FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

FAA Administrator James Busey's

Press Conference

"We Are Listening To User Concerns"

Washington, D.C.

August 10, 1989

PRO-TYPISTS, INC.

Professional Transcription Service

Area Code 202 347-5395

40700bf

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. BUSEY: -- got a cup of something to warm you up in this nice chilly place here this morning. Either the air conditioner works when it's cool and cloudy outside or it doesn't work when it's hot and dusty outside, so you're joining us in one of the times when it does really work.

Welcome here with us this morning. I've been on-board officially now I think about five weeks, and we thought that it was time to have an informal get-together so you could get to know who I am and what I'm all about and I could respond to some of your questions. What I thought I'd do this morning is lay a few words on your concerning my objectives as the new administrator of the FAA. I'll try to be very brief. I'll touch on some of the key issues that I'm sure are on your mind as they are on mind and then we'll devote as much time as we've got left to deal with your questions, and I'll take as many as I can.

I'll apologize up front and tell you that I've got to leave at exactly 10:45 because I've got to go over to the Department for the swearing-in this morning of Mr. Tom

Larson, the new Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration. His formal swearing-in is this morning and what we've all tried to do as a demonstration of solidarity in the Department of Transportation team, we've all been attending each other's swearing-ins so I want to make sure that I'm there for Tom's.

As you know, I left the Navy at the end of June. I left the command I had over in Europe, in Italy, on the 23rd of June, got home on midnight that night -- morning, Seth, how are you today? -- got home midnight that night, spent the next day helping my wife shuffle some boxes around and then reported in to the Department on the 25th, where I started getting prepared for the confirming hearings. I was sworn in then by Secretary Skinner out at Oklahoma City when we were there for the dedication of the new training building at our Aeronautical Center, was sworn in on Friday afternoon, the 30th of June. And then the formal swearing-in was about two weeks later than that. So I've made the transition now, I'm facing up well to the issue of trying to make the decision every morning as to what color tie I'm going to wear, since I didn't have to do that for 30-some years, so I think I've made the transition

to civilian life. Now let's talk a little about the FAA.

Let me share with you what I consider the key issues facing the FAA in the near term, and I'll try to be brief on those but it'll give you an idea, I think, of where I'm coming from.

System safety is, of course, the primary concern and objective that I have. I think any administrator has to have safety within the air transportation system as his number one objective, and I'm certainly no different in that regard. I think it's very important for us to continuously work to do the best job we can to project to the public -- since we are a public administration -- to project to the public our perceptions and help them develop their perceptions of how well they think we're doing here in the FAA.

Secondly, procurement is a primary issue of mine. I bring some experience in the procurement arena and, as you all well know, we in the FAA have been embarked since the early 1980s on a major procurement program to upgrade and modernize all the tools that we need in the air space that we're responsible for maintaining. We've got big bucks to continue to invest in modernizing and upgrading

the air traffic control system, all the navigation aids and all the other equipments attendant thereto, including our training programs for our technicians and our operators in the system. I have been intensively reviewing our procurement programs and I'm committed to the wise and efficient expenditures of the dollars the taxpayers make available to us through the budgeting process.

People is the third issue that I'll mention with you today that's a key issue of mine. We in the FAA must compete for an ever-tougher share to obtain of the young people that we need to keep our organization alive. We number, as you know, about 50,000 strong and it's a tough place out there in the marketplace with our decreasing population. Everyone is after the expertise, the technical skill, the operational skill that are needed to make not only public agencies go but the Department of Defense and industry. So we've got a tough job in recruiting, we need to tighten up our recruiting procedures and more effectively go after the young people that we need to keep the FAA system alive on into the next century.

Then, having obtained these people, we've got to work hard to retain them. We invest a lot of time and

money in training and giving our people the skills and the tools that they need to do the job that we need for them to do in the FAA, and once we've got them on-board we need to work hard to keep them. So we need to cultivate an aura of "This is a fun place to be, an important place to be," and work hard to hang on to those people that we need so badly.

And the fourth issue that I'll mention with you this morning I call outreach. As a public organization, we must hear from the users of the system, the lovers of aviation, the people that use the aviation system, the industry groups and all the other associations. It's my perception that we in the FAA may not be perceived by some of the user groups and the interest groups and the lovers of aviation as being all that too willing to hear from them. I think it's very important that we listen to the user groups, that we go out and avail of ourselves of opportunities to interface with these folks so that we can hear what their concerns are and clearly give them the evidence that we are listening to their concerns and that we are acting on them when appropriate. So public outreach is a very important part of the way we need to continue to do business.

Outreach also affects us internally. We've got to work on our internal communications systems and that's part of retaining our good people.

I want you to know that I intend to be as open and as accessible to you as I possibly can. I think a good relationship with you representatives of the media is very important to us so that we avail of ourselves of the vehicles and the avenues that you have to communicate with our users, the public, the traveling public and those users and lovers of the aviation community. So I will try to do my very best to make myself available to you from time to time, as the schedule they are inclined to lay on me permits.

Now let's talk about some specific issues that are key things, and I'll skip over these and I'm sure that a lot of your questions will surround them.

The D.C. 10 incident of last night, of course, is a key issue of concern to all of us. I want to share with you that we moved fast, starting last night when we first became aware of this incident that successfully concluded, fortunately, but it appears that we did in fact have another uncontained engine problem. We don't know any more

facts than that at this stage of the game. I think that it would be speculative of me at this time to try to draw any comparisons to the Northwest Flight 308 incident of last night with the number two engine problem, a comparison between that issue and the United Flight 232 in Sioux City. The NTSB safety experts, technical experts, are convening, have been all night, they're on-scene, and as the facts develop we'll all know more.

The second thing I wanted to share with you that's a current issue of importance is the system and efficiency review of general aviation compliance and enforcement that I have started in the last couple of weeks. I traveled to Oshkosh, my first time there, I was personally impressed by the vitality and the eagerness and the interest in the general aviation community. I heard from a lot of users, general aviation pilots and other interest groups, that perhaps we in the FAA have gone too strongly towards compliance and enforcement of procedures to the detriment of aviation safety. That's why I convened the group. I want to get to the bottom of these concerns, find out what if any factual basis there is for these inputs I've been receiving, and then decide what changes we may need to make

in our enforcement procedures so as to get back into the mode of allowing the general aviation people to perceive that we the FAA are there to help. We are their counselors, their advisers, and the strengtheners of their operations in general aviation.

So we've kicked off this review, headed by my associate administrator for safety, Keith Potts, and his team. They've got a multi-phase program that I think many of you are aware of. I expect for them to report back to me late this calendar year or early next year with a factual basis that I can use to make any changes and decisions. Our purpose is to determine if the views that I've heard are warranted and then how we need to alter the thrust of our compliance and enforcement procedures in order to make it a more positive force in fostering system safety. That's what we're after.

This morning I think you have all been provided a copy of a statistical analysis of how we're doing concerning near mid-air collisions, air traffic controller errors, and pilot deviations. I feel very positive about the results that we have seen in the last six months compared with 1988 and, again, that compared with 1987.

The trends are all moving in the right direction. I feel very good about the reduction in the near mid-air collision and the actual mid-air collision statistical data that we have, but I need to also say that we won't be satisfied with anything less than zero as far as actual mid-air collisions are concerned, and I want to continue to see this near mid-air collision reporting statistic decrease. We think that the results are primarily due to educational, regulatory and enforcement measurements, and I want to tell you that we will continue to work very hard to pursue all avoidance measures possible. But I feel very good and very positive about the trends that we see in the statistical data that's coming in.

