U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

In the matter of:

AVIATION SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Federal Aviation Administration McCracken Room 10th Floor 900 Independence Avenue, S.W. Washington, D.C.

The meeting of the AVIATION SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE commenced at 9:12 a.m., pursuant to notice.

APPEARANCES: ASAC Committee Members:

Rear Admiral Cathal Flynn, Chairman Aviation Security Advisory Committee Assistant Administrator for Civil Aviation Security

Mr. Bruce R. Butterworth Federal Aviation Administration

Ms. Susan Rork Air Transport Association of America

Mr. Alvy Dodson Airport Law Enforcement Agencies Network

R.Adm. Paul Busick U.S. Department of Transportation

Mr. Jerry Hill Federal Bureau of Investigation

AMERICAN REPORTERS

APPEARANCES (Cont.)

- Ms. Jennifer Whitlow
 National Air Transportation Association
- Mr. Bill Dunn
 Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association
- Mr. Duncan Henderson
 Airports Council International
- Mr. Edward J. Driscoll
 National Air Carriers Association
- Mr. David Stempler
 International Airline Passengers
 Association
- Mr. Dennis Schaar
 Airline Pilots Association International
- Ms. M. Theresa Coutu Mr. Al Graser

American Association of Airport Executives

- Mr. Robert Monetti
 Victims of PanAm Flight 103
- Ms. Meg Leith
 Association of Flight Attendants
- Mr. David O. Aldrich
 Allied Pilots Association
- Mr. Kevin P. Cummings
 U.S. Customs Service
- Mr. Jim Faith
 U.S. Postal Inspection Service

Also Appearing:

Mr. Fred Coppell
Ms. Sharan Sharp
Mr. John Wojtowicz
 U.S. Department of Transportation

APPEARANCES (Cont.)

Ms. Frederica Dunn

Mr. Karl Shrum

Mr. Paul Polski

Ms. Linda Valencia

Ms. Maureen Titsworth

Mr. Tom Guarini

Mr. Courtney Tucker

Mr. David Smith

Mr. Bill Wilkening

Federal Aviation Administration

Mr. Bob Martin

U.S. Postal Inspection Service

Mr. Ron Priddy

National Air Carrier Association

Mr. Chad Schulken

Airports Council International

Mr. Lloyd Anderson

Mr. Jerry Wright

Airline Pilots Association International

Mr. Wayne Lougheed

America West Airlines

Mr. John Head

Mr. Griff Roberts

Delta Air Lines

Mr. Peter O'Neil

United Parcel Service - Airlines

Mr. Jack Bullard

American Airlines

Mr. Alexander Kerr

FedEx

Ms. Paulette Brooks

USAir

Mr. Glen Winn

United Airlines

APPEARANCES (Cont.)

Mr. David Pillor InVision Technologies

Mr. Fred Roder Imatron Federal Systems

<u>CONTENTS</u>

PAGE

OPENING REMARKS

INTRODUCTIONS

REVIEW OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 18, 1995

UPDATE ON ASIA PACIFIC REGION CONCERNS

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE REWRITES OF REGULATIONS 107/108

COMMITTEE REPORTS

UNIVERSAL ACCESS SYSTEM (UAS)
PROTOTYPE TEST/RTCA UPDATE

REVIEW OF CARGO MEASURES

UPDATE ON AIRPORT DEMONSTRATION

CERTIFIED EXPLOSIVE DETECTION SYSTEM

PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNET

SCREENER OF THE YEAR AWARD

OTHER BUSINESS

CLOSING REMARKS

PROCEEDINGS

OPENING REMARKS

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Welcome, all of you, to a meeting of the Aviation Security Advisory Committee. This meeting was published in the Federal Register. Members of the public may attend.

The members of the organization of the ASAC are here at this round table. I would ask that people, when they're speaking for those organizations -- that would be those people at the table -- you may bring, with the permission or at the request of people who are at the table, you may have other people speak for your organization, if you wish to do that. But I'd ask that you would make that request to the Chair.

Communications from the public should be in writing, and we have not received any in writing prior to this meeting. The designated federal official for the Aviation Security Advisor Committee is Bruce Butterworth, to my left. And it is his responsibility to keep minutes of this meeting, and he will provide minutes to the members in due course.

Before we start the meeting, I would like to point out two things with regard to these microphones. These at the table here are solely for the purpose of having a recording of the meeting from which the minutes will be made. At the lectern here, there are two microphones; one for

recording for the minutes purpose, and then there is one that actually amplifies voices.

So as you speak here in this meeting, keep in mind that your voice is not amplified by these microphones that are around the table, and keep that in mind accordingly if you want other people to hear you.

I don't think it's necessary that we shift the microphones around for the minutes ones -- to move them around, but there are enough of them here around the table that if you speak from where you are, your voice can be picked up. The lady keeping that recording will signal me if there is any problem in that regard.

As is our custom, I start by asking that we inform, for the purpose of the minutes, so that we let each other know who we all are.

INTRODUCTIONS

ADMIRAL FLYNN: I am Cathal L. Flynn, Irish Flynn, the Associate Administrator for Civil Aviation Security in the FAA.

MR. BUTTERWORTH: Bruce Butterworth, Director of Policy and Plans in FAA.

MS. RORK: Susan Rork, Managing Director of Security, Air Transport Association.

MR. GRASER: Al Graser, Port Authority, New York and New Jersey, representing AAAE as the Chairman of their Safety, Security, and Technical Committee.

