

Special PASCO Board Meeting on Reno Airspace Safety – March 9th 2009 7pm

Participants:

SSA

Phil Umphres	Chairman of the SSA Board of Directors & SSA Region 10 director
Steve Northcraft	SSA Region 8 Director and Chair of the Government Liaison Committee
Cindy Brickner	SSA Region 12 Director, Vice Chair and Secretary of the Executive Committee, Chair of the Commercial Operators and Business Members Committee Chair of the Airspace and Pilot Certification Sub Committees,
Stew Crane	SSA State Governor for Nevada
Marc Ramsey	SSA State Governor for Northern California
Jay McDaniel	SSA Region 11 Director , treasurer Las Vegas Valley Soaring

PASCO

Peter Deane	President
Mike Mayo	Director (Truckee)
Joel Klein	Director
Fred Lasor	Safety Officer
Rolf Peterson	FAA Liaison
Tyler White	Membership Chair, AirSailing President

Concerned Region 11 Pilots

Jim Herd (Minden)
Laurie Harden (SoaringNV)
Mike Moore (SoarMinden)
Darryl Ramm
John Morgan (Minden)
Dave Bingham (Minden)

Introduction – Peter Deane

We have had another near miss between an airliner and a glider at 14000' directly over Minden.

The glider was not following PASCO radio procedures and did not have a transponder and was flying in exactly the right location to be a serious hazard to jet traffic approaching Reno from the south. The pilot was not a PASCO member but was an employee of a local FBO, who's owner had been briefed about the procedures and was fully aware of them. This occurred on Feb 24th this year.

FAA (FSDO) and FBI were investigating afterward and we have been told that this incident reached the very highest levels of the FAA. We are not sure what the fall out of that will be.

We are very worried about the potential for another midair, especially as this recent event clearly demonstrates that the PASCO procedures and guidelines are NOT being followed adequately and putting the travelling public in potential danger. The procedures are recommendations, not a 'legal' requirement, and are not being followed by regular users of the airspace.

I am calling this meeting so that we can all understand exactly what is going on and what the implications may or may not be. We want to look at what we can do to prevent this happening again. What are our options?

One of the proposals made by PASCO (April 23rd 2007) was for a glider alert area to be published on sectionals and approach charts so that other airspace users would be alerted to the glider activity in the area – this was NOT adopted by the FAA – we were not given a reason why. The final radio procedures were established with Reno TRACON in July 2007 and significant effort was expended to publicise, educate and make details available on the web site immediately thereafter.

PASCO has a documented history of promoting the use of transponders in the areas around Reno. Following the Hawker jet collision with an ASG29 over the Pine Nuts in 2006, the FAA and NTSB requested PASCO come up

with procedures to help reduce the chance of a glider – jet midair in the skies around Reno. For this to be effective we MUST have compliance from users of the critical airspace.

Goal of Meeting

Bring all meeting SSA, PASCO and concerned Region 11 pilots up to date with current glider-jet traffic safety situation around Reno – provide a forum for understanding the key factors and capacities for action at the national, regional and local level.

Clarify history of PASCO work with Reno TRACON to define current PASCO recommended practices and the reasons why this agreement exists

Clarify SSA position (long term and short term) on transponder rule making and FAA liaison

Discuss and clarify short term options for reducing glider-jet near miss occurrences near Reno

Discuss and clarify long term solutions for reducing glider-jet near miss occurrences near Reno

Define short term actions that can improve safety in the Reno airspace.

Karol Hines statement: Recent history of PASCO involvement in Reno airspace procedures

A few days after the Hawker/glider mid-air collision in August, 2006, the NTSB investigator called a meeting to bring together the owners of the Hawker, the local Soaring community, Reno TRACON and local and National FAA personnel. As a result of that meeting, the Soaring community was requested to put together Work Groups to coordinate with Reno TRACON and come up with procedures that would dramatically lower the possibility of this sort of accident happening in the future.

