest, the Airline Dispatcher’s Federation will provide a new type of session at this year’s Symposium being held at the Adam’s Mark Resort on October 18th-20th: "Operational Control - The role of the Aircraft Dispatcher".

This particular session will be geared towards those individuals just entering the profession who as of yet have only basic knowledge of their vital role as they exercise Operational Control for their airline. It will also be addressing those interested individuals who are looking to expand their careers as aircraft dispatchers.

The format will be very informal, with a brief presentation to begin the session followed by a question and answer forum. If you are thinking of attending the Symposium but were concerned because either you just became certified (congratulations!) or you aren’t yet an aircraft dispatcher but would like to know more about the possibility, here is your invitation to attend a session that is just for you!

Let this year’s Symposium be the one that allows you to take that first step towards becoming a true professional within the world of Aircraft Dispatching. Come join us in Daytona Beach, meet others who share your interests and concerns, expose yourself to the possibilities of your future, and interact with consummate professionals who form the elite top of class within the profession. Don’t hesitate!

ADF’s MISSION

To foster a global understanding of the nature and benefits of Positive Operational Control.

To advance aviation safety and efficiency by enhancing the professional standards of individual Dispatchers and the organizations within which they exercise Operational Control.

Take that first step towards one of the most rewarding careers in Aviation, and do it with the knowledge that we at the ADF are always there to answer any questions, provide guidance and support, and insure the role of the Aircraft Dispatcher maintains the integrity the profession demands.

There will be a sign up list at the registration tables for all sessions, or to secure a seat for this session now, email Michelle at michelle@aella.com.

Keep in mind there may be limited seating, so the best time to act is NOW! Hope to see you there!

- Michelle Duquette

Visit the ADF Web Site at www.dispatcher.org