AMERICAN REPORTERS

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
MR. HENDERSON: Duncan Henderson, Baltimore
   Washington International Airport, representing ACI.
              MR. DUNN: Bill Dunn, Aircraft Owners and Pilots
   Association.
 5
              MR. DRISCOLL: Ed Driscoll, National Air Carrier
   Association.
              MR. SCHAAR: Dennis Schaar, Chairman of Flight
 8
   Security Committee, Air Line Pilots Association.
 9
              MR. CUMMINGS: Kevin Cummings, U.S. Customs
10
   Headquarters.
11
              MR. HILL: Jerry Hill, FBI Headquarters.
12
              MR. STEMPLER: David Stempler, Executive Director,
13
   International Airline Passengers Association.
14
              MR. MONETTI: Bob Monetti from the Victims of
15
   Pan Am Flight 103.
              MS. LEITH: Meg Leith, Association of Flight
16
17
   Attendants in the Air Safety and Health Department.
              MR. ALDRICH: David Aldrich, Allied Pilots
18
19
   Association, Security Coordinator.
20
              MR. DODSON: Alvy Dodson, Dallas/Fort Worth
21
    International Airport Police, President of the Airport Law
22
   Enforcement Agencies Network.
              MR. FAITH: Jim Faith, U.S. Postal Service,
23
24
   Inspection Service.
25
              MR. BUSICK: I'm Paul Busick. I'm the Director of
26
   Intelligence Security for the Department of Transportation.
```

1	MR. RODER: Fred Roder, Intercontinental
2	Assistance
3	ADMIRAL FLYNN: Those of you in the back, if you
4	wouldn't mind, when you just come up here to the stay at
5	the nearest microphone.
6	MR. RODER: Fred Roder, Imatron Federal Systems,
7	and I'm the prime contractor to the developer of the CTX-5000
8	Explosive Detection System.
9	MS. SHARP: Sharan Sharp, DOT's Office of
10	Intelligence and Security.
11	MR. ROBERTS: Griffin Roberts, Delta Air Lines,
12	Corporate Security.
13	MR. HEAD: John Head, Delta Air Lines, Personnel.
14	MR. GUARINI: Tom Guarini, FAA Technical Center.
15	MR. WINN: Glen Winn, Director of Security, United
16	Airlines.
17	MR. MARTIN: Bob Martin, Security Group, Postal
18	Inspection Service.
19	MS. VALENCIA: Linda Valencia, staff member, Office
20	of Policy and Planning, FAA.
21	MS. TITSWORTH: Maureen Titsworth, Information
22	Technology, Office of Civil Aviation Security.
23	MR. WOJTOWICZ: John Wojtowicz, Department of
24	Transportation, Volpe Center.
25	MR. COPPELL: Fred Coppell, Volpe Center.
26	MR. TUCKER: Courtney Tucker, Civil Aviation

Т	Security Policy and Planning.
2	MS. WALKER: Arlene Walker, Manager of Technical
3	Services, Counter Technology, Inc.
4	MR. KOSATKA: Art Kosatka, Counter Technology.
5	MR. KERR: Alex Kerr, Federal Express Corporation.
6	MR. O'NEIL: Peter O'Neil, UPS Airlines, Chair of
7	the ATA Security Committee.
8	MS. BROOKS: Paulette Brooks, USAir Corporate
9	Security.
10	MR. WOOD: Leonard Wood, Counter Technology.
11	MR. ANDERSON: Lloyd Anderson, Air Line Pilots
12	Association.
13	MR. WRIGHT: Jerry Wright, ALPA.
14	MR. PRIDDY: Ron Priddy, National Air Carrier
15	Association.
16	MR. WILKENING: Bill Wilkening, FAA Security.
17	MS. COUTU: Theresa Coutu, American Association of
18	Airport Executives.
19	MR. LOUGHEED: Wayne Lougheed, Director of
20	Corporate Security, America West Airlines.
21	MR. POLSKI: Paul Polski, FAA Technical Center,
22	Program Director, Security R&D.
23	MR. SHRUM: Karl Shrum, FAA Security Policy and
24	Planning.
25	MR. BULLARD: Jack Bullard, American Airlines
26	Corporate Security.

REVIEW OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 18, 1995

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Thank you all very much, and again, thank you for coming. I recognize that it's a burden, financial and otherwise, for particularly people coming from out of town. And I particularly note the presence of consumer groups, and Bob Monetti, representing the victims of Pan Am 103, who continue to play such a valuable role in being the -- our conscience of what ought to be done in security.

I want to review the minutes from the January 18, 1995 meeting. Those minutes were mailed to the ASAC members on February 15th, 1995. And I will now open the minutes for any suggestions for changes or comments on the minutes from the last meeting.

Yes, Dennis?

MR. SCHAAR: Dennis Schaar, ALPA. On page 44 -- ADMIRAL FLYNN: Please go ahead.

MR. SCHAAR: -- line 22, the word "managed" should be "match," as in profiling passenger bag match. On page 45, line 4, Mr. Butterworth's quote, also the word "managed" should be "match," -- m-a-t-c-h. This was a discussion that Bruce and I had back and forth on the CTX-5000.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Anything further, Dennis?

MR. SCHAAR: Yes, sir. On page 53, Mr. Lally of
the Aviation Security Contractors Association queried the
Chair concerning an item that was supposed to have been on

AMERICAN REPORTERS

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

the agenda concerning the screener efficiency evaluation at the last meeting, and it was not on the agenda. Mr. Butterworth told him that it would be on the agenda for this meeting, yet I fail to see it on the agenda. MR. BUTTERWORTH: Dennis, would you restate the last correction, please? MR. SCHAAR: Starting on page 53, Bruce, at the 8 bottom, line 23. MR. BUTTERWORTH: This is the meeting of January 10 18th? All right, Dennis, could you go back and just restate 11 again the issue in the terms of what was supposed to be on 12 the agenda? 13 MR. SCHAAR: Sure. 14 MR. BUTTERWORTH: We'll have to track this later. 15 The pages that we have are different from the pages that you 16 have in terms of numbers. MR. SCHAAR: This was a question to the Chair from 17 Dick Lally. It says, "Mr. Chairman, the draft agenda that 18 19 was distributed to potential attendees included a fourth 20 agenda item for an update on screener efficiency evaluation 21 and reporting systems. I wonder if that's been deleted, or 22 can we expect a discussion of the topic?" Mr. Butterworth replies, "We're going to try it at 23 24 the next session." And Mr. Lally said, "Then that can be 25 expected at the next meeting, then?" And Mr. Butterworth

replies, "Yes."

But I fail to see that on the agenda for this meeting.

MR. BUTTERWORTH: Dennis, that's correct. It's an oversight on our part. We might be able to provide some informal update of the SPEARS project and demonstration. But if you will give us some time to try and collect our thoughts on that.

MR. SCHAAR: Thank you.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: We will come to that before the end of the meeting. Thank you, Dennis, for that. We'll note that the exchange as reported in the minutes between Mr. Butterworth and Mr. Lally is correct in its substance and its words, and that doesn't require a change. Your point as to what ought to be in today's agenda is noted.

And as far as the changing of "manage" to "match," we will pause and ask all of you now to -- those of you have the minutes -- to please take that as a change. I don't think that we will send out new pages unless you particularly want that. But note that that is a change to the minutes, which we will keep in the master copy of the minutes.

Are there any further changes to the minutes of the last meeting?

(No audible response.)

ADMIRAL FLYNN: With thanks to the Air Line Pilots
Association for suggesting those changes and reminding us of
what turns out to be an oversight, which we'll try to correct

2

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

by the end of this meeting. I would like someone to propose the adoption of the minutes. 3 MR. STEMPLER: I so propose. MR. ALDRICH: I second it. 5 ADMIRAL FLYNN: Any opposed? (No audible response.) ADMIRAL FLYNN: The minutes are adopted. 8 Our agenda today has on it a report on progress of 9 the rewrites of the Regulations 107/108, a report on the 10 Universal Access System prototype test, a review of cargo measures by Ms. Susan Rork of ATA, an update on Airport 11 12 Demonstration of a certified Explosive Detection System from Tom Guarini of the FAA Technical Center, and Ms. Maureen 13 14 Titsworth of FAA ACS will give a pre-presentation on our plan for implementation for Internet and allowance for 15 16 communication with us by Internet. And then, following that, we will -- that's Item 4 17 on the agenda -- we will come back to the screener 18 19 performance, and endeavor on that short notice to -- which is 20 our fault -- to give you a report, which I hope will be of 21 some use to you. 22 If it isn't, Dennis, or if others find that more 23 needs to be done, then we will certainly put it into the 24 agenda of the next meeting and have it on the agenda of the 25 next meeting. Again, my apologies.

MR. SCHAAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

UPDATE ON ASIA PACIFIC REGION CONCERNS

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Before we go into the reports, I want to hearken back to January 18th. And at that meeting, we mentioned that we were in the beginning of a particularly severe condition of threat to U.S. civil aviation in the Asian Pacific region. That elevated threat that we faced then has diminished appreciably, but not entirely gone away.

One of the things that has happened since January 18th is the arrest of the person alleged to be the ringleader of that conspiracy that was attempting to attack our aircraft in the Asian Pacific region, and one of his co-conspirators has also been arrested. They are both now in custody in the United States, presumably awaiting trial.

The threat in the Asian Pacific region posed a very considerable challenge to all of us who are involved in security, and I think it's appropriate to note in the minutes that the airlines concerned did a very fine job of ensuring security of their operations. They had to take a very considerable number of measures on short notice.

The flying public responded to it quite magnificently with understanding and with a minimum of complaint. And some of the complaint was justified, but tended to go away once the situation was explained.

All of those who are involved, from the airlines at their stations and those providing security, the foreign governments concerned, the aviation authorities of the other

nations that were involved, and the law enforcement intelligence services of the United States and the country teams in the nations affected, all -- as far as I saw it, and I saw it in some considerable detail -- did their jobs with exceptional dedication and effectiveness.

The threat, though much diminished, continues. We need to maintain our vigilance and our security. And without tempting the fates, I want to congratulate people for having come through a particularly challenging time and having done it well.

The first item on the agenda for a report is a progress report on the rewrites of Regulations 107/108. And Karl Shrum of FAA will give that.

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE REWRITES OF REGULATIONS 107/108

MR. SHRUM: When last we met, we were working on a survey to gain additional data from airports for our economists to use in cost/benefit analysis, what we call regulatory evaluation, for the proposed rule. We've completed that survey. We had responses from over 100 airports -- 109, I believe -- and that data has proved most useful. We now have the most complete and extensive regulatory evaluation that's ever been done on a security rule.

All well and good, but you still ask, when? Well, after 5-1/2 years, we're getting really close. In fact,

AMERICAN REPORTERS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

we're briefing the Administrator tomorrow. With his approval and concurrence, we would be down to the final drafting, tweaking the document, which is quite a large package by now; between the two NPRMs and the extensive regulatory evaluations, we're talking well over 300 pages of material.

At that point, once it's signed out of the building, we get it over to the Department. We've been working hand in hand with the folks in S-60, that's Admiral Busick's shop, to make sure that there are no last minute glitches or issues. At that point, it would be up to the Secretary to approve it, and then go on to the Office of Management and Budget for their ultimate approval for publication.