As PASCO President and SSA Region 11 Director, I was asked, by the NTSB investigator, to form and lead the Work Groups. I solicited input from the local Soaring community on who would be the best representatives for the various soaring locations in our area. We had representatives from ASI, Truckee and Minden as well as others from PASCO and the local FAA Examiner (for glider check rides). Over the next 10 months, the groups had several meetings with Reno TRACON and several conference calls that included NTSB, Oakland Center and Regional FAA Airspace folks. This was an open door process. We encouraged everyone to express their opinion and responded to as many communications as possible; published minutes for every meeting and generally encouraged everyone to become involved. Remember, everyone working on this issue on behalf of Soaring was a VOLUNTEER with other jobs and priorities in their life.

One of the very first requests from the NTSB investigator was that we define areas around Reno and Minden in which gliders would NOT be allowed unless they were equipped with a transponder. No one in the local soaring community supported that idea.

In coming up with a workable “solution”, the working groups had to make sure that whatever we came up with would not only satisfy the FAA and the NTSB, but would also be something that the local soaring community, including the many pilots in this area who had very little experience in working with ATC, would understand and support. We believe we did that. We created a briefing document to be given to each pilot the first time they came out to fly at one of the local locations and a “cockpit card” that summarized the procedure that they could keep in their glider for reference. We used the KISS principal and included a short primer on talking to ATC. After several iterations, this procedure and these documents were “approved” by the NTSB inspector and Reno TRACON. These documents are now posted on the PASCO web site safety page

In the Spring of 2007, a supply of the briefings and cockpit cards were distributed (in person) to AirSailing, Truckee and Minden. In addition, a briefing document for the briefer and a log for each pilot to sign when they were given a briefing and a card were given to each site. In June of 2007, we had Mark Beadle, a Reno TRACON controller and long time glider pilot, visit each of the local operations and give a talk to the pilots. A recording of his briefing at Truckee is also posted on the PASCO safety page.

The NTSB investigator on the case left the agency and turned the case over to a new investigator (forget the timing). The new investigator put the case on the bottom of her pile and did not close it and make a recommendation to the FAA until there was a very strange report posted on the NASA ASRS database (ACN 792919) by an airline pilot in which he said he responded to TCAS conflict warnings – a glider with a transponder. TRACON did not recall this incident and did not find anything on their recordings. No NMAC was filed, however, it

spurred the NTSB to finally close their investigation and make a recommendation to the FAA that the transponder exemption for gliders be removed.

If Jon Hannan (the pilot involved in the recent near-miss) had been following our simple procedure, the incident would NOT have happened. Transponder or not, he would have been talking to ATC – something he is very comfortable with since he is a former “FAA Test Pilot”.

Jon should not have gone above 10,000, with a paying passenger no less, when he realized he could not get the passenger to tune the radio, which was in the front seat – he was in the back, to the Reno Approach frequency. Reno approach is very cooperative in working with the soaring community, but we have to let them know we are there when we don't have a transponder and can be pretty certain that they can not see us.

Role of SSA and SSA position on transponder rulemaking - Steve/Phil/Cindy

Steve Northcraft statement - : SSA typically provides guidance and expertise, interpretation of FARs, examples of other practices in other parts of the country. SSA can indicate whom to contact to resolve the issues (PASCO appears to have a good working relationship with local TRACON). SSA can also work with FAA at a national level to resolve issues with their contacts. Sometimes the local FSDO may not agree with the correct interpretation of the applicable FARs—we can guide them to the right FAA people in Washington for a correct interpretation. Can give a national credibility. Sometimes though the local tracon people are more comfortable talking with the local soaring representatives.

Background: NPRM 88-2 in 1988 that mandated xponders. SSA & EAA sought exemption for aircraft certified w/o electrical system, and we received it. Xpon at that time used a lot of power. Now xponders are a 50 year old technology. As far as the regulatory philosophy: SSA is for Voluntary compliance. If you're in an area of high power traffic, you should be thinking about using a transponder. Also, use a PCAS. We think voluntary compliance works.

