Report No. DOT/FAA/RD-81/95 DOT/FAA/CT-81/79

IN-SERVICE TESTING OF THE PRECISION APPROACH PATH INDICATOR (PAPI) AT NEWARK INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, NEW JERSEY

Bret B. Castle

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION TECHNICAL CENTER Atlantic City Airport, New Jersey 08405





INTERIM REPORT

DECEMBER 1981

Document is available to the U.S. public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

Prepared for

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION Systems Research & Development Service Washington, D. C. 20590 OX 20 82012

THE PLE COPY

NOTICE

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof.

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturer's names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the object of this report.

and a second a second second and a second second

Technical Report Documentation Page

| 1. Report No. | 2. Government Accessi | on No. | 3. Recipient's Catalog No. |
|--|--|--|--|
| DOT/FAA/RD-81/95 | AD Anote | 143 | |
| 4. Title and Subitle IN-SERVICE TESTING OF THE PRECISION APPROACH PATH INDICATOR (PAPI) AT NEWARK INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, NEW JERSEY | | | 5. Report Date December 1981 6. Performing Gragnization Code |
| NEW JERSEY | | · · · · , | |
| 7 Authorist | | | 8. Performing Organization Report No. |
| Bret B. Castle | | | DOT/FAA/CT-81/79 |
| 9. Performing Organization Name and Ad Federal Aviation Administra | diess at i on | | 10 Work Unit No. (TRAIS) |
| Atlantic City Airport, New | Jersey 08405 | | 11. Contract of Grant No. 081-502-510 |
| 12 Sponsoring Agency Name and Address | · • | | 13. Type of Report and Period Covered |
| U.S. Department of Transpo | rtation | | Interim Report |
| Systems Research and Develo | ation opment Service | | Dec. 8, 1980 to April 8, 1981 |
| Washington, D.C. 20590 | r | | and sponsoring Agency code |
| 15 Supplementary Notes | | | |
| "NAFEC" referenced in this | report is now know | own as the 1 | FAA Technical Center. |
| 16 Abarrost | | | |
| This sugart course that as | which of the During | | ć |
| involving 4 months of in-s | ervice testing at | Newark Int | ernational Airport, New Jersev. |
| Basically, the PAPI was co | mpared against th | e standard | red/white Visual Approach Slope |
| Indicator (VASI) system at | a large airport | and on a ru | inway with an Instrument Landing |
| System (ILS). | | | |
| The PAPI system was instal is, different wheel-to-eye large commercial aircraft were not used for this par | led in a manner t e distances. The . Questionnaire ticular report | o take care e informati es from ge | e of aircraft of all sizes; that on was obtained from pilots of neral aviation aircraft pilots |
| were not used for this par | ciculal teport. | | |
| Results showed that under | these conditions | about 60 pe | ercent of the pilots (a total of |
| 11/ quest connaires) prefer | red the PAP1 over | the VASI s | ystem. |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| | | | |
| | ·· | | |
| 17, Key Words ΡΔΡΙ Visual Δία | 9 | 18, Distribution St Document in | available to the It S public |
| VASI | | through the | National Technical Information |
| ILS | | Service, Sp | ringfield, Virginia 22161 |
| Wheel-to-Eye Distance | | | |
| 19. Security Classif. (of this report) | 20. Security Classi | . (of this page) | 21. No. of Pages 22. Price |
| | | | |
| Unclassified | Unclas | sified | 9 / |
| Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72) | Reproduction of comp | leted page autho | vized E |
| | i | | |
| | 1 | | f : C |