I also want to give you the status of a couple of other rules we've been working on, first of which we have, unfortunately, been required to give numerous status reports, that being Unescorted Access Privilege, a.k.a. Criminal Background Checks. That one also is getting very close. It's in the Office of the Secretary of Transportation for the Secretary's approval. Again, it would go to OMB for final approval for publication.

The other rule we have working is Sensitive

Security Information, which has been out as a proposed rule.

We are now in the process of analyzing and responding to the comments to develop the final rule. Any questions on the status of the rules?

MR. GRASER: On the 107/108 --

MR. SHRUM: This is Mr. Graser. Go ahead.

MR. GRASER: Okay; Al Graser for AAAE. Karl, a question. You went through the -- when do you think the 107/108 might be out?

MR. SHRUM: Out of this building, hopefully this month. Out of the Department and to OMB would take a lot longer. I -- most optimistic would probably be in another couple of months.

MR. GRASER: All right. The reason I ask, AAAE and ACI have talked about a joint meeting as a working meeting towards the end of August. Probably, it would then be somewhat like we did with other documents, and also probably have other associations maybe joining in.

But we're just trying to get a feel before we try to set up that meeting, because one of the prime reasons would be for 107/108. So if the mid- to end of August doesn't look realistic, please give us that feedback along the way, so we don't want to establish something and then not have the document there. We'd rather save that for a later time.

MR. SHRUM: I understand.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Bruce Butterworth?

MR. BUTTERWORTH: I think that's probably unrealistic, given the time conscientious people take to review rules, both at OST and OMB. I would not want to stake

AMERICAN REPORTERS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

a meeting on that.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

MR. GRASER: We appreciate that, because then we would rather save that meeting for the appropriate time. So we'll just try to keep in touch as it goes forward through the summer months and see how it goes.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: I think so. I think that we could probably tell you, with confidence, six weeks out, when we really think that that thing is going to come out.

MR. GRASER: Okay.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: And if you can schedule your meeting on, shall we say, six weeks' notice, we would be able to say with some confidence that it should be published within six weeks.

MR. GRASER: Okay. One --

ADMIRAL FLYNN: And we're not able to say that at this time, and that's pretty close to the first of August.

MR. GRASER: One other question. I know the airports would be interested in some vehicle of getting the results of the survey of the 109 airports, and I think we have asked it informally. I was just wanting for you to consider the possibility, in one venue or other, of getting the results of that survey, because it would be very good for the airports to also have.

MR. BUTTERWORTH: I'm not sure what the -- don't know what the legalities are of providing that. It's a survey resulting -- it rendered a rulemaking now.

AMERICAN REPORTERS

MR. SHRUM: I would distinguish -- again, I'd have to check with a lawyer with this -- between the actual data that we gathered, which was supplied by the airports, which you could, somewhat laboriously, accumulate yourself, as opposed to the actual analysis that our folks have done that would appear in the regulatory evaluation itself.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: What do you mean, somewhat laboriously acquired themselves? Can't we give that to them instead of --

MR. GRASER: Well, if we went out and did it all over again ourselves, it would laborious. I mean, that's why it's -- it's been put together. So if there's a way and a mechanism that it can be shared with us --

ADMIRAL FLYNN: We will strive to do that, to make that available to you. And I don't know what legal or regulatory objections there would be to do that, but failing some strong objection on those grounds, we'll make it available to you.

MR. GRASER: Thank you.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Yes.

MR. SCHAAR: Dennis Schaar, ALPA. Karl, good morning. Was the issue of one level of security for all carriers, regional as well as majors, identified in this NPRM, or proposed rewrite?

MR. SHRUM: Okay, let me track -- I think you're referring to the commuter rule. In other words, 135 carriers

AMERICAN REPORTERS

2

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would now have to adopt the safety standards of 121 carriers.

MR. SCHAAR: Correct.

PARTICIPANT: Can't hear you at all up there. Can you get close to the microphone?

MR. SHRUM: Okay, how's that?

PARTICIPANT: All right.

MR. SHRUM: I'll just turn up the volume. Okay, I've got more volume now, does that help? We have to be careful we don't get feedback.

As I was saying, I think Dennis is referring to the commuter rule, which is an attempt to have one standard of safety for both 135 carriers and for 121 carriers. We made sure in that effort that nothing arose from those proceedings which would affect the security requirements under Part 108, which have uniform applicability depending on the type of operation and the size of the aircraft. So there's nothing in the commuter rule that's going to change anything in security rules by design.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Dennis, I think you look puzzled. Do you want to ask another question?

MR. SCHAAR: Yes. I'm thinking in two different veins here. The 121 rules that we talked about for the one level of safety -- I was under the impression that some of those rules would also carry over to security, as far as the number of seats of the airplane, would require the same level of screening as the major carriers do -- greater than 10

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

seats, does that ring a bell?

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. SHRUM: Yes, the commuter rule basically is 10 seats and up, with some special exceptions, you know, operations in Alaska and that kind of thing.

Security rules are based on the threat, which is primarily to large passenger aircraft. However, if, for example, because it deplanes in sterile areas, a small aircraft has to be screened, the standards for screening are the same regardless.

MR. SCHAAR: Okay, that's what I'm getting at.

MR. SHRUM: Yes. You either do security or you don't do it. But if you do it, it's all to the same standard.

MR. SCHAAR: Yes. That's why you bring a commuter airplane to a major hub, with unscreened passengers on board, and dump them on the AOA, and then screen them once they get in the building. That's what we were trying to focus on.

MR. BUTTERWORTH: Dennis, if I may call upon me. I think you're asking -- the question you asked sounded different than the question you're asking now. You're asking us, did we address the issue of how to improve the integrity of the sterile area.

MR. SCHAAR: That would be a good point for the record.

MR. BUTTERWORTH: Yes, absolutely.

MR. SCHAAR: Okay, thank you. Sorry I got it

AMERICAN REPORTERS

wrapped around the axle. ADMIRAL FLYNN: No problem. Any other questions? Yes, Susan Rork of ATA. MS. RORK: Karl, Susan Rork of ATA. My question 5 would be the same as my counterparts over here, in terms of the other two rulemakings, when we would expect to see them, the Criminal History Unescorted Access, and the Security Sensitive Information. Can you give us any feeling for the times? 10 MR. SHRUM: Assuming that we have the Secretary's 11 approval, which we hope is imminent, OMB has a maximum, by 12 executive order, of 60 days to process it and either approve 13 it or reject it, so within two months seems pretty 14 reasonable. As far as what we call SSI, Sensitive Security 15 16 Information, sometime this fall, perhaps. 17 MS. RORK: Thank you. 18 ADMIRAL FLYNN: Any other questions, comments, 19 comments from around the back of the room, maybe outside the 20 room? 21 (No audible response.) 22 ADMIRAL FLYNN: All right, thank you, Karl. COMMITTEE REPORTS 23 2.4 UNIVERSAL ACCESS SYSTEM (UAS) 25 PROTOTYPE TEST/RTCA UPDATE 26 ADMIRAL FLYNN: Your next report is on the

Universal Access System Prototype test. Karl?

MR. SHRUM: Briefly, to review, the original intent of the test program that was approved last September would have involved three airports, three air carriers, Detroit, Atlanta, and Chicago; Northwest, Delta, and USAir. Since that time, as I reported at the last meeting, Chicago has reconfigured its access control system from a central database to a distributed database and thereby dropped out of the test.

USAir would like to participate. Northwest and Delta have begun the process of rebadging their employees. The status at present is that Detroit is up and running -- systems have been installed. We projected May. We did, in fact, meet that target.

However, due to some internal miscommunications, Northwest did not begin its rebadging program until a few weeks ago. They're now going to need until probably September to complete the rebadging program so they'll be fully up and operational in Detroit.

We also had some difficulties at Atlanta. The primary contractor for Atlanta's access control system is UNISYS. We have a signed contract with UNISYS at the agreed terms that were set up before the working group.

However, the subcontractor, Infographics, would not agree to those terms; in fact, would not agree to any reasonable terms and asked for a "hold harmless" clause; no

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

matter how long or overbudget the project ran, and they would not give us a warranty on their work.

At that point, Atlanta did not seem feasible. We began considering alternatives, one of which was an offer from Miami, also in conjunction with West Palm Beach, to essentially transfer the Atlanta phase of the test program to Miami. The Volpe folks did a site survey. Prospects for Miami from a technical point of view are excellent.

We still need some additional information to include West Palm, but it would certainly be advantageous to have a second airport, a smaller airport, representative of other smaller airports, and all within easy driving distance to cut down costs. We have addressed some concerns that Miami expressed regarding the test procedures, and certainly some of the enforcement aspects during the operational part of the test.

However, in talking to folks recently, in fact, last night, Atlanta has now -- well, previously, we proposed as an alternative that in the process of renovating its access control system, that we would leave the existing card readers on the door, the Matrix readers; use those for the Universal Access System test; then the newer equipment installed under the contract with UNISYS would be a separate system -- there would be no conflict with the subcontractor.

That was initially rejected by Atlanta, is now, again, on the table for our consideration, and it may, in

fact, be possible to do all of these things, depending on the funding. But we do not have a commitment in writing from either Atlanta or Miami to actually participate in the test.

There are some other possibilities. Chicago -- in the event that neither Atlanta or Miami comes through, Chicago is nearing completion of its reconfiguration of its Access Control System. We might be able to return to that airport, different alternatives, different options out of the test program, but at least the airport is being considered as a site.

If USAir does, in fact, participate, that would bring in Charlotte, one of their hubs. And we've also got keen interest from America West and United Parcel Service, as far as their folks participating.