PASCO's done a good job of promoting the use of transponders.

Numbers: Noted that NTSB 60 NMACS between gliders and commercial jets in 20 year period. 42 of 60 were at or below 10K feet, in areas where a xponder was not required by any other aircraft. So, only 18 NMACS at altitude (10 were in NV, 4 in CO, 1 CA, 1 NM, 1 UT). One per year, so the majority of them are happening HERE (RNO area). Only one every 4 to 5 years in Colorado.

Spoke with NTSB investigator who wrote final report. She was looking for NMACS between Comm jet and gliders. However, for comparison, I came up with 9200 NMACs between commercial Jets and ALL other aircraft during the same period (most of which would have had transponders!) That's why we think a global ruling on xponders in gliders would not be especially helpful.

ADSB as currently envisioned will be primarily for IFR traffic management. We feel FAA should spend more resources on developing an ADSB unit for VFR aircraft. FAA will publish final rule in April 2010. Manufacturers should be able to offer units then. UAT-type units should be less expensive than current xponders.

About the Natl Xponder Code: NTSB recommended to the FAA that they establish a Nat'l glider xponder code. We've been advocating 0440. FAA will issue a final rule in March of 2010 (code likely “0000”—easy to remember.)

Peter: This is a very local situation and may need a local answer.

Steve: Carson Valley, Reno & Minden situation is unique. This is the only place in the nation where high altitude glider traffic coincides with high levels of commercial jet traffic, so yes, you may need a local answer.

Events after the near miss, local implications - Fred LaSor

I took the day off February 25th but came into the hangar about midday, at which time I saw a copy of the fax that had been sent out by Vince Bianco regarding the near miss between USAir and a Minden glider the previous day. Our copy of the fax came from Airport Manager Keith Kallman, who also told us the glider was piloted by a Soar Minden pilot.

Later that afternoon I received a telephone call from Vince Bianco, Reno TRACON Front Line Manager, who told us what he knew about the event and asked what our gliders were doing on the day in question. I told him we had two gliders up that day for a total of three flights (the K-21 had made 2 flights), that our gliders were transponder-equipped, and that our pilots were talking to Reno Approach, per the PASCO Traffic Briefing. I also told him we

wanted to work with the TRACON to make sure there were no repetitions of the events of the 24th. Bianco also made it clear to me they were NOT interested in restricting airspace unequally -- i.e., we had as much access to the airspace as the big boys, but we needed to work with them so there was no chance of a midair. At that time it sounded as if the event was going to be handled at the level of the Reno Approach.

Vince came in two days later to talk more about what had happened, and accepted my invitation to take a glider ride so he could see how we operated. During that ride he tried without success to talk to Reno Approach on the glider radio. My experience talking with Approach is that you need to be about 12,000' MSL for them to get a good signal from our radio, and I think he was about 10,000' when he called.

The next we heard of the event was when Reid Walburg, Operations Unit Supervisor of the Reno FSDO, and John Ginocchio, Special Agent of the FBI, visited our office March 2. They had apparently talked to Jon Hannan that morning, and perhaps to someone from the Soar Minden staff. They asked about transponders in our gliders and our operations procedure for flights in airspace where we might encounter commercial traffic in and out of Reno. We described our operating procedures and the PASCO Traffic Briefing, and they told us there was interest in this event at the very highest levels of the FAA. Walburg did not say so, and we did not ask, but we inferred that the FAA Administrator might even have been involved. Walburg also said we (gliders) might lose the transponder waiver, but did not speculate further on what might happen as a result of the near miss.

Looking at the future I do not anticipate that we will lose access to the airspace above Minden Airport, but I would not be surprised to have the waiver removed by some kind of emergency action (removal through the normal process would presumably require an NPRM and take about a year). I do not see any particular benefit to be gained from a public meeting, as both Tony Sabino and Jon Hannan have suggested, "to discuss alternatives to the simple, *but very restrictive*, steps" that Vince proposed in his fax of 2/24/09.

