

258082

FAA 02-12261-100

DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION  
1002516

October 8, 2003

2003 OCT 29 P 12:51

Docket Management System  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Room Plaza 401  
400 Seventh Street, SW.  
Washington, DC 20590-0001

Re: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), Docket No. Docket No. **FAA-2002-12261**; Notice No. 02-09, Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum in Domestic United States Airspace

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing in response to the NPRM mentioned above and wish to have my input on record as well on this matter. As I understand the purpose of Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum in Domestic United States airspace is to increase the overall availability of flight routes between flight levels 290 and 410 inclusive. After reading through the NPRM I have come up with several questions and concerns that have been brought out by several other persons or organizations in response to this NPRM.

First with the increase in air traffic where are all of these additional airplanes going to land?

Most of the major airports in the U.S. are over crowded now resulting in longer wait times in the terminals and on the plane setting on the ramp waiting for take off. Let alone the wait in flight for room and time to receive clearance for landing. Even with the smaller charter and corporate aircraft being routed to reliever airports this will simply increase the congestion for the often-limited space at these as well. Second is how far along has the avionics industry come in developing RVSM packages for all the smaller private and corporate jets that can fly at the flight levels covered by RVSM yet now will not be authorized to do so until the owners and operators can equip all of them. Are some of the older, yet still serviceable jets, such as the Learjet 25D

Docket Management

Docket No. FAA-2002-12261 DRVSM page 2

going to be forced out of service? If so then the cost to that owner/operator is not going to be limited to a mere \$175,000 to \$250,000 dollars to upgrade an avionics system it is going to be the cost of a new (er) more costly aircraft or forbid the thought that this operation may have to close their doors all together. These dollar costs were a range obtained from, JetCorp of Chesterfield, Mo, Worldwide Aircraft Services of Springfield, MO, and Bombardier Aerospace of Chesterfield, MO. My final question has to do with the authorization for aircraft to use the new RVSM. Are all the rules for international and overseas routing going to apply to those aircraft that only fly domestically in the airspace controlled by the FAA and the air traffic controllers here in the U.S.? Along this consideration are the pilots flying these domestic flights going to need to learn all of the ICAO and JAA flight rules that are in part a reflection of what is in 14 CFR 91.180, part 91, subpart B (flight rules), and part 91 appendix G?

I see the need for the Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum in Domestic United States Airspace; however, it seems that some of the original equipment manufactures (OEMs) have not developed systems that can be retrofitted into all of the aircraft that are in service now that could and do fly at the FLs above 290. Leaving some owners and operators needing to expend more than just the cost to add the necessary newer technology to their aircraft. If an effort to accommodate all aircraft were in the works then this NPRM would be more cost effective for all who will be involved and affected by its implementation. Also if there were a phase in process over say a five year time frame then more companies would be able to pro-rate their cost into their aircraft's maintenance cycles when doing annuals and other phase maintenance times. These may not be something that the larger commercial airlines are faced with in that much of their fleets are on track with these Collision Avoidance Systems with Traffic Alert and

Docket Management

Docket No. FAA-2002-12261 DRVSM page 3

Resolution Advisory warnings, global positioning systems (GPS) and other monitoring equipment mandated by the revisions of 14 CFR Part 91 and its many subparts and appendices.

It is my hopes that this matter will be looked at more form the small corporate business and the undo financial stress many of these companies and individuals have already alerted you about that this NPRM will impose on them.

One fear that I have heard from several is that in time these requirements will filter down to more and more of the general aviation aircraft and pilots making it almost cost prohibitive for the private pilot to enjoy the use of his own airplane.

I would like to say thank you for taking the time to read and consider my input on this matter.

Although I know this is a necessity for the growth of civil and general aviation as a whole I feel that more time and reasonable expectations are needed to allow for the completion of the requirements for this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kenneth D. Faught". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "K".

Kenneth D. Faught