The most optimistic estimate for getting the test program up and running, in either Atlanta or Miami, at this stage would probably be August. So we've incurred some delays because of an unreasonable subcontractor and some problems in getting Northwest rebadged. Any questions?

MR. SCHAAR: Schaar, ALPA. You mentioned America West. Is Phoenix going to participate then, you think?

MR. SHRUM: We're not sure if the airport in Phoenix is all that interested or not. Right now it's just an option.

MR. GRASER: Al Graser again. A question then, if the two airports, Atlanta, Miami, potentially are coming

2

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on-line in August, what does that do for the end date? Because the end date was going to be October, and that was tied in as one of the timelines for the RTCA efforts. So I don't think October holds. But again, what would your estimate now be of when the test will be over? The plan was for the test to continue MR. SHRUM: for six months. We might have preliminary data before the end of that six-month period. 9 MR. GRASER: That will be first quarter, '96. 10 MR. SHRUM: That's correct. The final report would 11 take some time after that. 12 ADMIRAL FLYNN: Further questions? Yes? 13 MR. WRIGHT: Jerry Wright, ALPA. Karl, can you 14 clarify as to whether the Northwest employees will begin 15 using the UAS system at Detroit as they're being badged, or 16 will they wait until all the employees at Northwest get the 17 badges before they start using it? 18 MR. SHRUM: The date I gave you was for all 19 employees to be badged. Fred, do we have any plans for 20 processing people before badging is complete? 21 MR. COPPELL: No, we don't have any plans at the 22 present time. We're going to wait for the company to badge. That can be entertained, those areas, so it's a question we 23 24 can pose to the airline. ADMIRAL FLYNN: Yes, Jack? 25 26 MR. BULLARD: Jack Bullard, American Airlines.

Karl, can you tell us what the status of the budget is? I know that was a concern early on. Has this had any effect on the budget, these problems?

MR. SHRUM: Not a major effect.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: How about commenting on the adequacy of funding to complete the program?

MR. SHRUM: There are sufficient funds to complete the program. The question is, which options would we be able to accommodate?

Now, as far as the basic options, Miami, Atlanta, and Detroit, no question we could fund those. Some of the peripheral options that we might try to include, I'd have to defer to Fred on that.

MR. COPPELL: Well, I'd to state -- regarding the program itself, it would be counterproductive to move forward with an airport now and not have another counterpart airport to be able to work the test program with, because we'd be essentially spending dollars and adding costs to the program.

So essentially, the program, we're trying to keep in a slowed down mode right now, in order to be able to start all airports that can come on-line in the September time frame. We'll have the implementation complete then. Does that answer the question?

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Yes, and you've given an interesting change from August to September while you were at it, but that's okay.

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. COPPELL: September is when Northwest will be complete, so that will allow us all to start the program in earnest.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Okay. I think earlier references to August should be revised to September.

MR. COPPELL: Thank you.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Thank you.

MR. SHRUM: I also want to give you a status report on the work of RTCA Special Committee 183, which is working on a set of standards for Automated Access Control Systems. We've advanced considerably since January. There's been a great deal of discussion on what the standards should look like, what should be included as a standard as opposed to guidance, and so on and so forth.

We now have a document that we're whipping into shape. It is a Minimum Aviation Safety Performance Standard. It's now in its third iteration. We'll be meeting again Monday to review the draft. So far, there have been no major issues that have divided the committee, producing what in RTCA parlance would be a minority opinion.

A concern that I had initially had to do with the compatibility with UAS and card-reader technologies or, I should say, user-interface technologies. However, I believe we've come to a solution that all parties can accept. And the committee has specifically decided not to select any particular technology at this time for the user interface --

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

couple of reasons, one being UAS compatibility, and the other being the technology is in a transitional state.

It may be possible, for example, to accommodate more than one technology in an access media; for example, a mag-striped card would also have a smart chip and can work in different readers. Rather than lock in a standard now that we want to revise later, we're going to leave the standards as functional requirements, rather than select any particular technology.

The compatibility with UAS is going to be what the engineers call upward compatibility. In other words, the information data stream from the user-interface would be comparable in all systems. However, if at some point the airport operator wanted to convert to Universal Access System, it would only be necessary to modify the user interface. In other words, change one type of card reader to another type of card reader, or possibly a reader that could accommodate multiple technologies.

So these standards will in no way preclude or prevent an airport operator that initially declines to configure their system as a Universal System from doing so later.

And of course, we've always maintained that the UAS should be adopted voluntarily by the airports; however, this standard will ensure that the airport is not influenced, or does not decide against UAS simply because it will require

ripping out the whole system.

We're trying to -- by creating a standard that is upwardly compatible, the cost and expense would be minimized, and this affords the greater opportunity for an airport operator to adopt or configure access points as Universal Access points.

Another key point that was raised at the last meeting -- we are developing a set of standards specifically for automated access controls, which is not the full spectrum of access controls, and it's certainly not the full spectrum of people that need access to secured areas of airports.

We're going to put some specific guidance into the standards to the airport operator that they should consider the needs of all users, even persons, for example, transients, who many not have the appropriate access media, in configuring their system. In other words, simply developing standards for an automated system and designing an automated system isn't completing the design for an Access Control System. It's a key point.

As far as the road ahead, as I mentioned, we're going to meet on June 12th. And depending on the work that's accomplished next Monday, the draft may or may not be ready for the associations, for example, to review with their membership.

The next meeting would not be until July 25th. And we've deliberately scheduled a long interim period here to

allow for comments outside of the committee, either through the associations or whomever else. By July 25th, we will either be meeting to come up with a final draft based on comments received or finalizing a draft for comments. As I say, it depends on the progress made Monday.

At that point, we're looking for a -- either way -- a final draft at the meeting on August 23rd, to be reviewed and approved at a meeting on September 27th. We still have to take up the issue of whether we might want to extend these dates based on the schedule that we now have for UAS.

One of the -- in fact, the first term of reference which is, again, RTCA parlance for goal or objective, of the committee was to incorporate the UAS data to the maximum extent practical.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Questions? Yes, Mr. Graser?

MR. GRASER: Again, Al Graser. Just the comment, I think from both of the airport associations and the port authority who has a member on the RTCA subgroup, I think we've all seen a monumental amount of work done since January. I think the two associations and the other subgroup members may want to compliment all of the participants on the amount of work that they've done and how good the product looks so far.

MR. SHRUM: I want to second that. There have been a number of people that have worked quite strenuously and diligently to meet deadlines, get material in on time. That

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

is much appreciated.

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Any further questions, comments?

(No audible response.)

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Thank you, Karl.

REVIEW OF CARGO MEASURES

ADMIRAL FLYNN: I now call on Ms. Susan Rork of the Air Transport Association to -- and her topic is Measures for Security of Cargo.

MS. RORK: Good morning. Thank you, Irish, and hello, ladies and gentlemen. Very briefly, I would like to talk to you about some actions that were taken by the Air Transport Association after the threats that we experienced in the Asia Pacific region.

The ATA reinstituted the Cargo Security Working Group. And that group's mission is, very simply, to review all cargo security measures and to develop an international cargo security contingency plan that would be used in accordance with the level of threat as it would be determined by the FAA.

An ancillary goal, and what we feel to be a very, very important goal at the same time, is that we hope to educate the FAA and foster a better understanding of what I describe as the "nuts and bolts" of how cargo is accepted and how it is processed.

Cargo is that enigma out there in the airline industry. It generates a tremendous amount of revenue for

AMERICAN REPORTERS

the airline industry. However, it occupies a very small number of people, compared to the passenger-service side of the air carrier industry.

So what we're trying to do, is bring in the expertise of the air carrier cargo folks, and hopefully educate the FAA folks on cargo security, as we feel that cargo security will be very, very important in the days and years to come.

The very first thing that we did was to try to address the bottom line, redefining and clarifying the definitions that are used by all folks out there, internationally in particular, and come up with very, very simple, user-friendly definitions.

We are still in the process of developing those definitions. And these will be definitions -- you all have heard these terms -- for shipper, for indirect air carrier, for unknown shipper. These are very, very, very important points that you must have clarified prior to developing your security plan.

The second thing that we're going to do, and we have done -- it is in the draft stage at this point, and I would prefer not to discuss the language in the draft stages -- is that we are developing a cargo security contingency plan.

As you recall, industry worked with the FAA in developing the AVSEC Security Plan and the threat levels that

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we all have today and the security countermeasures. We are doing the same thing; we have the same objective, only we're going to apply those contingency measures to cargo. We are in the process of developing that.

We have identified a working matrix. We have identified scenarios where we might apply a particular cargo security measure. I might add, at this time, that we have had two meetings. We have another meeting scheduled in July. And this is an ongoing process. We're very pleased so far with the results of this working group.

The other thing I would like to mention very quickly one more time, is that the airline industry ATA members have extended an invitation to the FAA, to members of your staff, to come out and see our cargo operations, whether it be a passenger carrier or it be an all-cargo carrier. We would certainly like to have your people out in the field so that we can all work together and better understand these measures.