We have had public meetings and we have had working-group meetings (some of which included a representative of Soar Minden) and we have come up with what I think are workable policies. At the time of the event of the 24th those policies and procedures were not being followed. If we establish more procedures and policies and they are ignored we have not gained anything. On the other hand, if the pilot of the glider at 14,000' over Minden on the 24th had been following the generally-accepted procedures I believe the chance of a midair would have been significantly reduced. A simple radio call to Reno Approach would have alerted the controllers to the glider's presence at a conflicting altitude above Minden.

I think PASCO now needs to re-examine the procedures and either modify them or keep them as they are. In either case, we have no power to enforce our procedures, yet if someone ignores them and causes an incident we will all lose. It will be worthwhile hearing what SSA is doing regarding the transponder issue, but as long as gliders fly between 12,000' and 14,000' over Minden they are going to be in airspace that is regularly transited by commercial traffic approaching Reno at high speed.

Karol Hines : Events after the near miss – FAA implications:

The pilot of the US Airways jet filed an NMAC (Near Mid Air Collision) report. The FAA does not require this but the airline probably does. The FAA (Reno TRACON and FSDO) did a follow up investigation and filed paperwork as they are required to do. The FAA (FSDO and TRACON) and the FBI talked to the glider pilot and other local Soaring pilots. They probably talked to the US Airways pilot as well. Since there was no damage or injury, this may not go beyond this initial investigation. Reno TRACON has not indicated that any additional action will be taken but they are VERY concerned with Jon's statement about not "participating" in PASCO and willfully not practicing the procedures that PASCO worked out with them in 2007. They do not know why the FBI became involved but believe it may be because we DO have this procedure and this commercial glider pilot appeared to be willfully "violating" this procedure. Steve and Cindy can give more insight into what happens when an NMAC is filed.

Problem Statement - Short and Long term - Peter Deane

We're in a difficult position – the procedures PASCO worked out with TRACON dramatically reduces (but does not systemically remove) the chance of a jet-glider midair – the keystone of this is radio contact with Reno approach. None of the procedures and recommendations are enforceable and safety in the region is vulnerable to scoff-law pilots, those who won't install transponders for whatever reason or those who decide that they are above the inconvenience of recommended safety oriented procedures because they are not mandated by the FAA.

If all gliders needed transponders above 10000' in this area there would be a systemic solution – ie an onboard instrument automatically responding to airborne or ground based interrogation.

Any short term solutions will be voluntary and local. Systemic equipment and/or airspace based solutions will take a lot longer and we cannot afford delays to improving the situation. Rolf has some proposals to discuss for short and near term options.

Short and near term options for improving safety Rolf Peterson

Short Term

Keep on emphasizing voluntary installation and use of transponders in gliders and radio contact with Reno Approach (RNO TRACON) by glider pilots flying in the Reno area.

Maintain good working communications between PASCO, Reno TRACON, Oakland ARTCC, and local glider pilots about operational procedures and operational problems.

PASCO has no enforcement capability. PASCO continue education and peer pressure activities.

Insist that the FAA ATC system comply with current FARs and conform to established regulatory rulemaking process in making any new requirements for gliders.

Near Term

Propose that the FAA ATC system, by regulatory process, establish a local Special Operating Rules Area in defined Class E airspace around Reno where gliders would be required to have an operating Mode C transponder to operate VFR. Objective is to improve safety of operations.

Both Reno TRACON and Oakland ARTCC airspace involved.

Encourage Reno TRACON and Oakland ARTCC management to initiate the regulatory rulemaking process within the FAA to establish a local Special Operating Rules Area for gliders.

Key Decisions needed for a PASCO proposal:

Boundaries of proposed glider transponder area:

Polygon, similar to previous PASCO request to establish an Alert Area - or -

Circle around KRNO

50 nm radius ?

60 nm radius ?

?? nm radius ?

Proposed special flight rules area should include Class E airspace below the Minden and Pyramid Glider Areas (wave windows).