And the last issue that I want to mention to you before we open up for questions is the task force that I created last week consisting of government and industry that will explore ways of improving survivability of wide-bodied aircraft following in-flight structural damage. I felt it was time for us to get all the best minds in aviation together so that we can learn from new technology and see if there is any opportunity offered by new technology to improve the backup flight control systems

on existing and of course on new designed wide-body aircraft. I think it's time to take a look at that. There may be something out there that's available to us that we have not been aware of in the past to improve backup systems on existing wide-body aircraft. We're going to start with wide-bodied aircraft first, of course, because of the recent incidents that we've had and experiences that we've had with that type of aircraft. But the task force will be looking at all aircraft with hydraulic control systems that must come together in the tail area to see if there are ways that we can improve those backup systems.

We will also be looking at the engine designs to see if there are opportunities through new technology to improve the containment possibilities in new engine designs. As I say, we're focusing first on wide-bodied aircraft, and I can tell you today that the first meeting of that task force is underway between industry and the users and the FAA, as we speak.

Now, I've talked for a few minutes. Let's give you all a chance. Yes, sir.

QUESTION: Yes, sir, Dave Cutley, with Weekly (inaudible). Regarding your system efficiency in general

aviation, there were a number of changes that were already underway in that regard as a result of some recommendations that the users provided several months ago. Are those changes going to keep on going, or is everything going to be frozen until you get your report back from _____?

MR. BUSEY: Oh, no. Those changes will continue, and I expect for those changes to be highlighted for me in Keith Potts' report. We're not going to stop anything we're doing right now, but what I again want is knowledge of the factual basis for these complaints and concerns that I've heard expressed from the general aviation community. We're not going to change anything until we have a chance to analyze the facts.

QUESTION: Well, now, I want to make sure I understand this. The ongoing changes will keep going?

MR. BUSEY: Yes.

QUESTION: All right.

MR. BUSEY: Yes.

QUESTION: All right.

MR. BUSEY: Yes.

QUESTION: Yes, sir, Jim Bob Gardner, Aviation Daily. The general aviation people aren't the only ones

concerned about the FAA enforcement procedures. In fact, the airlines have also been complaining about this demonstration program that you all have. I wonder if you're going to look into that also.

MR. BUSEY: I don't have any plans right now to expand this compliance and enforcement review to the commercial aviation side of it. The report that you mention that we've recently submitted to Congress as a requirement of the legislation that they imposed has been submitted. I'm aware of the complaints and concerns. We'll continue to evaluate that and I suspect that we'll probably hear about some hearings that the Congress may create in that regard. But the thrust of the group that I have underway right now is strictly general aviation.

Yes, sir.

QUESTION: Chris Bodos, Aviation Week, sir. Eastern Airlines continues to rebuild its way out of bankruptcy, and the unions involved are continuing to make charges and questioning the safety of the airline. Do the flying public have any concern with taking a flight on Eastern Airlines?

MR. BUSEY: The short answer to that is no. The

flying public should not have any concerns about taking a flight on Eastern Airlines. We intend to continue our intensive certification and safety review of Eastern as they rebuild. We're satisfied and confident that that oversight that we have in position and have had in position for the past many months gives us no reason for concern at all. The airlines as it reforms is fully in compliance with our certification requirements, and the traveling public should have absolutely no concern that we in the FAA won't continue that surveillance and oversight. They're safe to fly.

QUESTION: Laura Shineworth _____ --

MR. BUSEY: Yes, Laurie.

QUESTION: The NTSB was pretty critical of the FAA's report on the Aloha Airlines accident. Has the FAA responded to that report yet, and does the FAA oversee airline maintenance adequately (inaudible)?

MR. BUSEY: Yes, I'm aware of the criticism that the FAA received and I can tell you that we have responded to that criticism. We are providing the oversight to Aloha and other airlines flying those same kinds of aircraft. I think it's also fair to say the NTSB was pretty critical of

Aloha's maintenance and their procedures, and that's been tightened up now and of course that and the 747 door, United door issue, you all are aware have kicked off a lot of government and industry task force reviews of the overall aging aircraft issue, which is leading us to some pretty significant actions I think to deal with that issue, continuing action.

But in response to your direction question, we have responded and the maintenance oversight is being provided to Aloha.

QUESTION: Could I follow up on that?

MR. BUSEY: Yes.

QUESTION: I'm Nell Anderson from the Washington Post. A lot of people have suggested that what FAA really needs is a lot more inspectors out there to keep up both with the aging fleet and sort of the increase in the fleet over the next decade. What I heard in that question really is not are you doing the job but do you really have enough (inaudible) people to do the job well?

MR. BUSEY: Well, I think we do. I think we've got enough people. We've been asking for modest increases, not only in the inspector work force but also in security

forces, and we've been successful in getting the modest increases that we see we need. I think, though, today we have an adequate inspection force to provide the certification oversight in the maintenance and in the flight deck area that we need to -- and you can rest assured that if I become aware that we do have significant shortages in that regard, we're going to continue to ask for increases in the budget process. In fact, I can share with you that as we work the '91 budget submit, we're doing just that, in some areas that we see where we need more staffing.

Yes?

QUESTION: _____ Jack Cliff of the New York Times. This latest Northwest incident is surely going to raise engine (inaudible) already some people have gone so far as to suggest that these planes be grounded as a precautionary measure. How do you go about considering whether to ground a D.C. 10 in the face of two events that might be unrelated but bear some resemblance (inaudible)?

MR. BUSEY: Well, as you know, the responsibility for investigating the causes resides with the NTSB. We participate by providing expertise to the NTSB team. As

the facts are generated by that safety investigative process, we become aware of them immediately and as the facts flow in, the way we would operate and deliberate in the hypothetical situation you mention is we would take the facts, gather the expertise together, see what the facts indicate, and when we know what needs to be done then take the requisite action.

And I can share with you that out of my experience in the military and in naval aviation, the same thing applies there when one takes a decision to ground a certain type of aircraft, one must take it very deliberately and know what it is exactly you are looking to correct before you go into the process, because to act speculatively or on the basis of incomplete information, in my judgment would be irresponsible. And I'll add to that that in that regard we know of no hard facts at this time that would lead us to take any kind of action to ground the D.C. 10. It's safe to fly. I would fly in the aircraft today. In fact, I personally like the D.C. 10, it's a very comfortable and a very good performing aircraft. But rest assured that as the facts become available out of the investigative process we are prepared to take whatever action indicated by those

facts.

And I might just add again that it's the occurrence of these incidents that has led me to creating the task force that I mentioned earlier, to look at what new technology may offer us to consider changing the design of backup control systems on wide-bodied aircraft first. I want to try to take a good hard look and see if theré's something, some knowledge available to us that would lead us to make fixes on all these systems today or, if there is not, then we'll know that too.

QUESTION: Has anybody suggested to you that there is in fact something that's specific that could be examined?

MR. BUSEY: No. There is nothing specific available to us other than the incidents that we've been experiencing. As you know, we've got millions of miles of safe operations on all these wide-bodied aircraft that are moving our traveling public around in larger and larger numbers. I think it's just prudent for us, the FAA, to take a look at where we stand, what our requirements are, and see if there are any changes that we might make that would be positive towards creating better avenues for

backup systems. Don't know of any facts to lead us to that at this time.

QUESTION: Do you know anything about the Northwest accident, whether it was an _____ section, a hot section or anything about what happened?

