

Members of the UK Airport Commission:

Aerospace Safety and Security, Inc. [ASAS] and Aerospace Safety Research Institute, Inc. [ASRI] recognizes the Commission's repeated wisdom, as herein, by raising these questions of major significance - in addressing the current and future problems concerning UK aviation.

A. In a short consideration of 7.1 - ["capacity provided by airports other than those short listed"] - raises the specter for the ability of these outlying airports to feed passengers into the major hub(s).

B. In view of the Commission's short list selection - possibly limiting future expansion to two London hub airports, LHR and/or GAL - it is imperative therefore to consider (B.1) cost; (B.2) domestic demand; (B.3) the availability of landing and departing slots for traffic connectivity with out lying satellite airports.

C. Identifiable issues, problems for the Commissions consideration:

(C.1). Much of the cost associated with short connecting flights to a hub can be to some degree financed and supported by the ticket price of the long haul, long distance flights. As the Commission already documented herein, airports are dominated by fixed cost expenses.

(C.2). Domestic demand can be increased by the convenience of flights from regional [neighborhood] airports to major hubs. Pre-security clearance at these smaller airports not only reduce hub congestion at security lines, but add to passenger comfort, provide also baggage check in and saves much travel time also.

(C.3). The biggest constraint to UK aviation growth and the future UK competition on a national and international scene - is based primarily on UK hub limiting capacities and possible out-of-box technological capabilities.

D. Solutions for the Commission's consideration:

(D.1) Assuming that feeder airline aircraft would be smaller, most likely turbo-prop types landing and departing a London hub, noise consideration and runway length requirements will be greatly reduced.

(D.2) Based upon the ASAS/ASRI European Patent [EP 2 160 625 B1] previously submitted for consideration by the Commission, much of the capacity increase can be achieved for UK and EU connectivity.

E. Cost and time frame for implementation:

(E.1) Implementation of the European Patent Specifications [EP 2 160 625 B1] "*Safe Runway Aircraft Arrival And Departure System Using Split Runway Design*" can be

achieved in a year or two.

(E.2) Patent EP 2160625 B1 requires small runway lengthening - on the LHR north runway only about 3 to 4,000 feet maximum for 'near simultaneous' flight operations for these feeder airliners.

(E.3) Because of low noise footprint, these airliners can be scheduled for arrival and departure at times more favorable for these connecting flights.

(E.4) The cost of runway length increase modifications are miniscule to all other presentations at this initial time frame and time; It appears to be 1 billion British Pounds, [BP].

(E.5) One additional benefit of EU Patent EP 2160625 B1 is the allowance for the cross runway taxiway, in the event a third runway would be built at LHR - or a second runway at GAL.

(E.6) This cross runway taxiway is the **required and essential** difference between the instant presentation and that of Heathrow Hub.

(E.7) The Commission has taken advice that the presentation by Heathrow Hub has not been previously used.

(E.8) Therefore implying that testing of sorts should be accomplished prior to a major financial commitment. In this regard, EU Patent EP 2160625 B1 is an extensive and proper consideration. This patent requires a relatively small expenditure, it is an operation relying **on near simultaneous flight separation standards, especially with the advent of the satellite based navigation, it will be very safe and efficient.**

(E.9) Nothing is wasted on this EU Patent EP 2169625 B1 implementation. This additional runway length can be used for the future development of a two independent linear runway system, and will also allow a cross runway taxiway for a third runway development at LHR, if so approved and desired in the future.

F. A Win-Win situation to increase capacity for additional airline service from UK's Satellite Airports:

(F.1) Time frame and options are limited - costs can be prohibitive, ultra high! Practicality should rule the waves.

(F.2) British inventive and practicality can be best described by going back a spell. It was a British Naval Officer [BNO] Captain D. R. F. Campbell with the brainchild of creating the naval aircraft carrier 'half angled flight deck, it was [BNO] Commander H. C. N. Goodhard developed the aircraft carrier deck-landing system, and [BNO] Commander C. C. Mitchel who developed the aircraft carrier steam catapult with

Brown Brothers of Edinburgh. We in your former Colonies copied all that! THANKS. Hard to imagine that these incredible and outstanding innovative efforts have dried up, disappeared, or shrunk in UK. Reading the efforts of this Commission I have to say: NO. But hell NO!

(F.3) We here in your former Colonies would like to pay back for some of your [British] outstanding contribution to technology and science. After all, where did the Industrial Revolution begin?

Thanks for your outstanding and recognized efforts in behalf of your Nation - we certainly wish you the best. If indeed we can help in your quest and excellent effort, we are ready, all you have to do is ask. A short approved testing would most likely be very convincing!

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

CEO, Aerospace Safety and Security, Inc. [ASAS]

CEO, Aerospace Safety Research Institute, Inc. [ASRI].