DOCKET NO.: SA-517
EXHIBIT NO. 3-BB

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD
WASHINGTON, D.C.

FAA MEMORANDUM dated August 14,1997
SUBJECT: RESPONSES TO NTSB QUESTIONS

(2 pages)

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration

Memorandum

FAA GUAM SSC
P.O. Box 22829
Barrigada, Guam 96921-2829

Subject: **Information:** Responses to NTSB questions Date: August 14, 1997

From: Supervisor, Guam Radar/Automation System Support Center

Reply to Attn. of:

To: Air Safety Investigator, Lawrence G. Smith

Enclosed are responses to your series of questions requested August 11, 1997. Several of the questions concern the ARTS-IIA Operational Program. Our responses are as complete and accurate as possible, however, we in the Airway Facilities Service do not develop the ARTS-IIA operational program nor do we maintain the operational program by performing such functions as site adaptation. Our national organization, National Terminal Systems Engineering Division and the Air Traffic Control Service provide, and maintain the software (Operational Program), defining its capabilities and providing specific site parameter data.

Ken B. Reyes

BB-1

ATTACHED IS A LIST OF QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY LAWRENCE SMITH, TO THE GUAM R/A SSC FACILITY ON 8/12/97. APPROXIMATELY 0500Z.
Alphanumerics were assigned, by Guam R/A SSC, to the questions, to facilitate adequate responses, on this document, NTSB2A.DOC.

A. MONTHLY MSAW VERIFICATION PRIOR TO ACCEPTANCE OF THE SOFTWARE FIX.

Airway Facilities (AF) will be working very closely with the CERAP Air Traffic (AT) Automation Specialist (AUS) and the FAA HughesTech center, during the evaluation of the ARTS-IIA software by AOS. AF will ensure that ALL parameters are verified, prior to system certification. We expect to run 6190.5D, paragraph 84, numerous times prior to acceptance. We also expect to make accurate log entries, attesting to this fact, and receive proper documentation of appropriate MSAW locations, altitudes, and beacon codes available, from either the CERAP AUS, or the tech center.

B. SITE SPECIFIC PARAMATERS FOR THE CURRENT ASR-8 FACILITY.

The ASR-8/ATCBI-5 Site Specific Paramaters used in the ARTS-IIA Program are under the jurisdiction of the Air Traffic Service.

C. RADAR SITE MOVED?

The ASR-5, was located in between the runways at Andersen AFB. When this facility was decommissioned, the ASR-8, purchased by the Navy, installed at Mt. Santa Rosa, became the primary terminal radar facility, . The ASR-8 has not been moved or relocated, since its installation in 5/89.

D. AIR FORCE PGUA?

This location identifier, PGUA, refers to the ASR-5, which was decommissioned. It was not relocated to the current ASR site. The Navy ASR-8, was installed, commissioned, and maintained by the FAA prior to the decommissioning of the ASR-5. The Navy transferred ownership of the system to the FAA, as long as the FAA provided Broadband Terminal Radar data to their Radar Operations Facility (ROF), where the Navy processed and displayed ASR-8 BRITE information in the tower cab, and in the ROF facility. Once the Navy transferred the ASR-8 to the FAA, and removed their TPX-42 & BRITE equipment, the FAA installed, an advisory display in the ROF, which receives a slaved video presentation from the Andersen AFB DBRITE.

E. 6190.5D: PAGE 32, PAGE 49, AND PARAGRAPH 84 HOW WERE THESE TESTS PERFORMED?

These procedures were followed in accordance with FAA Order 6190.5D, and the MSAW procedures described in Paragraph 84.

F. WHAT WERE THE RESULTS?

The results received from periodic testing, did not meet the expected outcomes, as prescribed in paragraph 84.

G. LOTS OF INHIBITED AREAS-WHY? -WHO DETERMINES?

It is an Air Traffic function to request updates and modifications to the software, and forward reconfiguration requests to the technical center. Software patches are received by the AUS and installed, in some cases, with the need for AF presence.

H. WHO PROGRAMS?

The Technical Center receives these requests for changes to the software from the site AUS, and programs the software accordingly.

I. WHEN WAS THE PROGRAMMING DONE?

Airways Facilities site logs, do not reflect any receipt of changes to the software, other than 2/4/97, where the AF site supervisor, specifically requests AF presence, during an upgrade for inter facility hand-offs from the MicroEARTS system. It is an unusual circumstance for AF to get involved with software modification or upgrades to the system. There is no documentation, that exists, where AF is informed that the software upgrade is performing as advertised for Air Traffic operation. The Specialists assume, that certain specifics remain in the software, where confidence testing of such things as the MSAW functionality meet Air Traffic needs.

J. ANY COORDINATION WITH THE TECH CENTER ON INHIBITED AREAS?

AF was not involved in any coordination activities with software modifications and upgrades associated with inhibited MSAW service areas.

BB-2