Altitude Floor of proposed glider transponder area:

10,000 ft msl ?

Mike Moore : Floor to be such that jets on shallowest approach would be within area?

Peter: Yes if possible, any altitudes below 10,000 we run into conflicts with other regulations that affect other types of aircraft.

Steve Northcraft: If you try to extend below 10,000 you'd run into opposition from AOPA.

Rolf: My preference for Lateral boundaries would be polygon with straight lines between known landmarks.

Open floor for new options and inputs on proposals - Peter chair.

John "Bumper": Speaking to what Steve was saying about NMACS. Interesting to know that problems are with aircraft that are NOT voluntarily complying. Problems seem to be either no xponder, or xponder not on. Talked with Fred earlier today: If wave windows were moved further south, could potentially move them out of the descent profile for RNO. Wouldn't cost the FAA anything to have a box with a 24,000 foot floor for class A. Would be a major boon to soaring and would move glider traffic south out of the descent profiles.

Other item by way of example from his classic aircraft background: "Years ago shoulder harness additions to classic aircraft eliminated engineering requirements. Could do the same thing for gliders for battery box and

xponder installation. Could also eliminate the semiannual xponder check requirement, “simplify” and less onerous than to comply.

Fred: Really ought to be a national treasure for soaring. Owens Valley high altitude soaring area. Would get visibility

Rolf: In renegotiating wave windows, OAK center was willing to talk about moving windows slightly, but were not interested in increasing the total area of the wave window.

Fred: It may be that they don't have the authority to do that. We had to give up airspace over 28,000 due to the RVSM. Oak no longer has the authority to give us the space up there.

Bumper: Regarding a 24,000 floor: At that point (down south) no one is using the airspace. The jet traffic is higher at that point.

Rolf: This is a side issue---but not what we need to be concentrating on now.

Cindy: The problem at RNO is not above 18K, but below.

Rob Stone: IF xponder not working, will I be denied use of the airspace, or if it's not working will I have to leave the airspace.

Cindy: Presumably yes.

Rolf: Some provisions for limited local authorities to grant one time exceptions.

Northcraft: These are the types of details you can work out if you chose to go that way.

Peter: Let's focus on comments about Rolf's proposals.

Jim Herd: Rolf is on to something—where the conversation should be focused. In Europe they now have TMZ transponder mandatory zones. I strongly support that.

Want to comment on some things Steve said: While PASCO has helped, it hasn't solved the problem. We have a systemic problem. As I talk with pilots there's a great number that don't know about PASCO, or don't know about the special rules. Hannon implied that since no one asked his opinion, he was not inclined to comply. My guess is that there's only 50% compliance with the PASCO/Tracon agreement.

I think around RNO xponders will help immensely. Most jets have TCAS—it does work, and it would prevent near misses and midairs—both events.

ADSB is too far away to sit and wait for it.

The Carson Valley is only somewhat unique. Right now I'm at Turf Soaring in AZ. There are airliners here. The aircraft above 10K expect all other aircraft to have xponders. Potentially an issue here and other locations around the country. Don't hear about it here in that there isn't that much glider traffic. Reno's circumstances are unique only in the high volume of glider traffic. We need to make rules mandatory to make sure people comply.

Peter: If we do pursue a glider transponder activity zone in RNO airspace, it may be a useful model for solving problems in other areas as they arise.

Bumper: It may be easier for the FAA to require xponders above 10K feet nationwide. Not sure how EAA would feel about that with classic aircraft, though those don't often fly above 10k.

Steve Northcraft: FAA is not pre-disposed to require xponders. We have no NMACs in AZ in the last 20 years. Bulk of them are in this area (RNO).

Jim: Should we support nationwide removal of exemption above 10K? It would be easy to implement, but would cause a lot of pain among many glider pilots across the country.

Steve: NTSB has pushed FAA to remove exemption in the past, but they don't want to do it. Perhaps they're concerned that there'll be too many nuisance alerts when xponders get too close together. This may be a software issue that's being addressed, and why they may be amenable to the Nat'l glider transponder code now.

