

Sidney Bauguess

Columbia Aircraft Manufacturing

Technical:

Overall content was very informative, although most discussions were from Airbus and Boeing. It was very lacking in FAR 23 issues. Why did Adam Aircraft not present something? How come Columbia Aircraft was not asked to present something? Too much focus on FAR 25 aircraft. Need more guidance for FAR 23 aircraft. Consider guidance for FAR 23 aircraft for field repairs.

Organizational:

Subjects need to be held to required time. You should consider holding just a FAR 23 conference. Issues with repairs for FAR 23 airplanes need to be clearly defined and a consistent approach should be developed by the FAA. Consider reducing the number of lectures per day or add more days to the conference.

General:

Please direct all future meetings notices or correspondences to myself and/or Robert Kolodziejzyk at Columbia Aircraft.

Tom Walker

NSE Composites

This workshop was well planned and executed. There was a good balance between subjects, and between presentations and open discussion. Excellent subject-matter experts for speakers. Naturally created the interdisciplinary discussions needed to determine composite safety issues and develop solutions.

Generally good organization, but there was not enough time for discussions. Either more time needs to be allotted for each speaker, or the "talking" time must be restricted.

Ray Rawlinson

GE Aviation

Technical:

Good range of topics in the technical papers. Good diversity of attendees made for some interesting papers and discussion at coffee breaks.

Organizational:

Well organized, good location close to the airport. Not quite so convenient for those that drove but we must be in the minority. Lots of parallel sessions made it impossible for one person to cover all papers of interest. Each company really needed to send three attendees to cover all sessions.

General:

Hotel was fine. Closer to downtown would be nice but not essential.

David Snelling
Boeing

General:

This feedback is intended to initiate dialogue for the CH-53K Marine Corp Heavy Lift Program Office, Design Interface Lead as it relates to sandwich core composites. I am very interested in speaking with experts that may assist with all Design and Logistic considerations with composites. The CH-53K is a "New" build Helicopter under Sikorsky Corp as our Prime. I am looking for Subject Matters Experts interested in assisting the Government Team for Supportability assessments through design. David Snelling Design Interface/Maintenance Planning Lead CH-53K Heavy Lift Helicopter PMA-261/Patuxent River Maryland 301-995-2238

David R. Payne
Boeing

Technical:

It was a unique gathering of experts on composite damage tolerance and maintenance. The major issues of concern were raised. The presentations gave a very useful state of the art analysis of the subject.

Organizational:

Very well organized and chaired by Larry Ilcewicz plus helpers. Good informal/workshop approach which allowed technical discussions. A brilliant event to attend!

General:

The proactive philosophy of the FAA is noted. In the UK it is difficult to get funding to do research to prevent problems arising. It would be good to discuss how the UK could contribute to these activities including Mil-17 on a more formal basis. The NASA Aviation Safety Program Aircraft Aging and Durability Technical Plan Summary have also been noted.

Scott Demchak

Goodrich

Technical:

The breadth of topics was great and the level of presentations was professional. It was very beneficial to have foreign and domestic participation, as Goodrich services; both parties and the intermittent exchange of ideas was enlightening. So much relevant material to absorb for companies involved in the development of commercial aircraft, we should have had more than one representative.

Organizational:

Very well run. Wish we had a little more time. The delivery of all presentations via website really completes the workshop in terms of being able to disseminate information to the masses after the workshop is over.

General:

Only 1 comment - there were some discussions relating to detectable damage and consequence to the structure for PSE vs Secondary structure. The idea being that all of the inspection and substantiation criteria presented is geared toward PSE which may be overkill for less important secondary structure and may drive unnecessary weight into secondary structure. This came up as a question on the last day but I didn't see it recoded as a topic for future discussion - I thought it had been. Can you clarify?