MR. BUSEY: The only information I have is the same that you have, that which came out in the press last night. And as the teams are -- they're all in place now in Denver, and as those experts get to work the facts will begin to come out and then we'll be in a good position to know just what happened. But I think we should view what happened last night as the way the system should work. You know, the pilots had indications of an engine problem, they shut that engine down. It appears that there was an uncontained problem of some sort in that Pratt-Whitney engine. The pilots decided to divert. They had good control and they landed safely. There were no injuries, no problems. And that's the way the design should work.

QUESTION: So it was a Pratt and Whitney engine, not a GE engine?

MR. BUSEY: It was a Pratt and Whitney engine, Pratt and Whitney JT-9 engine. The General Electric engine

is what powered the United aircraft in Sioux City, the GF-6 engine. So there's no engine similarities. And we simply don't know what happened. But I feel that we should all be very positive that the flight deck crew handled an emerging situation exactly in the right way. The control systems were clearly available to them and they made a safe and uneventful landing.

Yes, sir.

QUESTION: What's your response to the GAO report, which is very critical of the Mode(?) C Rule of the _____ Schedule? It also suggested that the system cannot accommodate all of the information that it's now going to be getting from the Moat C transponders.

MR. BUSEY: Yeah. My response there is that some of the points that the GAO made in their report are exactly right. We agree. I agree. With their complaints, their concerns, that we didn't have a good capacity measurement system in place. We have that now, we have hardware monitors on the devices. You know, the work that the GAO did is more than a year old, as I recall, and the final data-gathering was about six months ago and we shared all of these findings with them at that time and I think the

FAA has responded positively in putting some of these monitoring systems into place.

As far as the Mode C Rule itself is concerned, this is part of us getting a better view of the traffic, the increased traffic that's flying in the system. It gives the air traffic controller the tool of knowing exactly who that radar blip is that comes on his screen when an aircraft flies through a TCA. The way it has been in the past until we implemented the Mode C Rule, all he had was raw data -- radar data return. He had no way of telling what altitude that aircraft was operating at. With the Moat C capability on all aircraft in that controlled airspace, he will know at what altitude and what kind of airplane basically there is that he's dealing with so he can vector all the other commercial aircraft away from it. We intend to press on with that Moat C Rule. That's part of the safety application that we're imposing on the air space for all the users, and the sole driver there is safety.

But back again to your initial question, the GAO is right in criticizing us in the FAA in some aspects of the procedures that we've followed, and I can also tell you

that I'm comfortable and confident that, first of all, we do have the capacity in our computer systems in the high density areas to deal not only with present traffic but with the so-called avalanche of new traffic that we will have visible to the controller with the advent of the Moat C Rule. The capacity is there and I'm satisfied that of what I know thus far in our procurement programs that we are planning for and procuring the fixes necessary to stay ahead of the capacity requirements, comfortably ahead.

QUESTION: Yes, sir. Are you going to have to back off of the MLS program now because of contract terminations with Hazleton?

MR. BUSEY: Good question. And a quick answer to that is no. I don't intend to back off from it. We're still committed to our Ikio (phonetic) agreement to be ready to implement MLS at international airports in the late '90s. We're going to have a little slowdown in that with the recent termination for cause of the ongoing contract, we will have to slow down our acquisition of systems but we still intend to go commercial off-the-shelf, pick up the necessary MLSs in that way so that we can go with an operational demonstration project. I intend to

continue that so that we can find out for sure what if any weaknesses do we have in our plans before we go to the category 2 and 3 MLS system procurement.

But I still intend to move down that line and to keep our commitments. I believe that MLS is the precision navigation system of the future, but we're going to have to work hard through the demonstration I think to convince a lot of the nonbelievers in that, and also to learn what's necessary for us to finalize our procurement for the category 2 and 3 systems that are still in the future.

Yes, sir.

QUESTION: What do you think of the presidential commission plan on Pan Am, and what is the status of the _____ inquiry into the security surrounding that incident?

MR. BUSEY: Okay. I think the presidential commission that was announced last week is a good move, I fully support it, I think that it will contain the senior expertise necessary to complete the task that the president has asked for, I don't think that it will in any way impede the ongoing criminal investigations and other highly classified security investigations. They will go on in

parallel. The president's commission of course will be informed of that and will be aware of all that, so I think it's a good tool and we fully support it.

QUESTION: Can you tell us anything about what the FAA has found so far in its own security look at Pan Am, or your ...?

MR. BUSEY: I think we've shared everything that I'm aware of, that we have found that is releasable in an unclassified way. Of course, it's led us to intensify the placement of the first six TNA devices. I was up at Kennedy field yesterday, in fact, and viewed the site and the machinery that's to go in place there within the next two weeks, and we hope to be operating, using that device to screen bags on international flights at TWA by the 1st of September. So I don't have anything new on our investigation to share with you.

QUESTION: On this point, can you say at this point that the FAA has determined that before the bombing Pan Am was in compliance with its security plan that was filed with the FAA?

MR. BUSEY: To the best of my knowledge at this stage of the game I can't add anything to that. Yes, they

were in compliance with the procedures that were in effect at that time. I can share that with you from a nonclassified standpoint.

QUESTION: You've reviewed their performance as it relates to this accident and found that they were in compliance with their security plan?

MR. BUSEY: Yes.

QUESTION: If I can follow up on the TNA question, are you going to -- Skinner's talking about requiring the airlines to get TNA in place. Are you going to set a deadline for that or ...?

MR. BUSEY: We have the rule, the final rule in place, and as I recall the first six devices, of course, are government procured, and we are placing those in cooperation with airlines at various international airports, first one's going into Kennedy field, second one we hope will go to Gatwick, third one will go in Miami, then we're going to Frankfurt, San Francisco, and other places. The final rule requires the airlines to have these devices in place by certain dates, I think it's leading on into the '90, '91 timeframe, as I recall, and I don't have that specific date at my fingertips. But it is our

requirement and our desire to specify the standards of response that these devices must perform to, and will of course continue to work to explore new technologies as they come, the so-called vapor detection devices and others, and as that technology matures we will then take steps to implement that.

QUESTION: Bob Trout at Reuters. Are the airlines happy about paying for these now?

MR. BUSEY: Well, I think there's still some discussion there, but our position continues to be that historically in our way of doing business in our country we put the expense and the responsibility for those types of security systems out in the public domain. We don't want the government to get involved in that kind of oversight and security, contrary to what some of our allied nations do. So yes, I think you're right, there is grumbling about paying for these devices. There are those that would like to see these systems paid for by the government, but the bottom line is it's the user community that will have to pay for this increased security one way or another. I would rather continue to follow our procedures wherein the public domain handles the expense and the implementation of

these devices, leaving our federal dollars free to expand on upgrading the air traffic control system, buying and procuring the new equipments there, and continuing the R&D efforts to decide if there are any new, more efficient, lower cost devices that we can offer into the public domain for improvement of security.

QUESTION: Given the _____ in the MLS program, what's the agency's attitude about installation of the visual ILS units?

MR. BUSEY: Our position there is that we're simply going to have to install additional ILS instruments to take up the slack. There are new airfields where we need precision approach equipments, that's in our interim support plan and we'll continue to be there to replace aging equipments -- for example, at LaGuardia yesterday I learned we've got seven ILS systems there at LaGuardia at various ages. The oldest is about 22 years old and the youngest is about six months old. So what I want to look at is should we modernize and bring all of those devices to the same configuration; would that be more economical for the taxpayer, for example, from a maintenance and a spare parts standpoint. So to answer your question, yes we do

need to continue to replace aging ILS systems where we need them.

QUESTION: What about installation of units where there are no ILSs now? Several groups have recommended, I think maybe 300 different places where ILSs should be installed. What sort of schedule, in terms of numbers, are you looking at?