| | Appreximate Con | rersiens to Metric | Measures | | ' ' 9 | : 8 2 | | Approximate Convors | tiens from Matric | c Messures | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | 27 | Symbol | When Yes Kisw | Multiply by | 1. 51 | Ĩ |
| | When Yes Knew | Multiply by | Te Fiad | | | 1 2 16] (11 | | | LENGTH | | |
| | | | | | • {. .{ | 02 | | | | | |
| | | LENGIA | | | ' ' | | ŧ | millingers. | 0.04 | uches | Ē |
| | | | | | ı, , | 61 !! | Ē | Continuetors 5 | 4.0 0 | in others | £ \$ |
| ļ | | ÷. | r and smallers | Ę | . 1. | • | E | State L | | | : 1 |
| | | 2 | c.entimeters. | Ę | '' 7 | BI | ε. | States. | - 4 | | ė |
| Ē | * suds | 0.9 | meter > | E | . , | ו : : ביוו | Ē | | | | |
| Ē | miles | 1.6 | h - lotterter s | ş | | 21 : | | | | | |
| | | | | | 1. İ. | יוווי | | ļ | AREA | | |
| | 1 | AHEA | | | 1. | 91 | ~ | | | | ~ |
| ~ | | | | ĩ | ۰l, | ; s | <u>ل</u> ة ~ | square cantimators | 0.16 | square inches source varia | = ` 5 |
| ē, | square notes | c.o | | <u>ج</u> | ' | 1 31 | - E | | <u>-</u> | | Û |
| , r F | square feet | 6 .0 | square moters | ε | ! ' | { | Ę | square kilometers | | | E |
| گړ | square vards | 8.0 | square meters | e . | .1, | ∙۱ ¦ | 2 | hectares (10,000 m.) | 67 | ecres | |
| Ē | squere miles | 9.2 | | 1 | ' ! | ļ | | | | | |
| | | • | | ! | ' ' | נו ; אולי | | | ASS (mainhs) | | |
| | ž | tASS {weight) | | | ' ' | ; ; ; [5] | | | | | |
| | | | | | 1.1 | 24 - 62) | c | OLATIS | 550.0 | OUNC ES | 60 |
| 8 | Ouris es | 8 2 | sumeric | a | 'l' | r Vál | | N-100rams | 2.2 | pounds | ₽ |
| ē | s puned | 0.45 | b.lograms | 5 | Į.1 | 11 | î - | tonnes (1000 kg) | : | short trans | |
| | short tons | 6.0 | lonne s | - | ' ' ! . | | | | | | |
| | : | | | | ' ' | n U 9 | | | VOLUME | | |
| | 1 | | | | ' ' | 6 | | | | | |
| | | | | î | I ,İ | : | Ē | (1)-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1- | 0 03 | fluid ounces | 11 02 |
| 130 | teasp. C | • ; | multiters | ĒĪ | . i . | # 1 | - | liters | 2.1 | puts | £ |
| Theo | tub/espoon s | <u> </u> | | Ē | ' , | : : | - | liters | 1.0K | quarts | 6 |
| 8 | | | liter. | _ | ' ' | 4 | _ | liters | 0.76 | guilons | 87 |
| . 2 | | 0.47 | 2 million | - | ' | | Ē | cubic meters | 5 | cubic leaf | ۲ |
| 1 5 | 51.444 | 5.0 | hiters | - | ' ' | : ; ; | Ē | CUDIC Replaces | C 1 | CUD+C YAND | \$ |
| ī | gallens. | 3.8 | iter. | - | '! | 9 9 | | | | | |
| Ĵ | rubic freet | 5C.4 | cubic meters | f | ' ' | יי וי. | | ICMOL | CDATINE (event) | | |
| ¹ 0Å | t ubic yards | £.0 | cubic meters | Ē | ' 2 | s ; [:] ¹ [| | | | ~.4 | |
| | TEMP | ERATURE (exact) | | | 'I' ' | Pa | ۲. | Celsus | 9 5 (then 155 and | Fahrenhert termerature | |
| | | | | ; | '¦' | | | temperature | | | |
| 1, | F. whenthere | 5 9 (8 1 4 | Celsius | J | ' | : : ! | | | | J. | |
| | temperature | subtracting | 10000 a strate | | '!' ' | | | 26 26 | 986 | 212 | |
| | | Ŕ | | | '1' | z וייין | I | a a a | 90 1 120 | 160 200 | |
| | | | | | ' | i' | | | | | |
| | | | | | 1 | i u | 1 | 40 -20 Ö | 20 140 | 0 | |
| | | | | | ' | د، (]]ا | | ر د | | | |
| | | | | | , | | | | | | |

METRIC CONVERSION FACTORS

and the state of the second training and the second s

and the set of the set of the set of

1 - 1 - 1 - 4

ï

.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|----------------------|--------|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Purpose | 1 |
| DISCUSSION | 1 |
| General Equipment | 1 |
| RESULTS | 1 |
| Test Summary | 1 3 |

APPENDIX

فللفاق فالقاق وفريد فأست المحمد مسابعات فالمقارفين والمستحين والقويين والمقرر معريتهم

ļ



· · · · ·

117

iii

and a second

10.010

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 1 | Percentage of Types of Aircraft | 2 |
| 2 | A Percentage Comparison of PAPI with VASI | 2 |

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE.

The Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) system is a visual glidepath indicator similar to the standard Visual Approach Slope Indicator (VASI) system. Previous testing of PAPI at the Technical Center has shown that the differences in PAPI over the standard VASI may be advantageous to the pilots who use the PAPI system. The purpose of this Interim Report is to document the in-service testing of the system at Newark International Airport (EWR).

DISCUSSION

GENERAL.

Four months (December 8, 1980 to April 8, 1981) of in-service testing was accomplished at EWR on runway 4R. Questionnaires (appendix) were provided to the pilots by the Air Line Pilots Association and collected by it and the Air Transport Association. The results are shown in this report.

In order to allow for the large difference in wheel-to-eye height between some small aircraft and some large aircraft, the scheme used at EWR was to move the PAPI units down the runway 300 feet beyond the Instrument Landing System (ILS) glide slope intercept point (a total of 1350 feet down from the displaced threshold at EWR), and open up the on-course signal to 30 minutes of a degree instead of the regular 20-minute segment. This allows the wheels of the small aircraft to cross the threshold at 62 feet and the wheels of the largest aircraft (B-747) to cross the threshold at 21 feet when folowing the bottom of the visual on-course signal.

Newark International Airport was selected to obtain data from large commercial aircraft and no general aviation testing was performed. Testing at a general aviation airport utilizing small aircraft and general aviation pilots is scheduled for a later date.

EQUIPMENT.

The PAPI equipment used during the EWR tests was the standard four-box model M!. 6 PAPI system manufactured by the Barrel Lighting Company Limited, of Stansted, England. It was installed on the right-hand side of runway 4R with the intensity controlled by a photo cell (bright during the daylight hours and dim during the hours of darkness). The system was left in the ON condition except when requested to be turned off by pilots and during low visibility conditions.

RESULTS

TEST.

1

During the 4 months of flight testing, a total of 117 questionnaires were returned. Basically, they compared the PAPI system to the standard red/white VASI system generally used throughout the United States. Table 1 shows the mix of aircraft used to obtain information for the tests.

Questionnaires were received from pilots of seven different aircraft types, all of which are considered transport aircraft, giving a good sampling of today's commercial aircraft. No questionnaices were received from general aviation pilots. More than 90 percent of the flights were made with the visibility greater than 3 miles, the ceiling higher than 2000 feet, and with no precipitation. A few flights reported rain, snow, fog, cloudiness, and smog. Some 63 percent of the approaches were made during the hours of 1600 to 2400, 34 percent during the hours of 0800 to 1600, and 3 percent during the hours of 0000 to 0800.

Table 2 shows the results of the comparison of the PAPI system with the standard red/white VASI system, in percentage form.

. بر

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGE OF TYPES OF AIRCRAFT

| Aircraft Type | % of Total |
|---------------|------------|
| | |
| B-727 | 42 |
| DC-10 | 22 |
| B-737 | 13 |
| DC-8 | 9 |
| B-747 | 8 |
| L-1011 | 5 |
| B-707 | 1 |

TABLE 2. A PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF PAPI WITH VASI

| | BETTER | SAME | WORSE |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
| Rate Information | 57 | 37 | 6 |
| Ease of Maintaining Approach Angle | 50 | 43 | 7 |
| Correcting Vertical Excursions | 57 | 33 | 10 |
| Usefulness of Touchdown Aiming Point | t 40 | 53 | 7 |
| Coincidence with ILS | 40 | 57 | 3 |
| Initial Contact Range | 60 | 29 | 11 |
| Overall Value Compared with VASI's | 61 | 28 | 11 |

2

SUMMARY.

Analysis of these data show that the United States pilots were not quite as enthusiastic about PAPI as testing results have shown in England, Canada, or France. PAPI, however, was rated better than VASI in all rating factors at Newark except in the "Usefulness of Touchdown Aiming Point" and the "Coincidence with ILS." In these two cases, most pilots thought that both PAPI and VASI rated about the same.

