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Based on the current status of windshear sensors and candidate data dissemination systems, the near-term capabilities for windshear avoidance will most likely include:

- **Ground-based detection:**
  - TDWR (Terminal Doppler Weather Radar)
  - LLWAS (Low-Level Windshear Alert System)
  - Automated PIREPS

- **Ground-Air datalinks:**
  - ATC voice channels
  - Mode-S digital datalink
  - ACARS alphanumeric datalink

The possible datapaths for integration of these systems are illustrated in the diagram.

In the future, airborne windshear detection systems such as lidars, passive IR detectors, or airborne Doppler radars may also become available. Possible future datalinks include satellite downlink and specialized en route weather channels.
Uplink of ground-measured windshear information to the flight crew presents a number of problems. Among these are:

- **Hazard Assessment:**
  Based on ground-measured information and the current tactical situation, what constitutes a hazardous windshear?

- **Information Issues:**
  What to send: what is 'critical'
  When to send it
  How to send it
  How to present critical info to the flight crew

The MIT effort is using the three methods outlined to address these issues.

**INVESTIGATIONS**

- **PILOT OPINION SURVEYS**
  Current Terminal Area Windshear Procedures
  Possible Future Windshear Warning Systems

- **HAZARD THRESHOLD STUDY**
  Definition of Windshear Hazard Thresholds Through Simulation Studies and Flight Test Data

- **PART-TASK B-767 SIMULATION**
  Simulation of Historical and Hypothetical Windshear Encounters
  Comparison of Verbal, Alphanumeric, and Graphical Presentation Options
  Effects of Message Delivery Time on Pilot Decisions
  Parallel Experiments with Graphical ATC Clearance Delivery
The survey has two sections: Current Procedures and Future Windshear Warning Systems. The first part included questions about:

- Pilot impressions of the hazard posed by microbursts
- Pilot confidence in windshear information obtained from ATIS, LLWAS, and PIREPS
- Pilot evaluation of the adequacy of currently available windshear alert data and the need for better and more timely alerts

The section on future procedures included questions about

- Modes of information relay and presentation
- When the crew should be alerted
- How much head-to-tail windshear is a threat
- What items of windshear information are important
- Who makes the avoidance decision - pilot or controller

**PILOT OPINION SURVEYS**

- Obtain flight crew evaluations of current windshear warning and avoidance systems and procedures
- Obtain flight crew feedback on future windshear warning systems and possible display formats
- Distribution: 250 United A/L flight crews
- Current Data Set: 47 51% of respondents have had a hazardous windshear encounter
- Data are being used to design part-task simulator experiments with advanced graphic and alphanumeric display formats
General results indicate that microbursts are perceived as a major safety threat and that currently available windshear alert data are not sufficient for safe terminal area operations. Also, there is strong pilot support for an improved windshear alerting system. The fairly low windshear threshold specified by the respondents is another indication of the belief that windshear is a major threat.

Sample comments from the last question listed:

"Only the pilot can judge the capabilities of his a/c type and his ability to cope with reported data."

"(Controller) Must make judgment calls to report only those shears meeting some minimum standards to avoid reporting 'everything'."

51% of the respondents have had (by their own definition) a hazardous windshear encounter.

**PILOT SURVEYS: GENERAL RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microbursts pose a major safety hazard to transport category aircraft.</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently available windshear alert data are sufficient for safe operation.</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A system to provide crews better and more timely windshear information is necessary.</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Perceived windshear warning threshold:  
  - Advisory: 10.6 kts  
  - Warning: 15.1 kts

- Who should have the responsibility for judging the threat due to a particular windshear event from the (assumed reliable) available data?  
  - PILOT: 83.0%  
  - CONTROLLER: 9.5%
The data are from the question:

Listed below are four currently available sources of information about windshear in the terminal area. Please rank them in order of usefulness, from 1 (most useful) to 4 (least useful).

- Low Level Windshear Alert System (LLWAS)
- Pilot Reports (PIREPS)
- Airborne Weather Radar
- Visual Clues (Thunderstorms, Virga etc.)

**Pilot Rankings: Usefulness for Windshear Avoidance of**

Pilot Reports
Visual Clues
LLWAS (Low Level Windshear Alert System)
Airborne Weather Radar

![Windshear Information Sources](chart.png)
The data are from the question:

A windshear alert could contain the following items of information. Please rank them in order of importance. (1 = most important, 6 = least important)

Location Shape
____ Intensity Intensity Trend
____ Size Movement

Pilot Rankings: Usefulness of Available Windshear Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Intensity Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>Shape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Windshear Information Items

- Location
- Intensity
- Movement
- Size
- Intensity Trend
- Shape

Higher Priority
The data are from the question:

Assuming windshear is detected by reliable ground-based sensors, how should this information be relayed to the flight deck? Please rank in order of preference. (1 = most preferable, 5 = least preferable)

- Voice (ATIS)
- Voice (ATC)
- Alphanumeric/Text uplink (similar to ACARS)
- Graphical display of windshear location on EFIS display
- Graphical display of windshear location on separate graphic device

**Pilot Rankings:** Mode of data relay/presentation:

- Verbal (ATC)
- EFIS EHSI (Moving Map) Display
- Alternate Graphical Display
- Alphanumeric Display
- On ATIS

![Windshear Information Relay/Presentation Graph]
The hazard assessment part of this project is motivated by the TDWR (Terminal Doppler Weather Radar) operational evaluations performed by MIT Lincoln Laboratory and NCAR over the past three years. In these experiments, TDWR proved able to detect hazardous microbursts nearly 100% of the time with a false alarm rate of 5%.