MR. BUSEY: Well, we've got a schedule plan and I think our procurement plans and the interim support plan has something between 40 to 50 new systems per year in the plans, to the best of my recollection. The debate goes on as to whose priorities for placement are correct. We have an FAA plan where we think the priority needs should be lined up and we're proceeding to procure and install to that plan, and then we've got to enter into the debate about the -- with the others who have differing ideas of what should be priority locations.

QUESTION: Dave Rickra from AP. On this wide-bodied study, I felt a little curious that you had to go back to 1981 and '85, I think, to find incidents involving Lockheed and Boeing. Isn't this study really going to focus primarily on the D.C. 10?

MR. BUSEY: No. We're starting with the D.C. 10, but almost at the same time we're looking at the other wide-bodied aircraft. I want to take a look at all of them, I want to make sure we understand the differences between them, if there are design changes that can be made and retrofitted that will improve the backup control systems. But no, we're not going to concentrate only on the D.C. 10. I want to look at all wide-bodied first and then we're going to look at other narrow-bodied aircraft that are similarly configured to see if there are ways that we can modify and certainly ways that we need to consider the new design in our certification.

QUESTION: Now, assuming that you find that modifications are needed, what kind of a timetable are we talking about? How long would it take before that airplane that I'm going to fly tomorrow will be ...?

MR. BUSEY: Well, that's difficult for me to give you a detailed timetable. I could tell you my personal timetable will be ASAP. As soon as possible. Once we decide on what fixes are feasible and necessary, you know, then we'll have to deal with the timetables.

QUESTION: But are we talking about several years?

MR. BUSEY: No, I don't think we're talking about several years. I think what we're looking for are the possibility of changes that can be made more quickly than a few years. Are there alternative fixes that would add to the possibility for controllability for maintaining control of the aircraft in the event of catastrophic failures. You know, we've got some pretty tight design requirements for engines, the containment of engine problems, but none of us believe that you can contain a failure of a fan where you're dealing with a 300-pound or more titanium disk and a lot of mass out there on the front of the engine that might break loose. We haven't been able to figure out how to deal with that kind of an uncontained catastrophe in the past and, fortunately, we haven't experienced many of those because of the extensive design and certification process that engine manufacturers and airframe manufacturers must go through.

But what I want to do is see is there anything that new technology that offers us now that wasn't available to us 20 years ago when some of these aircraft that we're currently flying were on the design boards, that we should be considering. And once we get the answers to

that, the factual detailed answers, then we'll take the next step indicated and then we'll have to divine the timetables. But having said all that, if there are such fixes available, I think we need to push to do it as soon as possible.

QUESTION: Just one more thing. How far along are you in forming the task force. Have you got the members?

MR. BUSEY: Oh, the members are together and, as I said before, the group is meeting as we speak.

QUESTION: Is it? I'm sorry. I didn't hear you say that.

MR. BUSEY: They're meeting now. The industry government task force is meeting today, their first meeting. Yes, sir.

QUESTION: Steve Spar of the Washington Post. When you talk about the fixes that might come out of this task force study, could you give us a couple of examples of what you're thinking about or are we talking about skin, are we talking about thicker shells around engines, redesign of the hydraulics in some new way? I mean, ...?

MR. BUSEY: I think "D, all the above." I think all of those are within the realm of possibility that we

need to look at. You know, in the last ten or so years, new developments, new technology has offered us opportunities using Kevlar (phonetic) armor, you know, the Defense Department has new lightweight armor devices, and those are the kind of things I want this task group to look at to see if the application of any of this new technology is feasible for us. Or, if it's not feasible from a retrofit standpoint, it's certainly something that we should consider in new design applications. So nothing is beyond the realm of possibility.

QUESTION: Has McDonnell-Douglas expressed any concerns about the task force?

MR. BUSEY: No, McDonnell-Douglas is cooperating and participating.

QUESTION: Are they going to have their MD-11 experts in the task force?

MR. BUSEY: They have -- I don't know specifically what experts on their MD-11 are available, but I am confident that they've got engineering talent available and participating that can certainly communicate and consider that, yeah.

QUESTION: Is there a Pratt and Whitney

representative on the task force?

MR. BUSEY: Yes.

MR. : Can we have one more question?

QUESTION: Shifting radically from the safety aspect, do you have anything in the activity going on to try to get new airports going?

MR. BUSEY: Yeah, Seth. Of course, the Denver Airport is a primary concern, and I think you're aware of our participation there; the environmental study that's required by law should be about complete, and I've lost the bubble on that. It's a matter of weeks now that we're down to. We are planning for and requesting the budget support for the FAA facilities that must be included in that new airport, so Denver is certainly one. In the Chicago area, there is a policy group that is meeting, consisting of senior representatives from the State of Illinois, State of Indiana, that's looking at a possible new airport, a third airport in the Chicago area. We are certainly participating in that and will support the funding of the studies that will lead to the determination of where a new airport needs to go. So I think we're moving in that regard.

My concern that I'll share with you is that as well as looking at new airports to be built around the country, we all need to be looking at -- how should I define it? -- under-utilized concrete that's available on airports that are near major metropolitan areas. My feeling is that perhaps we can make better utilization of some of those existing airports, that existing concrete, to help relieve some of the continuing growth or increasing capacity that we're seeing around our large metropolitan areas.

QUESTION: (Inaudible) think you will (inaudible) military _____?

MR. BUSEY: It may. It may. I support joint use of military fields where it makes sense. There's been a lot of attention over the last few years to potential joint use of Scott Air Force Base in southern Illinois near St. Louis. It appears to me that that makes sense. There may be other military facilities near large metropolitan areas where joint use -- pardon?

QUESTION: Andrews?

MR. BUSEY: Andrews is not beyond the realm of possibility. And --

QUESTION: What about (inaudible) finances to support that (inaudible) speaking about the military field. How do you feel about the move (inaudible) money collected in the airport programs, some of the trust fund programs into the general fund, and do you support this and support this idea letting _____ on the slotted airports?

MR. BUSEY: I haven't studied the fee on the slotted airports sufficiently to have formulated an opinion. I'm aware, of course, of where they are in that regard. My reaction to that is I don't know how in the heck we would implement that kind of procedure and where the bucks would go. The other part of your question I think was --

QUESTION: Well, the bucks, they say will go to the general fund.

MR. BUSEY: Yes. And the bucks I think would need to go to the trust fund and of course we've got the other issue of increasing and improving our accessibility to the trust fund and I think we're going to see better -- the trend is in the right direction, I think, in the next few years on gaining access to the trust funds.

QUESTION: Will there be any administration

opposition to this plan by the sort of Commerce Committee and on the House side to tap this airport area, such as doubling the head tax and _____ general fund, slotted airport fees to the general fund, and the House taking the trigger on the 8 percent ticket tax and putting half, which is almost one billion dollars, into the general fund. Will there be a solid administration opposition to that, sir?

MR. BUSEY: I think it's too soon to tell on that. I believe the administration supported the action that was taken several weeks ago to bypass the so-called penalty clause. I suspect that there may be some feeling that perhaps that is a bad move because that has been impeding access to the trust fund, and I choose to look at that action that was taken with that almost one billion dollars coming out of the general fund as really coming out of the trust fund because those are monies that should have been flowing into the trust fund anyhow.

As far as the administration position on head taxes and on the charging for slots, I don't think we've all done our homework well enough yet and I'm not aware of an administration position in that regard.

Let me briefly respond to the wayport thing before

I leave, because I've got to get out of here.