Fred: Question: If someone could impose the PASCO procedure on glider pilots, would that make it a safer place to fly. If yes, then if the FAA could mandate the PASCO procedures...Or does that leave out something?

Peter: Without mandatory xponders in the key areas, would not be complete.

Jim: Spoke with John Hannon, and thinks the PASCO procedures are "Impractical and ineffective." It's just not enough. Gives a false sense of security. Jet traffic isn't all in these corridors. PASCO procedures is effectively an airspace giveaway...If

Fred: Not at all intended to be an airspace giveaway. The purpose was not to avoid those areas, but to be aware.

Peter: A warning that if you're going to be playing on the freeway...

Ty White: As a pilot, not president of AirSailing. Would like to see Rolf's mandatory proposal.

Cindy: A question for Ty: Do you always stay on RNO frequency?

Ty: If going south, stay on frequency until Mt Siegle.

Cindy: If we chose to discuss glider pilots carrying xponders as a piece of equipment...they relax their vigilance. Radio communications does increase situational awareness. Encouraging glider pilots to have to listen to what's going through the neighborhood helps OUR side. Hauling the xponders around helps the OTHER side. How do we reach out to the ATP?

Bumper: Heard the same argument against TCAS (or PCAS). I've been using TPAS (Xaon) –the alerts are a constant reminder to get your head out of the cockpit. Would have been run over by a Bonanza if not for having one.

Bumper: If you're going to have one of those two, the xponder is the most important.

Darryl: I fly with TPAS—think it's wonderful and get's your head out of the cockpit. Think that pilots who are early adopters are not part of the problem. Think that TPAS isn't helpful for fast movers though. We should take that off the table.

Hope that PASCO goes quiet on UAT technology. That's a distraction for the immediate safety issues. Plus, it's so far away that it's not a viable option to Mode C. Strongly support Rolf's idea for a required zone. Wish that PASCO Procedures could've been more effective. It's probably a human factors issue, and that 50% compliance is about right. Some pilots are belligerent, some are nervous about speaking with ATC. John Hannon comes off as a spoiled kid, "I wasn't involved, so I won't comply."

Jim: Agree with Darryl, but think there's a sense of disenfranchisement among some pilots.

Darryl: Think the PASCO procedures are great, but we're not getting full compliance and it's gone as far as it can go.

Stew: Question was, what is the quickest way to get some relief? If PASCO procedures were mandated by the FAA for this area, then there's no cost involved, on an individual basis.

Fred: And second part of my question, if that doesn't do it, what is needed?

Mike: Mandating transponders!

Stew: Before NSA had xponders in all it's ships, it was SOP above 8K to check in with RNO, and they would alert their traffic to your presence.

Peter: I agree with Darryl that the effectiveness of the procedures is limited by the human element. Not necessarily a rational response. If we took PASCO procedures now and made them required, you're still relying on radio procedures for separation. Can't see a way to significantly improve safety without both radio & xponder requirement.

Bumper: FAA has long had a policy of not discriminating against one type of aircraft, how could they exclude classic powered aircraft w/o an electrical system.?

Peter: Gliders can go a lot of places that classic aircraft can't.

Darryl / Bumper / Cindy back and forth about xponders & TPAS, enhancing or not.

Fred: Time for PASCO to be proactive. We can draft a letter to go to all operators, enclosing PASCO procedures; reminding them that we have these and that they work to help improve safety, and that we recommend that you brief it to your employees and customers.

Darryl: Be careful in writing that letter, should be more of a reminder about existing procedures rather than some new mandatory change that they might react negatively to.

Dave Bingham: I agree with you Darryl. I think there's only one thing we should do, and that's have transponders. My perception is that 50% of pilots are cowboys. You have to mandate something to improve safety, and that's a transponder. I'd like to propose that there's mandatory xponder usage in some radius around RNO.

Darryl: I support Fred sending a letter out, as that's something we can do tomorrow. I'm still trying to get my head around the letter that was sent to the FAA, while we're doing the other things as well.