Despite the accuracy of the radar, some dangerous incidents still occurred. One potential problem is assessment of the hazard due to a particular microburst in a particular situation. The hazard reported by the detection system must relate directly to what the threatened aircraft would experience if it does penetrate the microburst. If a large threat is predicted, and little dynamic effect is encountered, an accurate warning can be perceived as a 'false alarm' and damage pilot confidence in the system.

As listed, this study will compare the factors contributing to the windshear hazard and attempt to determine a useful and relevant hazard criterion.

**WINDSHEAR HAZARD THRESHOLD EVALUATION**

**1987-88 TDWR OPERATIONAL EVALUATIONS**
- Proved ability of TDWR to detect hazardous windshear
- Problems in dissemination of warnings:
  - Delays in voice transmission
  - Message format problems
  - Pilot-perceived "false alarms"

**PROBLEM:**
Given perfect knowledge of the windfield, what is the most accurate and relevant assessment of a windshear hazard in terms that the flight crew can relate to the actual dynamic effects on their particular aircraft?

**FACTORS:**
- Windshear intensity measurement
- Spatial factors: off-axis penetration, microburst asymmetry
- Aircraft characteristics, weight, configuration
The most critical factor in the threat evaluation is how to quantify the microburst intensity. Three possible ways are listed. The delta-V measurement is currently used by TDWR. F-factor, a measure of instantaneous threat, is more applicable to in situ and airborne sensor systems. An integrated energy loss calculation is another possibility, better suited to long range sensors such as TDWR.

**WINDSHEAR INTENSITY MEASUREMENT**

- **DELTA-V**
  
  Maximum headwind-to-tailwind component an aircraft can be expected to encounter over a specified distance

- **F-FACTOR**
  
  $$W_x = \frac{W_z}{g} \frac{W_n}{V}$$

  Developed for in situ sensors, measures loss of "potential altitude" due to immediate windfield

- **INTEGRATED ENERGY LOSS**
  
  Measures expected loss of energy over a projected flight path: including kinetic (airspeed) and potential (altitude) energy components
These issues will be evaluated through parametric flight simulations and possibly actual flight data. As listed, measured dual-Doppler windfields will be used with available aircraft models to examine the effects of various factors on the microburst hazard. Once a candidate hazard threshold has been determined, the dual-Doppler data will be degraded to simulate a single TDWR measurement and the hazard criterion will be re-evaluated. Supporting data may be gained from flight tests flown this summer by the University of North Dakota in conjunction with the TDWR evaluation.

PLANNED APPROACH

- Literature Search: Microburst-Aircraft interaction studies
- Develop Simulation
  Aircraft Dynamics: 737-100, Cessna Citation
  Windshear model - assume ideal sensor using NCAR/MITLL dual doppler radar windfields
- Perform Parametric Studies
- Evaluate and modify hazard criteria based on studies
- Evaluate flight test data from UND Citation
- Simulate effect of sensor limitations on hazard threshold validity
The simulation is currently under development. It will be run on a Sun 3/80 workstation with MATRIXx simulation software to minimize development time and allow easy automation of parametric studies.

**DIAGRAM:**

- **AIRCRAFT DYNAMICS:**
  - a/c type
  - configuration
  - guidance strategy
- **DUAL-DOPPLER WINDS:**
  - TDWR Demos
  - JAWS
- **TIME SIMULATION:**
  - Sun Workstation
  - MATRIXx simulation software
- **INITIAL CONDITIONS:**
  - Spatial Factors
  - Phase of Flight
- **RESULTS:**
  - Airspeed and Altitude losses
  - Deviation from desired flight path
An ongoing focus of the MIT windshear effort is the dissemination of ground-measured and evaluated windshear information. As displayed, several information-related issues arise and are being addressed with several resources, including the previously discussed pilot opinion surveys. Current research is focused around the 767 part-task simulation.

**UPLINK OF CRITICAL WINDSHEAR INFORMATION**

**OBJECTIVE:**
Examine transfer and presentation of vital windshear information to flight crews, based on modern ground-based sensors and datalink capabilities.