Wayport -- good idea. My feeling is, it's got a place in our overall strategic plan and that's the way I have elected to look at the idea of wayport. We've talked about increasing capacity by perhaps adding new concrete at existing airports, I've mentioned to you I think we need to look harder at existing concrete that's under-utilized, and in the overall strategy the wayport issue probably has a place but not -- certainly not a priority place by itself. We need to look at it in conjunction with everything else that we're trying to do from a capacity standpoint.

MR. : Thank you, (inaudible).

MR. BUSEY: Okay. Thank you all very much.

(End of proceedings as recorded.)

REMARKS FOR JAMES B. BUSEY
ADMINISTRATOR
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
FLORIDA AIRPORT MANAGERS ASSOCIATION
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA
AUGUST 15, 1989

GOOD MORNING. IT'S GREAT TO BE WITH YOU TODAY.

THIS IS ONE OF THE FIRST SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS I'VE ACCEPTED SINCE I JOINED THE FAA. I GET A LOT OF INVITATIONS, AND MOST OF THEM, UNFORTUNATELY, I HAVE TO TURN DOWN BECAUSE MY TIME IS SO LIMITED.

BUT I ESPECIALLY WANTED TO COME HERE TODAY FOR A COUPLE OF VERY GOOD REASONS. FIRST OF ALL, FLORIDA AVIATION IS BIG AND IT'S IMPORTANT. THERE'S A LOT OF FLYING GOING ON HERE.

BY ALMOST EVERY MEASURE, FLORIDA RANKS NEAR THE TOP AMONG THE STATES IN AVIATION ACTIVITY. IT'S SECOND IN THE NUMBER OF TAKE OFFS AND LANDINGS AT AIRPORTS WITH FAA CONTROL TOWERS. AND IT'S THIRD IN THE NUMBER OF AIRPORTS, THE NUMBER OF PILOTS, THE NUMBER OF AIRCRAFT, AND IN THE NUMBER OF PASSENGERS SERVED BY LARGE U.S. SCHEDULED AIR CARRIERS.

I'M TOLD THAT MORE THAN HALF OF ALL THE PEOPLE WHO VISIT THE STATE EACH YEAR GET HERE BY AIRPLANE.

WHAT'S MORE, FLORIDA AVIATION IS GROWING BY LEAPS AND BOUNDS. BUT THAT'S NOTHING NEW. IT'S BEEN GROWING STEADILY FOR 75 YEARS -- EVER SINCE THE WORLD'S FIRST SCHEDULED AIRLINE FLEW BETWEEN ST. PETERSBURG AND TAMPA, BACK IN 1914.

TO TOP IT ALL OFF, FLORIDA'S GOT PENSACOLA -- AND THAT REALLY PUTS THE STATE AT THE TOP OF THE LIST FOR AN OLD NAVY FLYER LIKE ME.

SO FLORIDA AVIATION IS STRONG AND GROWING, AND THAT'S ONE REASON I WANTED TO BE WITH YOU THIS MORNING. THE OTHER IS THAT I WANT TO OPEN UP LINES OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH FOLKS LIKE YOU, WHO HAVE A DIRECT, PERSONAL, AND PROFESSIONAL INTEREST IN HOW WELL OUR AIR TRANSPORT SYSTEM WORKS.

WE SHARE COMMON CONCERNS. WE FACE COMMON PROBLEMS. AND WE MUST COMMUNICATE WITH EACH OTHER. YOU'VE GOT TO KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON AT THE FAA. AND I'VE GOT TO KNOW WHAT YOU'RE THINKING AND WHAT'S HAPPENING OUTSIDE THE WASHINGTON BELTWAY -- OUT WHERE, AS I LIKE TO SAY IT, THE RUBBER MEETS THE ROAD.

SO LET ME START BY SAYING HOW PLEASED I AM TO BE PART OF THE FAA. IT'S A TREMENDOUS ORGANIZATION. IT'S GOT A LOT OF DEDICATED, TALENTED, HARD-WORKING PEOPLE, AND A GREAT RECORD OF SERVICE TO THE NATION.

WHEN I LOOK AHEAD OVER THE NEXT FEW YEARS, I'M REALLY OPTIMISTIC. THEY'RE GOING TO BE EXCITING YEARS FOR ALL OF US.

FOR ONE THING, WE'VE GOT A SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION WHO KNOWS HOW TO SPELL "FAA". SAM SKINNER CALLS HIMSELF AN "AVIATION JUNKY." HE'S A PILOT. HE LOVES AVIATION. AND HE'S SENSITIVE TO OUR NEEDS AND CONCERNS. AND WHEN I SAY "OUR" I DON'T MEAN JUST THE FAA. I MEAN EVERYONE IN AVIATION.

HERE'S A SECRETARY WHO'LL FIGHT FOR US IN CABINET MEETINGS AND UP ON THE HILL AT THE BUDGET TABLE. AND I'LL JOIN HIM IN THAT. WE'RE GOING TO BE AVIATION ADVOCATES IN THE ADMINISTRATION AND WITH THE CONGRESS.

I WOULDN'T HAVE COME TO WORK FOR SECRETARY SKINNER IF I HADN'T BEEN CONFIDENT THAT WE COULD WORK WELL TOGETHER. AND THAT'S IMPORTANT, BECAUSE IT MEANS HE'LL GIVE US THE SUPPORT WE NEED TO GET ON WITH THE JOB AT THE FAA.

I'M OPTIMISTIC NOT ONLY BECAUSE WE'VE GOT SAM SKINNER ON OUR SIDE, BUT ALSO BECAUSE WE'VE GOT A LOT OF SUPPORT IN THE CONGRESS. THE FAA BUDGET IS INCREASING, AND I BELIEVE IT WILL CONTINUE TO INCREASE.

IN ADDITION, WE'RE GOING TO BE MAKING PROFOUND CHANGES IN THE WAY WE DO OUR WORK. WE'VE GOT ADVANCED HIGH-TECH EQUIPMENT COMING ON LINE THAT WILL REVOLUTIONIZE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS. NEW TRAINING PROGRAMS ARE BEING SET UP. AND A LOT OF TALENTED NEW PEOPLE WILL BE COMING ABOARD.

NO QUESTION ABOUT IT, WE FACE MANY CHALLENGES AND MANY OPPORTUNITIES. AND I'D LIKE TO TAKE JUST A FEW MINUTES TODAY TO TELL YOU ABOUT MY GOALS FOR THE FAA OVER THE NEXT FEW YEARS.

LET ME PREFACE THIS BY SAYING THAT I HAVE NO INTENTION OF STARTING OFF WITH MAJOR CHANGES IN THE FAA ORGANIZATION. THOSE WERE MADE A YEAR AGO, AND I'M GOING TO PLAY THE HAND I'VE BEEN DEALT. THE TASK NOW, AS I SEE IT, IS TO MAKE THE ORGANIZATION REALLY WORK.

SO WHAT ARE MY GOALS?

WELL, THEY COVER SIX MAIN AREAS: SAFETY, PEOPLE, PROCUREMENT, BUDGET, OUTREACH, AND AVIATION POLICY.

MY NUMBER ONE PRIORITY, AS IT MUST BE FOR EVERY FAA ADMINISTRATOR AND FOR EVERYONE IN THE ORGANIZATION, IS SAFETY.

WE HAVE THE SAFEST SYSTEM IN THE WORLD, AND I'M GOING TO WORK AS HARD AS I POSSIBLY CAN TO ENSURE THAT IT STAYS THE SAFEST IN THE WORLD. THAT'S AN ABSOLUTELY MANDATORY GOAL THAT STANDS HEAD AND SHOULDERS ABOVE EVERYTHING ELSE.