Dave: Education is good and important, but minor in comparison to having xponders.

Action items for the short term - Peter chair

Peter: Fred's inputs for short term things we can do are good. Don't provide a systemic improvement, but helps limit the human issues. Promotion and educational efforts will be very important. Sounds like we have a pretty unanimous desire for a xponder requirement for a special-use airspace area ASAP.

Jim: TRACON probably doesn't have the authority to go as far as we're talking about here.

Joel: In regards to Cindy's question about reaching out to ATPs. I listened to the Audio of the recent NMAC. In his conversation with RNO, the jet pilot was astonished to find someone at that altitude without a transponder. We need to make sure that airline pilots flying into RNO know about the glider activity here. How can we educate them?

Mike: If we just use the radio and talk to TRACON; that will let them know that we are here.

Cindy: There's an intermediate step: Chose to reeducate local audience. Say something like: "We have a procedure that can help. Bring a handheld to speak to ATC when you can't reach the front radio. Prudent pilot would learn all about this, imprudent pilot could receive warnings from FSDO..."

Peter: That's part of it, but peer pressure is NOT systemic.

Darryl: Still will have a percentage of pilots who are going to do what they are going to do.

Steve: Going the mandatory transponder route will take at least a year to get something in place. So, in the meantime, have the FSDO get meaner with NMACS.

Bumper: What John Hannon did was not illegal. The see & avoid is on the overtaking aircraft. Having the FSDO come down on something that is not a rule is problematic.

Steve: 91.13 careless & reckless. We have a procedure that you didn't follow that resulted in an NMAC, write him up. (In violation of a letter agreement with PASCO.)

Rolf: This approach is tenuous. We do NOT have a letter of agreement. TRACON has encouraged it, but it's not an actual letter of agreement.

Phil: I have to go now. So, if PASCO says to the FAA that we can't police ourselves and want an enforced solution, please keep us in the loop as this could have national consequences.

Mike Moore: You can brief the procedure till the cows come home, but you can't expect everyone to comply.

Cindy: Do pilots who fly in eastern region 11 know that there's a busy airport in Reno. Prudent pilots should know that there's a radio frequency they can listen to, to know that they're playing volleyball on the freeway.

Jim Herd: It's 9:30, how do we make xponders mandatory around RNO?

Peter: Rolf's proposal is probably the best approach.

Jim: How do we work the political angle to do this within the FAA. Presumably the TRACON can't approve this directly.

Rolf: Perhaps Steve can help with this: Do we Initiate it with TRACON or go to FAA directly?

Cindy: I agree with using xponders in this place, but I worry about national implications. Is this truly the belief of all PASCO members? You should make sure that your membership is in agreement.

Peter: The only real way we can move forward is to come up with a proposal. Then send it out for comment to PASCO members, and hopefully all active glider pilots in Region 11.

Jim: Need to get membership on board. Require big effort of education. You (to Peter) as president should direct Rolf to make initial enquiries with TRACON, not to make a specific proposal but to proceed along both tracks. Think there's a possibility of revolt in either direction we choose.

Peter: Have no objections to having Rolf talk to TRACON & FAA in a general sense.

Summarize and Next steps - Peter chair

Action Items:

Peter—will summarize key points of discussion and send them out to group. Need to have everyone come up with short-term improvements in education approaches – Peter will ste near term action plans in motion and publish to this meeting group and the PASCP membership at large.

Rolf plus core team of people to talk with RNO TRACON about how to move forward.

Cindy: Anyone want to write letters to airlines education departments for airlines that fly into RNO?

Peter: Good idea - We'll need to have another discussion like this once we've distilled the information here. Need to make sure all inputs and considerations are listed.

Cindy: Rolf, If your TRACON RNO FSDO will support charting an alert area, that may be something that would help in the next chart cycle. I can assist you with this. It helps the other side (ATP) see you, and is not a national issue.

Meeting ended: 9:50pm