



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Memorandum

AIRPORTS DISTRICT OFFICE
9677 Tradeport Drive
Suite 130
Orlando, FL 32827

Subject: Minority Report on FAA Aviation System
Panel

Date: MAY 1 1990

From: Manager, Airports District Office,
Orlando, FL (Panel Member)

Reply to
Attn. of:

To: Administrator, AOA-1
THRU: Manager, Airports Division, ASO-600
Assistant Administrator for Airports, ARP-1

For unexplained reasons, certain FAA officials have been trying to rename the Wayports Concept since January 1989. This is to respectfully advise and caution that attempts to discredit Wayports by inaccurate definition and misrepresentation in order to allow endorsement of a similar but renamed concept would be a mistake. This issue has been raised a number of times in my reports to the panel and the attached June 16, 1989, letter is an example.

Documentation will show that long before the FAA panel on National Aviation System Policy was formed, the Wayports Concept was defined as follows:

a. Wayports serve all types of passengers including international, intercontinental, connecting/transfer, origin destination, short-haul commuters and charter.

b. Wayports serve next generation aircraft described as the hypersonic, subsonic, Orient Express, 1,000-passenger airliners, million-pound cargo airlifters, short-haul commuters such as tiltrotor and supersonic business aircraft. Suborbital and space shuttle flights could be accommodated if necessary.

c. Wayports are to be located "as near as possible to an urban area" to provide for labor, housing, schools, churches shopping and other social amenities. However, the highest Wayport positioning criteria is to provide additional airspace capacity by expanding enroute and terminal area airspace. The second highest criteria is positioning Wayports in the hub and spoke system to attract use by all of industry. Underutilized airline airports and abandoned military bases could be considered along with rural or remote sites if they satisfy the positioning and large capacity criteria. The third criteria (which was panel's first criteria) would be to place Wayports as near as possible to an urban area.

d. Wayports are general purpose facilities serving all aviation and aviation-related activities. Wayports would also cater to manufacturing, maintenance bases, avionics, industrial, warehousing, shopping and recreational facilities.

e. Wayports would be "regional" and serve a large multi-state area. For example, a "southeast wayport" would off-load and relieve pressure on a large number of existing regional airports such as Atlanta, Charlotte, Memphis, Nashville and Raleigh-Durham before they reach a maximized, slotted capacity. Most of these airports accommodate between 65% and 80% transfer traffic. Wayports were never proposed to strip connecting and transfer activities from existing airports. Wayports provide a dependable reservoir of long-range airspace and airport capacity which does not now exist.

f. Wayports have always been set forth as a long-term concept that could be planned and phased in during the "near term." I was unaware the panel was evaluating the Wayports Concept only in a "near term" context until the final report dated February 15, 1990.

g. The enormous enhancements that Wayports provide to long-term safety and operational efficiency were omitted from the panel report. Attached is a list of potential safety enhancements that Wayports could provide.

h. Wayports would generate increased activity at underused general aviation and airline airports by using them as feeders for a Wayport system. This would help relieve highway and airway congestion by off-loading in-town gridlocked airports. Wayports would form a different alternative to long-range collection/distribution for all aviation activities far beyond airline needs. Such a system would create an early need for new light and high-speed rail systems which is supportive of the National Transportation Policy. For example, mail and cargo as well as passengers could come to a Wayport by fast rail.

The preceding qualities and characteristics of Wayports are those that the panel missed or did not understand. This may be because the panel refused to meet to discuss Wayports which might have avoided all the confusion.

The panel never requested a definition of Wayports until the February 7, 1990, meeting which was held to adopt the final panel report. Attached is a copy of that definition.

It is virtually impossible for members of this panel or for others in the FAA involved with Wayports to be ignorant of such knowledge. Considerable briefing materials have been distributed over the past two years. The same slide presentation used to

brief Administrator McArtor on March 8, 1988, was used to brief Administrator Busey on July 27, 1989, (six months before the panel's meeting to discuss the final report).

The final report did not mention other concepts promoted by other panel members such as "Remote Transfer Airport," "New Port of Entry," "Interport," and "Superport." Since these are all variations of the Wayport, it was agreed at the February 7, 1990, final meeting that the term "Wayport" would be used to describe this new type of airport facility. All of these names, other than Wayports, describes a limited-use facility while "Wayports" describes a "general purpose" facility.

"Interport" and "Remote Transfer" airports are proposed for the exclusive use by airlines for transferring passengers.

"New Port of Entry" and "Superport" are exclusively for international passengers, but otherwise meet all Wayport parameters.

Terms like "Regional Hub Facility" should not be substituted for Wayports. This term was not discussed or agreed on by the panel and is not mentioned in the final report sent to the Administrator.

Some may suggest that I am not objective about Wayports because of being an advocate. I believe others in FAA may not be objective as evidenced by their openly opposing or ignoring Wayports for over two years.

Other organizations contracted or advised by FAA such as Aopogee, Transportation Research Board (TRB), and George Washington University may publish views on Wayports. They may have misconceptions and misunderstandings about Wayports if they did not get a balanced briefing by FAA people who may not be "objective" on Wayports.

It would appear that the opportunity for FAA to redefine or rename Wayports has passed. Worldwide discussion of Wayports is in progress. Legislation exists in both Houses of Congress. Many communities and states are supporting the concept. Some have created Wayport Authorities and others have passed resolutions or made public their advocacy. Marketing another name would require wasteful and needless clarification because of the enormous publicity Wayports has received.


James E. Sheppard

Attachments