NEXT COMES PEOPLE. IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, THE PERFORMANCE OF AN ORGANIZATION IS DETERMINED BY THE QUALITY OF ITS PEOPLE. YOU CAN HAVE THE MOST ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY, THE BEST HARDWARE, THE MOST EFFICIENT SYSTEMS, BUT THEY WON'T MEAN MUCH IF YOUR PEOPLE CAN'T RUN THEM WELL.

SO WE MUST HAVE TALENTED, WELL-TRAINED PEOPLE. WE NEED THE RIGHT PEOPLE IN THE RIGHT NUMBERS AND IN THE RIGHT JOBS, AND I'M DETERMINED WE'LL HAVE THEM. FROM RECRUITMENT TO TRAINING TO RETENTION, I'M GOING TO MAKE SURE THAT THE FAA IS THE KIND OF PLACE THAT ATTRACTS AND KEEPS SMART, HARD-WORKING, DEDICATED PEOPLE.

IN THE PROCUREMENT AREA, MY GOAL IS TO INSTILL GREATER ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE PROCESS.

AS YOU PROBABLY KNOW, THERE HAVE BEEN SOME DELAYS AND COST OVERRUNS IN THE NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM PLAN. THE NASPLAN, WHICH ADMINISTRATOR HELMS STARTED IN 1982, WILL COST A TOTAL OF $15.8 BILLION AND IS THE KEY PART OF OUR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

THAT PROGRAM IS SO IMPORTANT THAT WE SIMPLY CAN NOT TOLERATE OVERRUNS AND DELAYS. WE'VE GOT TO FIND WAYS TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY DON'T BECOME A CHRONIC CONDITION IN OUR PROCUREMENT PROCESSES. AND I INTEND TO ENSURE THAT WE ARE WORKING WITH OUR CONTRACTORS TO GET OUR NEEDED HARDWARE AND PROGRAMS DELIVERED ON TIME AND ON COST.

AS YOU CAN SEE, MY PROCUREMENT GOAL HAS TO DO WITH HOW WE SPEND THE MONEY. MY BUDGET GOAL, AS YOU WOULD SUSPECT, HAS TO DO WITH HOW MUCH MONEY WE GET TO SPEND.

LET ME PUT IT QUITE SIMPLY: MY GOAL IS TO GET THE MONEY WE NEED TO MAKE SURE THAT AMERICA CONTINUES TO HAVE THE SAFEST AND MOST PRODUCTIVE AIR COMMERCE SYSTEM IN THE WORLD.

SECRETARY SKINNER AND I ARE COMMITTED TO THE GROWTH AND ADVANCEMENT OF OUR AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.

THAT MEANS THAT A CRITICALLY IMPORTANT PART OF MY JOB WILL BE TO WORK HARD WITHIN THE ADMINISTRATION AND WITH THE CONGRESS TO SEE THAT WE GET THE RESOURCES AND FUNDING THAT WILL ALLOW THE SYSTEM TO EVOLVE AND GROW AS IT SHOULD. AND THAT APPLIES TO THE WHOLE FAA BUDGET, INCLUDING THE AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE AVIATION TRUST FUND IS USED AS IT WAS ORIGINALLY INTENDED. I STRONGLY BELIEVE THAT THE MONIES IN THE TRUST FUND SHOULD BE SPENT FOR THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH THEY WERE TAXED FROM OUR TRAVELING PUBLIC AND AVIATORS.

NOW THERE'S NOT MUCH I CAN DO, AT THIS LATE DATE, TO INFLUENCE THE 1990 BUDGET. IT LOOKS LIKE WE'LL SEE SOME GROWTH ON THE AIP SIDE, BUT IT'S PRETTY WELL LOCKED UP BY NOW. OF COURSE, WE'RE WORKING WITH THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO AVOID ANY LINE-ITEMING OR LAST MINUTE SURPRISES.

FOR THE '91 BUDGET, WHICH IS BEING DEVELOPED NOW, I'M CONFIDENT WE'LL BE ABLE TO ESTABLISH A TREND THAT WILL CLEARLY DEMONSTRATE INCREASED ACCESS TO THE TRUST FUND.

THERE'S NO QUESTION THAT AMERICA NEEDS MORE AND BETTER AIRPORTS. AND LET ME ASSURE YOU THAT SECRETARY SKINNER AND I FULLY RECOGNIZE THE NEED FOR HIGHER AIRPORT FUNDING. IT IS ONE OF OUR MAJOR BUDGETARY GOALS, TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE UNDER OUR CURRENT FEDERAL BUDGET CONSTRAINTS.

BUT, AS THE SECRETARY HAS SAID, WE MUST ALSO "DEVELOP NEW, CREATIVE WAYS TO FINANCE MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENTS WHICH MEET OUR MUTUAL GOAL OF EXPANDING THE SYSTEM WHILE RECOGNIZING THE CONSTRAINED IMPOSED BY THE FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT."

I KNOW THAT AIRPORT CAPACITY IS ONE OF YOUR BIGGEST CONCERNS, TOO. AS YOU KNOW, THE FAA IS NOT IN THE AIRPORT BUILDING BUSINESS. WE CAN HELP YOU PLAN. WE CAN HELP YOU FUND. AND WE CAN BUILD THE TOWER AND RUN THE AIR CONTROL AND APPROACH SYSTEM.

BUT THE DECISION TO BUILD OR NOT BUILD IS IN YOUR HANDS, AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL. WHEN YOU MAKE THOSE DECISIONS, I HOPE YOU'LL KEEP IN MIND THAT YOU WILL BE AFFECTING AIRPORTS AND TRAVELERS THOUSANDS OF MILES AWAY.

IN OUR INTERDEPENDENT SYSTEM, WHATEVER HAPPENS, OR DOESN'T HAPPEN, IN ONE LOCALITY CAN SERIOUSLY AFFECT WHAT HAPPENS IN OTHER PARTS OF THE SYSTEM. A LACK OF AIRPORT CAPACITY IN ONE MAJOR CITY CAN SLOW PLANES AND PEOPLE ALL OVER THE COUNTRY.

THAT'S THE KIND OF THING I'VE GOT TO CONSIDER WHEN WE MAKE THOSE DIFFICULT DECISIONS ON HOW TO USE THE LIMITED DOLLARS WE'VE GOT. WE JUST CAN'T JUSTIFY FUNDING A PURELY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT THAT HELPS A VERY LIMITED NUMBER OF PEOPLE, WHEN THERE IS A FAR GREATER NEED SOMEWHERE ELSE IN THE SYSTEM. WE'VE GOT TO LOOK SYSTEM-WIDE WHEN WE MAKE OUR DISCRETIONARY AIRPORT FUNDING DECISIONS.

I MUST SAY, HOWEVER, THAT YOU'RE DOING PRETTY WELL HERE IN FLORIDA. YOU LEAD THE NATION IN STATE FUNDING FOR AVIATION. AND YOU'VE GOT SOME GREAT AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS GOING IN MIAMI, ORLANDO, AND TAMPA.

ANOTHER OF MY MAJOR GOALS IS OUTREACH. WE'RE GOT A LARGE COMMUNITY OF AVIATION LOVERS OUT THERE -- PILOTS, MECHANICS, TECHNICIANS, FBO OPERATORS, AND MANY OTHERS. THEY'VE GOT IDEAS. THEY'VE GOT THINGS ON THEIR MINDS. AND THEY SHOULD BE HEARD.