If you all have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. I would be hesitant to address any specifics at this time, as this working group has not completed their project.

MR. DRISCOLL: Since ATA has an internal working group, what is the responsibility of FAA so that others that are not members of ATA but are involved in cargo, both on passenger airplanes and all cargo, can participate? Isn't

this an FAA function to take over, from the invitation ATA has given you, so that you can bring all of the air carriers into the system?

MR. BUTTERWORTH: Yes, Ed. Eventually, anything that we do in terms of changes to the security program has got to be the subject of consultation with all the carriers. Now I'm going to ask Bill Wilkening, who I think has been most intimately involved in this, to give us an idea of when we might expand out our consideration to other carriers. Bill?

MR. WILKENING: Thank you very much, Bruce.

Bill Wilkening from FAA. As Ms. Rork points out, this

working group has been reactivated, based primarily upon some

of the experience we had in the Far East threat situation.

We have been looking at the possibility of developing some

sort of contingency plan along the line of the current AVSEC

plan.

However, at the meeting I attended, the last two meetings, we are serving, at this point, in a support capacity, more -- insofar as providing guidance on definitions, experience we've had, and taking the offer from the industry to look at their cargo operations, both domestically and internationally. There has not been any move yet to turn this into some sort of regulatory obligation. It's very preliminary. It's in a planning stage.

As Bruce points out, if we change the SSP, or propose to change the SSP, or if we propose anything in the Indirect Air Carrier Standard Security Program, or in the Domestic Security Integration Program that we have available for cargo carriers, all cargo carriers, any one of those three standards, or in the regulations themselves, we would have to go through the standard notice and comment.

There was a group associated with the ASAC several years ago. We had a task force which provided a lot of guidance on the cargo issue. Most of the guidance provided by ASAC is now in the regulations, both the Standard Security program and the 109 program. The effort, I understand, on the part of ATA, is to add to that and look at possibilities on contingencies. But I don't think it is working towards a regulatory purpose at this point, if that answers the question.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Mr. Driscoll?

MR. DRISCOLL: We had several sessions dealing with the cargo, and the entire industry was involved -- I think it was prior to your time, Irish -- and in which all rules and regulations were considered and adopted.

And the FAA was taking on the responsibility of identifying, worldwide, all freight forwarders who were involved in the cargo operation, requiring the freight forwarders to get into the screening of the cargo, and I think it was the one big issue as to whether the post office

department was going to do the screening of the mail and so forth which also goes aboard airplanes. And I'm not familiar with where that one ended up.

But it seems to me, if we're going to have anything to do on a regulatory basis -- and I put it regulatory -- on cargo, then all the carriers should be considered. I can only applaud ATA for taking on their own carriers and discussing what they're going to do. But if that is leading to the coordination with FAA to regulatory process, then I think the rest of the industry has to be brought into it.

MR. BUTTERWORTH: May I?

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Yes.

MR. BUTTERWORTH: Okay. Ed, I think what people didn't formulate was -- surely, in their minds -- that when ATA develops a proposal, it's going to be put into another ASAC coordination process with the rest of the industry. I can't -- if ATA wants to invite NACA into what they're doing --

MR. DRISCOLL: I'm not suggesting that.

MR. BUTTERWORTH: Okay, but I understand what you're saying.

MR. DRISCOLL: I am getting the impression here that this is an FAA-endorsed activity. And I'll make my point very clear.

If it's an FAA-endorsed activity, then it should be an industry activity, and not one association. I can't make

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

myself any clearer than that.

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

MR. BUTTERWORTH: Right. But the only thing -MR. DRISCOLL: Because if you are endorsing it,
blessing it, or anything else, it has to turn into an
industry; otherwise, you are discriminating between
organizations and carriers.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: When it comes to improving security, in consultation, to the extent that people wish to volunteer associations or, indeed, individuals, with ideas about how things might be defined, there are indeed steps and lines that are there, with regard to when is one into any notion of a regulatory process. And of course, there are requirements for notification and consultation at that time.

At this point, we have an association that had learned from the experience of the crisis of security earlier this year that there are questions of definition and others that they want to approach themselves. We would want to support that. And if others are of a mind, we would want to support that also.

And if we are coming at any stage to something that goes beyond the kind of consultation that we ought to have with people to an endorsed activity, well, then indeed, yes, we will formally do it as a subset of this ASAC or otherwise.

MR. DRISCOLL: Irish, going back to the situation in the Pacific, when those situations arose, NACA and some of its member carriers were not even clued in on the initial

information that was sent out to all carriers. We had to call and be invited in, and then the procedure was set up so we are also kept advised.

That's my concern, that the FAA is dealing with one segment and not the other.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Your point is well made. And we will ensure that you are informed, and we can arrive with you, and any others who are here present, who wish to be informed as to what's going on; and then that, of course, was the intent of Ms. Rork's report, was to so inform you.

That's one of the reasons that we have the ASAC.

MR. DRISCOLL: We appreciate that, and we're not trying and take anything away from ATA.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Yes.

MR. DRISCOLL: Only when it becomes -- into the FAA, do I think, at that point, that you have a duty then to advise all people that are air carriers, involved in the process, which we did find that you didn't at one time. We weren't on the list. Some of our carriers weren't on the list. We had to get Bruce and others into it. We are now on the list. We now get called.

So I only raise this as a word of caution that, certainly, ATA does represent the majority of the carriers. However, there are carriers that are not members of that, that are involved in the cargo, and fairly large-size carriers. And that's my only point, to make sure that

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

somebody doesn't go on the misapprehension that when you deal with ATA, you deal with the entire industry, because you don't.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: We accept your point fully. Any other questions?

(No audible response.)

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Susan, I want to thank you for your report and to thank you for what ATA is doing with regard to seeking to improve the effectiveness of security for cargo. And we will certainly ensure that others that are affected may be involved to the full extent that they wish and will certainly be consulted appropriately.

The next Item Number, Item Number 3, is the update on the airport demonstration of the CTX Explosive Detection System. You will recall -- and that will be given by Tom Guarini of the FAA Tech Center.

Before Tom gives his report, I think that it's worthwhile to review the language and intent of the Aviation Security Improvement Act of 1990, as it applied to explosive detection systems. The Act required the FAA to establish criteria for certification of explosive detection systems, to develop protocols for testing them, and to have an independent means of testing them for certification.

The performance that was -- and those standards that are developed had to do with probability of detection of certain explosives, a wide range of explosives, of the

AMERICAN REPORTERS

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

minimum amount we believed to and estimated to be capable of causing lethal damage to large aircraft, and the probability of detecting them, and the associated alarm rate and through-put rate.

The Act also requires the FAA, prior to taking action to mandate the use of EDS, to demonstrate the effectiveness in an operational setting of the EDS. In December of last year, the CTX-5000 passed its certification tests at the FAA Tech Center. Those tests are performed with live explosives; a detection is of live explosives.

And the next step of the procedure leading to decisions on mandatory use of EDS is to take them into airports, integrate them fully to deal with such questions of resolution of alarms, through-put, and how best they can be integrated into the operations of airlines in airports.

We have developed a considerably detailed plan for doing that, and that has required us to enter into cooperative agreements with airlines. To report on that, I now call on Tom Guarini.

UPDATE ON AIRPORT DEMONSTRATION

CERTIFIED EXPLOSIVE DETECTION SYSTEM

MR. GUARINI: Good morning. If I could, I'd like to direct your attention to the far end of the room, because I have several viewgraphs I would like to use in describing the status of the program.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Could you crank up the volume a bit

AMERICAN REPORTERS

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there.

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. GUARINI: How's that, better?

ADMIRAL FLYNN: A bit better.

MR. GUARINI: Back when I reported to you back in January, I described at that time the goals of the program and what we were trying to accomplish, and I also told you that we were in the process of putting a notice in the Federal Register.

Since that time, I'm happy to report that we had a notice placed in the Federal Register. We received proposals to do this work. And on May the 12th, we signed three cooperative agreements with three carriers. The three carriers are Delta Airlines at Hartsfield/Atlanta

International Airport, Northwest will do a demonstration at Manila in the Philippines, and United Air Lines will have a demonstration at San Francisco International Airport.

What I would like to do is now just briefly describe the approach that we're going to take to do this demonstration. First, I'd like to cover Delta, which is the next viewgraph.

Remember last time I spoke to you, I described that, in terms of trying to accomplish this demonstration, we were looking at the various approaches for where you would place this equipment. As it turns out, in the case of the Delta demonstration, the CTX-5000 equipments -- and they will be using two systems -- will be an in-line system down in the

baggage room area.

We anticipate that a single operator will be able to operate both systems. Now, of course, this is one of the purposes of the demonstration, to determine what are the demands on the system from a manpower point of view. But you also understand that the EDS is an automatic equipment, so you don't need an operator standing there, constantly looking at the cathode ray tube. So in this case, we anticipate that the single operator would be used for the purpose of resolving alarms with the equipment.