No overall test ratings by the pilots indicated that the VASI was better than

PAPI. In the "Overall Value Compared with VASI's," 61 percent favored PAPI, 27 percent thought they were about the same and 11 percent thought the VASI was better than the PAPI. This clearly indicates that, overall, the pilots who evaluated the PAPI at Newark considered the PAPI to be an improvevent over the VASI. It must be remembered that these in-service tests include only information derived from commercial pilots of large aircraft and do not include the general aviation segment of the flying public. Further testing of this type is presently in process.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE AND SAMPLE COMMENTS

Figure A-1 is a summation of the results of the questionnaires received from the 117 pilots who flew the system at Newark. It also contains samples of the majority of comments received from the pilots.

(After completion of the approach, please check the appropriate boxes)

EWR TEST RESULTS

| ſ | Date: 12-8-80 | Time:0000-0800=3% | Aircraft Type: |
|---|---------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | to | 0800-1600=34% | |
| l | 4-8-81 | 1600-2400=63% | |

| RVR or Visibility | 1200 | 1800 | 2400 | | | |
|-------------------|------|------|------|-----------|-----------|---|
| on Approach | to | to | to | 1-3 miles | > 3 miles | X |
| | 1800 | 2400 | 4000 | | | |

| Lowest | 100 | 200 | 300 | 500 | |
|--------|---------|---------|---------|----------|-------------|
| Clouds | to | to | to | to | > 2000 ft.X |
| | 200 ft. | 300 ft. | 500 ft. | 2000 ft. | |

| Precipitation/Visibility Restriction | Type: | None: |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| | | |

Comparison with VASIS. Please assess PAPI on the following points:

| | | Better | Same | Worse |
|----|--------------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
| 1. | Rate Information | 64 | 42 | 7 |
| 2. | Ease of Maintaining Approach Angle | 56 | 48 | 8 |
| 3. | Correcting Vertical Excursions | 64 | 38 | 11 |
| 4. | Usefulness on Touchdown Aiming Point | 44 | 59 | 8 |
| 5. | Coincidence with ILS | 42 | 61 | 3 |
| 6. | Initial Contact Range | 67 | 33 | 12 |
| 7. | Overall value compared with VASIS | 70 | 31 | 13 |

(NUMBER OF PILOT RESPONSES)

Х

FIGURE A-1. QUESTIONNAIRE WITH NEWARK TEST RESULTS (Sheet 1 of 2)

A-1

SAMPLE COMMENTS TAKEN FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRES

- 1. By far the vast majority of comments (at least 20) concerned the control of the brilliance of the lights. Most indicated that the white lights were too bright compared to the red lights; or the red ones were not bright enough compared to the white. Some thought both colors (red and white) were overpowering and should be dimmed.
- 2. At least eight comments stated that overall, the Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) system is better than the Visua' Approach Slope Indicator (VASI) system. Samples - "PAPI gives more precise information," and "An excellent system."
- 3. At least six comments concerned the rapid change in colors. Most thought this was beneficial but two preferred the subtle pink transitional area of the VASI.

QUOTED COMMENTS

- "Since interpretation is not based on pink/red shading, the positive change of one light from white to red shows very positive trend allowing faster recognition and thus correction. I purposely went to 3 red/1 white, then 3 white/1 red, then to 2 red/2 white. I feel the system is a vast improvement 'rom VASI."
- 2. "The visibility, intensity of PAPI is much greater than VASI. I particularly like knowing its location, touchdown aiming point, extremely useful. PAPI is a highly acceptable, flyable, visual landing aid. However, I would rather have a VASI on all non-ILS runways than PAPI on the runways that now have a VASI."
- 3. "One light low and high corresponded to exactly one dot low and high on ILS glide slope."

وليده بلب لكالأ أساط مثب البالزلال ومعطات الالمعمال الالالافيدا

- 4. "Appears to be more definitive in close; i.e., inside the outer marker. Cannot be seen as far out as VASI."
- 5. "Biggest factors were ease of acquisition even at 10 nmi and rapid transition from red to white and back. I like it much better than conventional VASI."
- 6. "Easier to determine small excursions early in approach."
- 7. "Information is not as obvious as VASI."
- 8. "Requires horizontal plane scanning which is not normal during approach."

FIGURE A-1. QUESTIONNAIRE WITH NEWARK TEST RESULTS (Sheet 2 of 2)