BUT THAT'S NOT HAPPENING. I'VE HEARD FROM MANY OF THE USER GROUPS THAT OUR RULE-MAKING PROCESS REALLY DOESN'T PROVIDE THEM ENOUGH OPPORTUNITY TO GIVE US THE BENEFIT OF THEIR VIEWS. AND EVEN WHEN THEY DO COMMENT ON A PROPOSED RULE, IT OFTEN APPEARS THAT WE DON'T PAY MUCH ATTENTION.

SO I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT FOR THE FAA ADMINISTRATOR TO GET OUT AND VISIT WITH REPRESENTATIVE INTEREST GROUPS LIKE YOURS. AND I'M GOING TO DO THIS AS MUCH AS I CAN.

INCIDENTALLY, ONE OF MY FIRST MEETINGS WAS WITH THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF YOUR NATIONAL ORGANIZATION AT OSHKOSH, AND WE HAVE A VERY GOOD SESSION.

THE LAST GOAL I WANT TO MENTION IS FAA'S PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY -- WHICH IS ONE OF SECRETARY SKINNER'S PRIMARY GOALS.

WE'RE GOING TO PLAY THE LEAD ROLE IN DEVELOPING A NATIONAL AVIATION POLICY THAT WILL FOLD INTO THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY. WE WANT THIS POLICY TO BE AS REALISTIC AND AS ALL-ENCOMPASSING AS POSSIBLE, SO WE'RE MAKING A SPECIAL EFFORT TO GET THE VIEWS AND THOUGHTS OF AVIATION INTEREST-GROUPS FROM ALL AROUND THE COUNTRY.

I FEEL STRONGLY THAT A NATIONAL POLICY LIKE THIS SHOULD NOT BE DEVELOPED STRICTLY FROM INSIDE THE WASHINGTON BELTWAY. NOR SHOULD IT BE GENERATED BY SOME CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED GROUP. IT'S OUR RESPONSIBILITY, AND WE'RE TAKING THE LEAD.

FINALLY, I'D LIKE TO SAY A FEW WORDS ABOUT EMERGENCY PLANNING. I'M SURE THAT ALL OF YOU ARE DOING EMERGENCY PLANNING. AND I WOULD ENCOURAGE YOU TO CONTINUE, BECAUSE I CAN GIVE YOU FIRST-HAND EVIDENCE OF HOW WELL IT WORKS WHEN THE TEAM DOES ITS PLANNING AND IS READY TO RESPOND.

I VISITED SIOUX CITY RIGHT AFTER THE RECENT CRASH THERE, AND I WAS TREMENDOUSLY IMPRESSED WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF THE COMMUNITY TEAM THERE. BELIEVE ME, THEY'D DONE THEIR HOMEWORK.

THEY'D HAD A PRACTICE EXERCISE ABOUT TWO YEARS AGO, AND THERE WERE A LOT OF MISTAKES. BUT THEY CORRECTED THOSE, AND WHEN THE CRISIS HIT, EVERYONE WORKED TOGETHER -- POLICE, FIRE, AIRPORT MANAGEMENT, CITY, AND MEDICAL. THEY WERE AS WELL-PREPARED AS ANY TEAM I'VE SEEN -- AND THAT'S WHY THEY WERE ABLE TO RESPOND SO EFFECTIVELY.

BELIEVE ME, EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PLANNING WORKS. AND I WOULD ENCOURAGE ALL OF YOU TO TAKE IT VERY SERIOUSLY.

I'M GOING TO STOP TALKING NOW, SO YOU CAN HAVE A CHANCE. I DO APPRECIATE BEING WITH YOU THIS MORNING. IT'S BEEN A REAL PLEASURE.

NOW I'D BE GLAD TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE...

TALKING POINTS BY JAMES B. BUSEY
ADMINISTRATOR
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
BEFORE THE FLIGHT SAFETY FOUNDATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.
AUGUST 17, 1989

THIS IS A GET ACQUAINTED SESSION.

I'VE BEEN ASKED TO SAY A FEW WORDS INFORMALLY -- OFF THE CUFF AND OFF THE RECORD, SO THAT WE CAN HAVE A FRANK DISCUSSION OF SAFETY MATTERS OF CONCERN TO ALL.

I'LL GIVE YOU SOME OF MY OBSERVATIONS ABOUT SAFETY -- BOTH OPERATIONAL AND SECURITY.

EQUALLY IMPORTANT, IMPORTANT, I WANT TO HEAR YOUR VIEWS ON THESE SUBJECTS.

FIRST, THERE'S NO QUESTION THAT DESPITE THE SO-CALLED "CROWDED SKIES," DESPITE DEREGULATION, SAFETY IS BETTER THAN JUST A FEW YEARS AGO -- AND IT'S GETTING BETTER ALL THE TIME.

THE FACTS SHOW IT.

IN THE TEN YEARS, 1979-1988, THE AIRLINE ACCIDENT RATE PER 100,000 HOURS FLOWN DECLINED ALMOST 40 PERCENT AND THE FATALITY RATE PER 100,000 HOURS DECLINED BY NEARLY 51 PERCENT.

THE U.S. AIRLINE FATALITY RATE FROM 1972 THROUGH 1978 WAS 1.19 PER 100 BILLION PASSENGER MILES. BUT FOR THE TEN YEARS 1979 THROUGH 1988, THE RATE WAS ONLY .48 PER 100 BILLION PASSENGER MILES -- A DECLINE OF 60 PERCENT.

THAT DOESN'T MEAN WE CAN REST ON OUR LAURELS.

WE'VE GOT TO KEEP ON STRIVING TO INCREASE SAFETY, EVEN THOUGH WE KNOW THAT 100 PERCENT SAFETY IS BEYOND REACH -- UNLESS WE KEEP ALL THE PLANES ON THE GROUND, AND EVEN THEN SOMEONE WOULD PROBABLY GET HURT FALLING OUT OF ONE.

SAFETY: WE ARE DOING THINGS THAT WILL INCREASE SAFETY.

AGING AIRCRAFT -- MANY EFFORTS UNDERWAY.

* $10 MILLION IN FY 1990 BUDGET FOR AGING AIRCRAFT RESEARCH--ALSO A REQUEST FOR 400 SAFETY INSPECTORS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL.

* ISSUED A SERIES OF AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES IN MAY THAT MANDATE EXTENSIVE STRUCTURAL MODIFICATIONS TO OLDER BOEING 727s, 737s, AND 747s.

  - THIS REPRESENTS A NEW APPROACH THAT REQUIRED AIRLINES TO MAKE STRENGTHENING MODIFICATIONS TO BASIC CRITICAL STRUCTURES TO PRESENT FATIGUE PROBLEMS.

* FAA INSPECTORS NOW DO MORE "HANDS ON" WORK WITH AIRLINES DURING HEAVY MAINTENANCE CHECKS OF HIGH-TIME AIRCRAFT.

* RECENT DISCOVERY OF CRACKS IN FOUR 727-100s IS WORRISOME, BECAUSE CRACKS WERE IN THE LOWER PART OF THE FUSELAGE AND NOT ALONG A RIVET LINE WHERE THEY ARE USUALLY FOUND.

NEW TECHNOLOGY: EXPECT FURTHER SAFETY INCREASES IN NEXT FEW YEARS FROM NEW TECHNOLOGY NOW BEING PUT INTO THE SYSTEM.

* MORE ACCURATE WEATHER RADAR AND WINDSHEAR DETECTORS.

* ADDITIONAL TCAs, AND ARSAs.