Some of the interesting things that Delta proposed, they are going to procure both computer and software mods for the equipment, such that they can automatically collect data on the baggage. And also, they would like to record the image data itself that they get from the baggage, such that they can do post analysis, and also, I guess, we can use that data in training operators on the system. Because of how the flights are scheduled, we anticipate that the system will be in operation eight hours every day, approximately one shift. Next please, Paul.

For Northwest, they also will be using two with the CTX-5000 systems. And again, it will be installed in the bag room area. They do anticipate, rather than having it fully integrated, they have carrousels, such that when the bags come down the carrousels, they will manually move the bags from the carrousel to the CTX equipment.

Because of the environmental constraints and our concern about the temperature and humidity in an open area in the Philippines, we are going to have to build an environmental enclosure around the two systems.

United Airlines, which also flies out of the Philippines, will be invited to participate as part of Northwest, at least for that flight that they fly on a daily basis.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Let me say, too, that any other carriers that are there -- Continental Micronesia -- I've asked Tom to look into that with Northwest. And any others that are there, intermittently or otherwise, should be afforded the opportunity to have bags screened by those machines. The bags tend to all come down to the same very large carousel with CTX-5000 at each end of the racetrack. Thank you.

MR. GUARINI: You're welcome. Next, Paul.

For United and their demonstration at San Francisco International, they plan to take a single CTX-5000 equipment, and it will be placed upstairs in the terminal behind the ticket positions. They have 46 windows in the international terminal for ticket positions, but this particular equipment will be set up such that it serves seven of these ticket windows.

To ensure that at least the bags of interest, particularly the ones that are going to extraordinary

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

destinations, are not bypassing the system, United has said that they will do something like putting signs up, such that people bound for those destinations will have to go to those seven ticket windows, such that will ensure that the baggage will get checked going through the CTX-5000 system. And again, similar to the other two airports, we anticipate that the system will actually be in operation eight hours per day. Next, please.

Now, all the time from when we signed the agreements on May 12th up until when we finally get going here, what we call the operational demonstration, will be spent in making changes to the airport to accommodate conveyor belt systems, to accommodate the installation of the CTX-5000. What you're looking at there on the bottom line is the actual time of the demonstration.

In the case of United, you're looking at the late fall of this year is when we hope to have the system up and running, and the demonstration would last for approximately one year. In the case of Delta Airlines, which is the top line, you can see that they want to be in position such that they're operating the equipment in February of next year because, of course, they have the Olympics coming up in the summer. So we show that as running from February through the following February. And Northeast starts about the middle of next year.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Northwest.

MR. GUARINI: Northwest, I'm sorry. And you can see that they'll be running into the middle of the next year.

So I'm happy to report that we are able to actually accommodate three of the proposals. When I spoke to you, we said that we were going to do at least two demonstrations, but fortunately, we're able to do all three. If you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

(No audible response.)

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Questions? Comments?

(No audible response.)

Thank you, Tom.

MR. GUARINI: You're welcome.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: The next item is Maureen Titsworth will give a presentation on our use of Internet and how you can call us.

PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNET

MS. TITSWORTH: Thank you, Admiral Flynn. Good morning everyone, I'm Maureen Titsworth. I'm a member of the IRM, Information Resource Management, otherwise known as Information Technology staff, in the Civil Aviation Security Office at the FAA.

I was asked to come here today to just give you a brief explanation of what the Agency is doing, namely, the Security Office, with regards to helping out the National Performance Review. As we all probably realize, one of the things in that large effort that this Administration has

AMERICAN REPORTERS

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

begun, is taking advantage of technology as it exists today.

One of the things that we here at the FAA have instituted is we -- all Agency employees have access to electronic mail. The product here at the Agency that we use is Lotus Corporation CC Mail. We do have a link and interconnectivity with the Internet, which gives us an opportunity to communicate with anyone else who has access or availability to the Internet for electronic messaging.

Now, I start off with this slide, which is just a simple presentation of what our E-mail addressing format is for any Agency here in the FAA, including all staff members and Civil Aviation Security. That includes both headquarters, our regional offices, and our field facilities.

As you will note, the first part of this address format is the individual's name that you're attempting to contact. The second half of the address format, on the right-hand side of the "at" symbol, is a common address scheme for all Agency employees, no matter what organization they are in.

I will speak just briefly in the next few slides about our use of this opportunity for electronic telecommunications between ourselves and anyone else interested in contacting us though this medium.

We have, over the last several weeks, as a matter of fact, been communicating with Susan Rork from the ATA, so we know that this method does work. We did that as sort of a

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

test environment. As a matter of fact, some of us have had the opportunity to communicate with other people outside of the Agency, including our children at colleges and universities.

One of the things that we do encourage --

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Okay, I want to know who is going to jail here. Does the Bureau want to read us our rights?

(Laughter.)

MS. TITSWORTH: From our home computers.

(Laughter.)

them up in the E-mail system itself.

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

MS. TITSWORTH: I'm not going to give you a quick lesson in Internet; I'm going to trust that the majority of you know what it is and how it works. I am going to give you some assurance to know that this is not the only medium that we do intend using with regards to communicating with you or other people outside of this room.

With regards to learning how to communicate with someone here in the Agency, we encourage you to please call that person first to verify what their address name is to the left of that "at" sign, as we saw on the previous slide. That's very important because some of our people have middle initials, or use nicknames, in terms of our attempts to set

So you can't just guess that the person you know as "Richard Jones" might be in our E-mail system as that, because we have a lot of Richard Jones. So they may be Dick,

AMERICAN REPORTERS

or there may be a middle initial associated with that person.

So we suggest to you that you communicate voice-wise with the party you'd like to electronically send a message to before you attempt to do so.

If you'll notice in the addressing scheme itself, the format, the underscore does take care of all blanks to the left of the "at" sign. We do have a telephone number here. This is our organization, the IT staff, that will be more than glad to help you out if you run into any problems, or even give you a general idea of what you need to do in order to take advantage of this medium and this opportunity to electronically communicate.

One of the things that I have been asked to stress very strongly, is at this time, this particular effort is in the early stages. We don't plan on using this as our single method for communicating with any of you. We will not be transmitting sensitive information, nor will be using this medium for document transfer.

We expect that some time down the road, there could be a possibility, and I would expect that that sign-in sheet that's being passed around this room would eventually include a column that would ask you to put down your Internet E-mail address, along with your fax telephone. I expect that we will see the day where the fax phone number will go away, and it will only be your E-mail address. But for this time, all our methods for communicating with you now will continue.

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is just an additional opportunity.

With that in mind, one of the other things that we are exploring with regards to opportunities for maybe posting documents and information of a nonsensitive nature is using the FAA's new corporate bulletin board. This corporate bulletin board was established by the Agency's large Information Technology office some time ago, and other organizations throughout the Agency have taken advantage of this.

The Airways Facilities and Air Traffic people have areas on this bulletin board, and we are taking a hard look at those opportunities that this particular form and platform provides to us.

So one of the things that our Policy office is exploring with regards to taking advantage of this medium is, what is the interest out there with regards to, is it an advantage, will people actually use it, will it be an additional help, those sorts of things, to gain that kind of information to determine whether it is within the public interest.

The other thing, naturally, is by nature of our business itself, we have to be somewhat careful about what we do and how we do it, in terms of the kinds of information and the types of data to be stored out there. Again, fire walls are in place, and so on and so forth, but security is an important aspect, and we have to keep that in our minds at

all times.

The other things is, with regards to anyone who has used bulletin boards -- which I'm sure there is a number of you who do and have -- bulletin boards offer you also an electronic messaging capability, user forums, and opportunities to post information and respond to questions from other people who access to the bulletin board itself.

That's another initiative that we're having to take a close look at, and that is, what are the resources involved with regards to our making this part of our daily routine, in terms of monitoring the bulletin board, responding to questions and E-mail that is sent back and forth between the bulletin board members.

On this slide, we do offer you the telephone number and a general idea of access to the bulletin board itself.

Right now, there are several areas on the bulletin board.

There is not one for Civil Aviation Security. Airways

Facilities does have one, and Public Affairs has an area on the bulletin board.

So those of you who do not already have access but do have the facilities to do so, I would encourage you to sign into the bulletin board, take a look at it, explore it a little bit, see how it works, and then perhaps someday when it's decided that Security may use it, then you will already have that experience and be able to take advantage of it.

We are not monitoring the bulletin board with

AMERICAN REPORTERS