**ISSUES:**
- What information to transmit
- When to send information
- Information mode: Verbal, Alphanumeric, Graphical

**RESOURCES:**
- Pilot surveys
- Analysis of past windshear encounters (7/11/88)
- GA part-task simulator study
- Boeing 767 part-task simulator
On July 11, 1988 a group of very severe microbursts occurred on the final approach path to Denver/Stapleton runway 26L. Five aircraft were affected by the event. The TDWR evaluation was in progress, and successfully detected the microbursts. However, four of the five aircraft involved still attempted to land and penetrated the microbursts, in one case passing below 100 feet AGL one mile short of the runway threshold. The problem in this case was with dissemination of the warnings, not with detection of the microbursts. In this case, the effectiveness of the alert was degraded sharply by a number of factors:

- Variability of aircrew interpretation of warnings: In one case, two aircraft were given virtually identical warnings within 30 sec of each other and made entirely opposite decisions.

- Delay inherent in voice transmissions: The minimum delay between detection and message transmission was about 60 sec.

- The messages were often imbedded in a routine landing clearance message, resulting in a lack of urgency; this, combined with the high crew workload at the outer marker, may have caused the warnings to be missed or go unheeded.

- PIREPS are critical - once the lead aircraft reported windshear, later aircraft initiated earlier missed approaches.

MICROBURST EVENT: 11 JULY 1988

- Occurred during 1988 TDWR Operational Demonstration at Denver-Stapleton Airport: Doppler Radar was operational.

- 20 minute period of intense microburst activity on final approach to active runway 26L: shear intensity up to 80 kts

- 5 aircraft involved

- Microburst warnings promptly and accurately produced by TDWR system: given to final approach controller

- Despite timely warnings, 4 of 5 aircraft penetrated microbursts and encountered significant performance losses before aborting the approach

- Problems:
  Time delays
  Message format
This simple experiment was designed to demonstrate the gain in pilot situational awareness due to graphical displays. By linking a schematic graphical display of windshear location to a general aviation simulator, a significant improvement in pilot performance was measured. This experiment, although simple, indicates that graphical displays are desirable and that further investigation of graphical formats and measurement of achievable performance gain is required.

**PART-TASK GA SIMULATION**

- GA Simulator and IBM PC display
- Microburst occurring on final approach
- Non-standard missed approach procedure required for avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display Type Used</th>
<th>Avoidance Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice only</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway-fixed display without a/c position</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway-fixed display with a/c position</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 8 Pilots: 210 to 1700 hours total time
- 16 Approaches per display
Further information presentation options are being explored through a Boeing 767 part-task simulation, which has just been completed. The 767 was selected because its advanced "glass-cockpit" instruments allow for many possible alphanumerical or graphical presentations. The major electronic and electromechanical instruments are simulated on an IRIS graphic workstation, and an IBM is used for simulation of the major features of the Boeing FMC (flight management computer). Mockups of the autopilot control panel and electronic display control panel are linked into the system through a data acquisition unit. In addition, the crew workload is adjusted and monitored through a simple compensatory sidetask controlled by the IRIS mouse. The final component is a pair of headsets for pilot and 'controller'.

**BOEING 767 PART-TASK SIMULATION**

**CONCEPT:**
Simulation of modern "glass-cockpit" transport aircraft with Electronic Flight Instrumentation System (EFIS) and Flight Management Computer (FMC), allowing a wide variety of information presentation options.
This figure illustrates a typical EHSI (Electronic Horizontal Situation Indicator) in map mode for an aircraft equipped with a flight management computer. Information displayed includes the currently programmed flight path, nearby navaids, intersections, and airports, wind information, and the aircraft's current heading and groundtrack. Weather radar returns are also overlaid on the EHSI, making it even more desirable to place windshear information on this display.
The initial experiments as described are designed to gather more data about modes of information presentation. The experiment is being performed in concert with a study on the benefits of delivering ATC routing amendments graphically. Each scenario has elements from both experiments, which should reduce the pilot learning curve and result in better quality data. All pilot actions, including ATC transmissions and sidetask performance, will be recorded and time-stamped by the simulation computers. Audio and video coverage will also be taken.

**INITIAL SIMULATIONS**

- Performed in concert with Graphical Amendment Delivery experiments
- 9 scenarios will be flown by each subject:
  - Denver-Stapleton Airport
  - 3 Initial Conditions, 3 ILS approaches
  - Modes: Verbal, Alphanumeric, Graphical
  - Microburst Position:
    - Off to side of approach
    - On final approach
    - On final approach and cleared missed approach path
  - Alert times:
    - When cleared for approach
    - 2 nm outside outer marker
    - At or inside outer marker
  - Simple compensatory sidetask for workload monitoring
If 9 subjects are obtained, as described a total of 81 approaches will be flown. Allowing 3 modes of communication and 3 different microburst threat conditions, 9 points per set of parameters will be obtained. These experiments are planned for July and August of 1989.

Possible future experiments will deal with such issues as delay times and possible graphical format options.

**INITIAL SIMULATIONS**

**SUBJECTS:**
- Active Transport Category a/c crews
- Time requirement: 5 hours per subject
- Minimum 9 subjects desired for initial simulations
- Subjects are being contacted through ALPA, to be tested during BOS layovers

**STATUS:**
- Simulator 99% operational
- Subjects currently being sought
- Results should be available for next Tri-U Conference...