* MODE C (ALTITUDE REPORTING) TRANSPONDER REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL PLANES IN AND ROUND TCAs AND ARSAs.

* TCAS II REQUIREMENT FOR AIRLINERS -- PILOTS BECOMING MORE RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR OWN SEPARATION.

* MODE S TRANSPONDERS THAT WILL ALLOW AUTOMATIC DATA-LINK TRANSMISSIONS THAT WILL ELIMINATE A LOT OF ERROR-PRONE AND TIME CONSUMING CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN PILOTS AND CONTROLLERS.

    - I SAW A DEMONSTRATION AT THE TECH CENTER, USING SIMULATED DATA LINKING -- CONTROLLERS SAY IT INCREASES THEIR ABILITY TO HANDLE MORE TRAFFIC SAFELY.

* NEW PROCEDURES LIKE THE EAST COAST PLAN, THE NATIONAL FLOW CONTROL COMPUTER, ETC., ALL HELPING TO GIVE SYSTEM GREATER CAPACITY AND POTENTIALLY HIGHER SAFETY LEVELS.

* THE ADVANCED AUTOMATION SYSTEM (AAS) COMPUTERS THAT WILL BE COMING ON LINE IN THE EARLY 1990s AND THAT WILL ALLOW A NEW LEVEL OF AUTOMATION IN AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL -- WITH COMPUTERS DOING WHAT THEY DO BEST, AND CONTROLLERS BECOMING TRUE AIRSPACE MANAGERS.

* COMPLEMENTING HIGH-TECH HARDWARE ARE OUR NEW HIGH-TECH TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR CONTROLLERS, USING VERY ADVANCED SIMULATION TECHNIQUES TO MAKE SURE OUR PEOPLE MEASURE UP TO OUR TECHNOLOGY.

NEW IDEAS: MUST CONTINUE THE SEARCH FOR NEW IDEAS TO INCREASE SAFETY.

AIRCRAFT IN MANY WAYS ARE GETTING AHEAD OF OUR ABILITY ON THE GROUND TO DEAL WITH THEM.

* RIGHT NOW, WE RESTRAIN AIR TRAFFIC BECAUSE WE WANT ALL OF IT TO MOVE AT ABOUT THE SAME SPEED IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN OUR SEPARATION STANDARDS.

* MAYBE WE SHOULD FIND WAYS TO CREATE DIFFERENT SEPARATION STANDARDS, KIND OF SUPER HIGHWAYS OF THE SKY, WITH THE SLOWER GUYS OVER IN THE RIGHT LAND AND LETTING THE FASTER ONES COME ON THROUGH ON HIGH SPEED LANES -- HAVEN'T FIGURED THAT OUT YET.

SECURITY:

WE'VE MADE GREAT ADVANCES IN RECENT YEARS:

* BETTER PASSENGER AND BAGGAGE SCREENING TECHNIQUES;

* WORLDWIDE USE OF X-RAY AND METAL DETECTORS;

* THE FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL PROGRAM;

* TIGHTER CONTROL OF ACCESS TO AIRCRAFT;

* MORE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW SECURITY TECHNIQUES AND TECHNOLOGIES;

* BETTER INTELLIGENCE CONCERNING TERRORIST ACTIVITIES;

CAN SEE REAL RESULTS FROM THESE ACTIVITIES: ONLY TWO ATTEMPTED HIJACKINGS OF U.S.-REGISTERED AIRCRAFT LAST YEAR -- AND THE NUMBER OF ATTEMPTED HIJACKINGS OF FOREIGN AIRLINES WAS HALF WHAT IT WAS EARLIER IN THE 1980S.

BUT DESPITE ALL THESE ADVANCES, CIVIL AVIATION WILL CONTINUE TO BE A TARGET FOR CRIMINALS AND TERRORISTS.

A FORMIDABLE CHALLENGE, AS TECHNOLOGY AND POLITICAL AGENDAS EVOLVE.

SABOTAGE IS THE NEW TERROR: AIR INDIA FLIGHT 102, TWA FLIGHT 840, KOREAN AIR FLIGHT 858, AND PAN AM FLIGHT 103.

WHAT ARE WE DOING TO COMBAT THIS MENACE?

* ADDING TO OUR CIVIL AVIATION SECURITY WORKFORCE BY 56 ADDITIONAL PEOPLE THIS YEAR, AND HAVE REQUESTED 120 MORE IN OUR FY 1990 BUDGET, BRINGING THE TOTAL TO JUST UNDER 700.

* CONTINUED INVESTMENT IN NEW TECHNOLOGY.

* ACCELERATING DELIVERY OF THERMAL NEUTRON ANALYSIS (TNA) UNITS.

    - SIX UNITS TO BE IN OPERATION BY JANUARY 1990.

- FIRST INSTALLED AT JFK-- I'VE JUST INSPECTED IT, AND, BELIEVE ME, IT WORKS.

* ALSO DOING RESEARCH ON A VAPOR DETECTION SYSTEM THAT WILL CHECK PEOPLE FOR EXPLOSIVES.

* THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE IS DOING A FULL-SCALE REVIEW FOR USE OF THE SECURITY DETECTION DEVICES THAT ARE AVAILABLE FROM STATE-OF-THE-ART TECHNOLOGY.

  - RECENT BRIEFING I GOT FROM THEM SHOWS THAT WE ARE ON THE RIGHT TRACK WITH TNA DEVICE, WITH DUAL CAPABILITY -- NUCLEAR RADIATION COUPLED WITH AN X-RAY.

  - ALSO ON THE VAPOR DETECT ON DEVICES -- A TOUGHER PROBLEM.

* WORKING WITH OTHER NATIONS TO DEVELOP UNIFORM APPROACHES TO COMBAT TERRORISM.

* IMPLEMENTING THE ICAO ANNEX 17 TO THE CHICAGO CONVENTION, WHICH SETS SECURITY STANDARDS AND RECOMMENDED PRACTICES.

* ESTABLISHING NEW FAA SECURITY INITIATIVES, INCLUDING:

  - REQUIRING TNA DEVICES AT BUSIEST AIRPORTS HERE AND OVERSEAS WHERE U.S. AIRLINES OPERATE.

  - SETTING STANDARDS FOR X-RAY AND METAL DETECTION EQUIPMENT TO ASSURE THAT U.S. CARRIERS ARE USING STATE-OF-THE-ART EQUIPMENT.

- ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL AVIATION SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

- CONDUCTING A TOP TO BOTTOM REVIEW OF HOW WELL U.S. CARRIERS ARE COMPLYING WITH SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

ON AIRPORT SECURITY:

WE'RE TRYING TO PREVENT PEOPLE FROM WANDERING AROUND AIRPLANES ON THE FLIGHT LINES -- PARTICULARLY PEOPLE WHO WOULD HAVE ACCESS TO PASSENGER PLANES.

BUT I'VE HEARD FROM MANY SOURCES THAT OUR AIRPORT SECURITY REQUIREMENTS ARE REALLY AFFECTING THE GENERAL AVIATION GUY -- REQUIRING SECURITY ACCESS TO THE FLIGHT LINE.

THE TIGHTNESS OF OUR SECURITY IS IMPEDING THEIR ABILITY TO TAKE GUESTS OUT TO THE AIRPLANES.

HEARD A LOT ABOUT THIS OUT AT OSHKOSH.

SEEMS TO ME ONE SOLUTION WOULD BE TO ISSUE A MAGNETIC ACCESS CARD TO A TRANSIENT OVERNIGHT AT AN FBO, SO HE CAN GET BACK TO HIS AIRPLANE.

CONCLUSION