regards to electronic messaging at this time. So I do ask you that if you do sign on and send out an E-mail message for, just in one of the forms or so forth, or even to the system's operator, that no employees in Security are monitoring that to respond to your questions at this time. So I do want to caution you.

This here is just a quick picture. I'm sorry; it may be difficult to read. But it is the first page on the corporate bulletin board that gives you an idea of what is out there and available right now. It's somewhat limited. Again, it's in the early stages. So the Agency has not built this to level that the opportunity provides it to do so. But it does give you an idea and an opportunity to sign into a place where at least information is posted that may be of interest to you and others.

MR. WINN: Could you read that to us? Unfortunately, my age has got my eyes.

MS. TITSWORTH: I did want to mention also that in the chair over there are copies of this briefing that you're more than welcome to take a copy.

Yes, it's the Skynet bulletin board; Public Affairs bulletin board; Flight Standards bulletin board; our OATS bulletin board, which is the Agency's Office Automation Technology and Services area; a CC mail bulletin board, again, that's more for internal Agency use only; and then the Airway Facilities Special Interest group.

For the heck of it, before I came down here today,
I signed in and took a look at a few of them, and there's a
lot of information out there. Naturally, there's nothing
that relates to security now, but maybe some time in the
future. Any questions?

MR. STEMPLER: What's the Skynet?

MS. TITSWORTH: I'm sorry, I'm unable to answer that question to you directly, because I'm not sure. I'm not the system's operator, and that's managed by someone else. I can find out for you.

MR. STEMPLER: All right.

MS. TITSWORTH: Okay. Thanks very much.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Thank you very much, Maureen.

In addition to the agenda, I want to call on

Dave Smith to give us a presentation on the Screener

Performance Evaluation and Reporting System, or the means to

evaluate screener performance. Dave?

MR. SMITH: Good morning, everybody. It's a little bit of short notice, but I'm going to spend a little bit of time. I'd like to do three things. First off, I'd like to give you a little bit of a background of what SPEARS Screener Proficiency Evaluation Reporting System is, where we are today with it, and then what we are looking at down the road a little bit.

SPEARS is really a concept that we've developed here over the years, primarily to make the screening job

AMERICAN REPORTERS

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

easier and better on the screeners at the checkpoints, so that we're now looking at applications also for check baggage.

SPEARS really consists of two distinct functions; one of them is a training function which is done off-line, and the other one is an on-line monitoring and testing and evaluation system which actually takes threat images electronically out of a library and inserts them into a passenger's bag as that bag is being screened. And in addition, we can also insert entire bags into the system, which we can use as a gauge of how well the system is performing.

One of the advantages of this is the fact that when we take our special agents and go through and evaluate the system, because of the manpower involved -- and the carriers do this same identical program, and they understand this -- it's a lot of manpower involved in taking a bag and walking through a screening point, so the day would get very limited. With SPEARS, we can do that electronically and we can control that. We could do that every minute, if we wanted to; obviously, that's a little bit high.

But we're looking at trying to optimize the frequency to do that, to get the best performance out of screeners. And obviously, if the screeners are always aware that there may be a test coming through, then they're going to be looking more intently at each bag.

We have currently just finished at the Technical

Center an operational test and evaluation of the off-line

training portion of SPEARS, and that is a multimedia training

system that currently is being produced by Safe Passage.

It's a public computer systems up in Rochester, New York.

That's a multimedia training system that is being used currently in the United States and also outside of the United States. I can't really address right now what the results of that are. The test has just ended, and we're not really in position yet to -- we haven't really analyzed all the data.

The second part, the on-line portion, is currently scheduled to start undergoing an operational test out in Los Angeles this month. That system is TNT made by EG&G Astro Physics, and that's the part that actually puts the images into the system.

Our plans for the future are, when we complete these tests, there are a few upgrades that we are initiating into the systems. We plan then in '96, to take these out at, hopefully, all the category airports -- and also the three locations where the CTX that Tom Guarini just mentioned is going to be located -- and go through an operational test and evaluation for about a year, in which time we'll pin down all the benefits and all the costs and so forth, so that it will allow us to then make some smart regulatory decisions, if they're needed.

One additional thing that we're looking at, in conjunction with SPEARS, is under a contract, we're looking at a selection methodology. One of the things that we have found in some of our previous tests is that there are certain people out there that make very good screeners; there are certain people out there that, no matter what you do in the line of training, will never make good screeners.

And we would like to be able to identify those people before they're actually hired and put on-line. That will be used in conjunction with SPEARS, and we'll be doing some evaluations of that during the year also.

The functional requirements have already been developed in draft form and provided to the manufacturers, and we're still working to meet those requirements. Those requirements will be refined after the operational test and evaluation is complete, and a deployment decision will be made probably the latter part of '96, after we complete the data analysis from the demonstrations that we're currently scheduling.

I think that's probably it in a nutshell. I'd like to entertain any questions, if there are any.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Dennis?

MR. SCHAAR: Schaar, ALPA. Thank you for the briefing on that. I didn't mean to embarrass the Chair by bringing up that point, but I was looking forward to hearing where this -- I had just gotten this flyer on Human Factors

program from Aviation Security -- and I wanted to hear where we were with the SPEARS program.

If I may, through the Chair, I'd like to have Glen Winn tell us about an award that was presented yesterday to a Screener of the Year. Would that be appropriate?

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Let me begin on that, if I may, and then I would like Glen to chime in on it. I'd like to come to that a little later. Are there any other questions about the SPEARS system and our program for it?

(No audible response.)

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Well, I want to thank Captain

Schaar for reminding us of that obligation to brief that.

It's a very appropriate one. You did not cause me

embarrassment. I'm embarrassed that we didn't have it on the

agenda, but I'm very glad that you reminded us of it.

MR. BULLARD: Admiral Flynn?

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Yes.

MR. BULLARD: This is Jack Bullard again. I did have a question about this SPEARS. You may recall, I think it was shortly after you came on board with the Agency, that we had a meeting out in Chicago, spent about three days out there. This was a topic of the discussion there.

One of the recommendations that was made at that time was that the FAA consider purchasing this on-line testing equipment as a way to improve the efficiency of the FAA testing and upgrade the whole system.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We thought that it was cost effective, considering the -- as Dave mentioned in his report, it's very expensive to conduct these tests, and you could conduct tests remotely as frequently as deemed appropriate and get a much better view of how well they were doing on any particular checkpoint.

I never heard back whether or not there was any follow-up to whether or not the FAA would fund that themselves, or if -- it seemed to be inferred by David's report that they're more on a track to pass that cost on to the airports and/or carriers.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Ms. Rork? Did you want to speak?
MS. RORK: No, go ahead, Admiral.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: It has been the intention of ACS, since I have been the associate administrator, that we would validate the effectiveness of various means of improving screener proficiency performance, and SPEARS is a very important aspect of that, these automated systems.

It seems almost intuitively obvious that when you're dealing with people who must discern things that are difficult to discern on the screens of X-rays, that the best way of improving their mental library of images that might indicate a threat is to give as many threat indications as possibly can be done and to achieve what that efficient rate of presentation to people would be.

We have acquired some of those systems in order to

AMERICAN REPORTERS

conduct our operational test and evaluation. We have a proposal within the administration that we should get some more of them in order to accelerate their introduction. But it is not our intention that we would provide those wholesale to the system overall, to all the screening points in the system.

We appreciate the keen interest that we have seen on the part of the carriers and their screening companies in, as one screening company official mentioned, raising the crossbar of performance and of availing themselves of this new technology that looks so promising in order to be able to achieve that, so that they, who are acutely conscious of their responsibility and their desire to do a very good job on that, can use that technology in order to have better, more reliable data on how screening is, in fact, working; on how it is performed; and how one selects, trains, and maintains the mental libraries and alertness of the people who are actually doing the screening.

Ms. Rork?

MS. RORK: I'd like to bring up one further point regarding the meeting that I did attend -- and I was in another position at that time. When I attended that meeting in Chicago, and I believe Mr. Bullard's question was also raised, if I'm not mistaken -- and I would appreciate if someone in your organization could check -- we were promised a report of the results of that meeting of what the

intentions were of the FAA regarding the SPEARS' training program.

One of my concerns since I've been in my present position at ATA is the direction of this effort and the unavailability of information, because I would like to be able to provide that to the other carriers that are not actively participating through my security committee.

I don't know if that report was not published, or maybe inadvertently, I was left off the list. So if you could help us out in that way, I would very much appreciate that.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Well, I do not wish to go back to an event of September 1993 and try to reconstitute a report from that. I think as far as screener proficiency is concerned, to my knowledge -- memory becomes problematical at my advance age -- but it does seem to me that, as part of the briefing for security directors, that the SPEARS program was covered and that the human factors was covered in some detail by Jim Fobes.

We will make available to all carriers and all interested persons, and those who have an interest and would be subject, quite possibly, to security restrictions on the dissemination of it, but certainly all carriers would have the appropriate interest in it, that we would want to make available the copies of the reports from the test and evaluation.

And I recall that we have briefed on the initial tests that were done in San Francisco, with regard to performance and what might be achievable by the application of SPEARS so far. I mean, I should not get out ahead of what is actually being found in the operational test and evaluation.

But it seems to me that the opportunities for improved performance are dramatic, and almost certainly the industry will want to avail -- the carriers will want to avail themselves of that in the interest of better security, far before we approach the question of regulation. It would seem to me that that would be practically a no-brainer.

SCREENER OF THE YEAR AWARD

ADMIRAL FLYNN: With regard to the importance that the carriers put on screener performance, we had yesterday, in this room, the Administrator, David Hinson, presented on behalf of the FAA the ATA and RAA, the Screener of the Year award to Mr. Renzoni, who's an employee of Argenbright and screens for United, among some other airlines, at Dulles Airport -- a very fine man who has worked very hard and diligently to do his job well, and to supervise others in doing it.

And so, we were very glad to join in that, and we're very glad to see the resources that were dedicated to that by the Air Transport Association and the Regional Airlines Association.

We appreciate their help in that, in selecting initially 90 screeners nationwide, then 8 regional winners, and then the national winner from among those 8. United was there and present, and I would like to ask Glen to give his view of yesterday's event.

MR. WINN: I'll try and shorten this presentation as much as possible. As the admiral said, Mr. Renzoni was present yesterday with a room full of dignitaries from within the FAA, the Air Transport Association, the RAA, and the Department of Transportation, and the administrator.

Mr. Renzoni had his wife with him here, and was presented with a plaque from the three organizations mentioned.

We, United Airlines, are very proud of that fact, that this man has performed some of the functions that he had. Examples were -- the amount of contestants involved were several thousand, as the admiral said, and then it came down to a regional situation. In the citation for Mr. Renzoni, it was stated that nominees for the award had to display specific and sustained superior performance in aviation security.

Over the past four years, Mr. Renzoni's contributions to aviation security have included reconfiguring checkpoints to enhance security; creating test objects to help screeners to better detect potentially dangerous materials; and in that matter, he had, in fact, put together several demonstrative bomb devices of his own for

testing his own people.

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

And we thought that was quite ingenious. And he had done it specifically with the training of the personnel that worked for him in mind, and of course, the protection of all of you, and the public and, in general, the 1.5 billion people that are checked yearly in the systems of the United States security.

Going on with the citation, states that he had performed working extreme shifts, in one case, several cases, 16-hour shifts, and making sure that the checkpoints were adequately staffed in all kinds of weather. And, in fact, he was responsible over a four-year period of time of personally detecting 105 actual weapons.

We consider that an extremely qualified person for the job. And as a result of that reward he received yesterday, and his wife being present, et cetera, we, as an airline are flying him to Chicago for a special presentation from our senior staff in the next two weeks.

I don't have any other comments on it. I just thought it was a real mark for all of us in this room because, as you know, we've worked on this over a 10-year period of time to get it to the level that it came to yesterday with a national award. And with that, I think everybody in this room deserves credit to themselves for what they've done to bring it to that level finally. Thank you.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: I'm very glad that Mr. Renzoni will

AMERICAN REPORTERS

be mentioned in the minutes of this meeting, and it's important to note that award. Security comes to a matter of performance by people, and we need the kind of dedication that he has shown.

Okay. Any other matters? Yes, Bob?

OTHER BUSINESS

MR. MONETTI: What about the -- Bob Monetti, from Pan Am 103. Dave Smith said that the testing for the training part of SPEARS is completed, but the report wasn't done. Can we put on the agenda for the next meeting that a report will be given on that for the next meeting?

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Yes. I think what he was saying was that the evaluation had been done. And that report -- I don't know the sensitivity and the availability of it, so I can't really undertake to distribute it to all participants at the meeting, but certainly those with an interest, we will make it available. And we can provide a presentation, however, appropriately modulated, on it. I note your request, and we will follow on it. And let's see if we can't actually get it into the agenda next time.

MR. MONETTI: I'll be watching.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Okay. Yes, Mr. Graser?

MR. GRASER: Al Graser again. Can a representative of the FAA give us an update on the Group Access project?

MR. BUTTERWORTH: Let me try an ad lib version, Al.

A Group Access pilot was ready to be launched, and we were

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

setting baseline performances, performance required in the area of ID display, challenge, et cetera. I think we are trying to now validate that those baseline measures are being met at airports before the Group Access pilot projects take place. MR. GRASER: It's still a little while yet? MR. BUTTERWORTH: Yes. I think the decision to do 8 it is there, but it's a questions of making sure that the 9 baseline measures that we need to ensure --10 ADMIRAL FLYNN: Baseline performance is there. MR. BUTTERWORTH: -- performance is there. 11 12 MS. RORK: Do you want to elaborate on the baseline 13 measures? 14 MR. BUTTERWORTH: No, not in this forum. 15 ADMIRAL FLYNN: No, no. No, we do not. 16 MS. RORK: Thank you. 17 ADMIRAL FLYNN: Yes, Dave? MR. STEMPLER: David Stempler, Executive Director 18 19 of the International Airline Passengers Association. 20 I would just make a request in the future to the FAA, as well as to United, that whenever you're having any of 21 22 these ceremonies for these screeners, we'd certainly like to 23 be present. Too often, the screeners get a lot of abuse from 24 passengers and don't get the accolades. And we want them to 25 know how much we appreciate their fine work. 26 And as representing airline passengers, we'd like

them to know that we really appreciate all that they do, and especially for a gentleman like this who has found so many weapons and done such an exemplary job. We'd like to give them an "atta boy," at least from the passengers.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Let me express regret that you weren't invited for that. We should have invited you. Let me undertake to pass on, on your behalf, to Mr. Renzoni the appreciation of the International Airline Passengers Association.

MR. STEMPLER: Thank you very much. I hope United, the same.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Yes?

MR. SCHAAR: That goes for ALPA as well.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Yes?

MS. RORK: Susan Rork of the ATA. As Irish mentioned, the ATA and RAA joined with FAA to present this award. And we did give a monetary reward, a joint award from the ATA and the RAA.

And just informally, I'd like to say, in our discussions and as we reviewed this whole process, our thinking was that this was a first year. This was a start. We got it together, and we made the first step. And we would hope that in the second year and in future years that we could further expand this program, and maybe even expand the recognition. I mean, this was a national award.

The nominees came from the 9 FAA regions into

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

headquarters, and then those 9 nominees were reviewed from the original 90 that came nationwide. So I believe that we should look at this, and I'd like to recommend that we look at even making this award a more expanded type of award, involving more people. I think it would be a win/win for everyone.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: I agree. And again, my apologies for not inviting you. We'll get better at it as time goes on. Next year's will be bigger, better, as Susan suggests. And we'll even have our invitation list up to the point of so finely tuned that we'll have members of the ASAC invited. How about that?

MR. STEMPLER: Mr. Chair, I didn't mean this to elicit -- in the sense of complaint, but I just, you know, very well done; just for the future, we just would like to participate.

ADMIRAL FLYNN: Got it. I would say, not to forgive myself, but those who work for me, and the RAA and the ATA, that to get it done was a considerable thing.

It's amazing how modest people are that they don't come forward to pat themselves on their backs, and they're a little reluctant sometimes to make nominations. So we kept working on that, too, and indeed, got very fine nominees, after some time.

Anything else from particularly the people here at the round table, or in the first instance? Yes, Mr. Dodson?

AMERICAN REPORTERS

MR. DODSON: Mr. Chairman, Alvy Dodson from ALEAN. I just want to commend the FAA and I suppose yourself on the joint meeting between the category "X" airport security coordinators and the federal security managers that was held in Orlando. I know that we found it personally, from an operational point of view, an excellent meeting for the FSMs and the airport security coordinators from around the country 9 to get together and discuss some issues. And I would certainly encourage the continued involvement of those two 10 11 groups on a yearly basis. We thought it was very productive. 12 And I'd like to compliment Pete Falcone and his 13 folks that put that together. I assume it was his staff. 14 But it was very productive, and we just want to encourage 15 that to continue. 16 ADMIRAL FLYNN: Thank you very much. Yes? Around 17 the outside, Admiral Busick? ADMIRAL BUSICK: No. 18 19 ADMIRAL FLYNN: Mr. Butterworth, did you? 20 MR. BUTTERWORTH: Yes, a small housekeeping task. We have about 25 copies of the '93 annual report to Congress 21 22 on Aviation Security, which is a publicly available document. Frederica, they will be down --23 2.4 MS. DUNN: I'll put them on the table.

MR. BUTTERWORTH: They'll be on the table.

takes some time to get reports to Congress. The '94 report

25

is on its way up there soon. But that's the most currently available public report on security that's been given to the Congress. MR. STEMPLER: When was this issued? 5 MR. BUTTERWORTH: In December, I think. It could have been available for the last ASAC meeting, but we didn't have copies. Anything else? 8 ADMIRAL FLYNN: 9 MR. BUTTERWORTH: Next meeting? 10 ADMIRAL FLYNN: The next meeting will be September, and we will be providing notice of it in due course. 11 12 MR. GRASER: Another question. Al Graser. UAS 13 working group is a subgroup of ASAC, and it's been quite a 14 while since we've had a meeting of that group. Now, it may 15 be because if we're coming on-line in September, one of the 16 things you may suggest is have that working group the afternoon of, or maybe have this in the afternoon, and that 17 in the morning of the same day. 18 19 ADMIRAL FLYNN: We'll try to schedule them for that coordination, for that convenience. 20 MR. GRASER: Okay. 21 22 Any other questions? ADMIRAL FLYNN: 23 (No audible response.) CLOSING REMARKS 2.4 25 ADMIRAL FLYNN: Again, I want to thank you all very much for attending, and thank you for your devotion to 26

1	security.
2	
3	AVIATION SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE was concluded.)