

REMARKS BY JAMES B. BUSEY
FAA ADMINISTRATOR
BEFORE THE DAYTON AIR AND TRADE SHOW
DAYTON, OHIO
JULY 19, 1990

THANK YOU. IT'S GREAT TO BE HERE
TODAY.

THIS IS WHERE IT ALL STARTED.

THIS IS WHERE A COUPLE OF
HOME-GROWN GENIUSES, ORVILLE AND
WILBUR WRIGHT, DEVELOPED THE
TECHNOLOGY THAT FINALLY FULFILLED
MANKIND'S AGE-OLD DREAM OF FLIGHT. THIS
IS WHERE THEY OPENED THE AIR AGE -- AND
CHANGED THE WORLD FOREVER.

AS WE ALL KNOW, THE WORK THEY DID
HERE IN DAYTON LED TO THE FIRST POWERED
FLIGHT IN HISTORY -- AT KITTY HAWK ON A
DECEMBER DAY EIGHTY-SEVEN YEARS AGO

IT WAS A HUMBLE BEGINNING, THAT FIRST FLIGHT. JUST A HUNDRED FEET, LASTING ONLY 12 SECONDS. BUT HUMBLE THOUGH IT MAY HAVE BEEN BY TODAY'S STANDARDS, IT BROUGHT UNPARALLELED OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES.

TODAY, NINE DECADES LATER, WE'RE STILL LEARNING WHAT THE GIFT OF FLIGHT REALLY MEANS. WE HAVE ONLY JUST TAPPED THE SURFACE.

AFTER THEIR TRIUMPH AT KITTY HAWK, THE WRIGHT BROTHERS SPENT THE NEXT TWO YEARS OUT AT HUFFMAN PRAIRIE, EIGHT MILES EAST OF DAYTON.

THEY WEREN'T RUNNING AN AIR SHOW. THEY WERE CONCENTRATING ON ADVANCING THE TECHNOLOGY OF FLIGHT. BUT EVERY TIME THEY FLEW, THEY WERE PUTTING ON A SHOW. AND PEOPLE CAME TO SEE IT. FINALLY, IN LATE 1905, THE WRIGHTS STOPPED FLYING THERE BECAUSE, AS ORVILLE WRIGHT PUT IT, "SO MANY PEOPLE WERE ATTRACTED TO THE FIELD".

THE PEOPLE OF DAYTON OF THAT TIME WERE PRIVILEGED TO SEE THE FIRST AIR SHOWS IN HISTORY. AND THAT FASCINATION WITH FLIGHT IS STILL ALIVE TODAY. FROM THE DAYS AT HUFFMAN PRAIRIE TO NOW, AIR SHOWS HAVE NEVER LOST THEIR POPULARITY.

AT ONE TIME, THEY HELPED DEVELOP AVIATION TECHNOLOGY. THEY OFFERED OPPORTUNITIES FOR COURAGEOUS AND CREATIVE FLYERS TO ADVANCE THE TECHNOLOGY -- AND DEVELOP THEIR OWN SKILLS -- TO THE ABSOLUTE LIMIT. AND THEY WHETTED THE APPETITE OF THOUSANDS OF YOUNGSTERS WHO WOULD SOMEDAY BECOME FLIERS THEMSELVES.

TODAY AIR SHOWS NO LONGER PLAY MUCH OF A ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY. BUT THE WONDER AND THRILL OF FLIGHT IS STILL ALIVE -- AND PEOPLE NEED TO EXPERIENCE IT. AND THAT'S WHY WE HAVE AIR SHOWS.

BUT AIR SHOWS ALSO SERVE ANOTHER PURPOSE. THEY GIVE MANUFACTURERS A CHANCE TO SHOW OFF THEIR PRODUCTS, AND THEY GIVES BUYERS A CHANCE TO TOUCH AND FEEL AND KICK THE TIRES AND WATCH THE MACHINES DO WHAT THEY'RE DESIGNED TO DO.

I BELIEVE THAT AMERICA HAS GONE TOO LONG WITHOUT A MAJOR AEROSPACE EXPOSITION. WE'RE THE LEADING AEROSPACE NATION, YET, UNTIL NOW, WE HAVEN'T HAD A TRULY INTERNATIONAL SHOW THAT IS INDUSTRY-WIDE IN SCOPE.

AS SENATOR JOHN GLENN SAID IN APRIL, "THE U.S. AEROSPACE INDUSTRY DESERVES A HOME-BASED INTERNATIONAL ARENA WHERE NEW TECHNOLOGY CAN BE SHOWCASED." THE SENATOR IS ABSOLUTELY RIGHT.

A STUDY BY THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE CONCLUDED THAT THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY WOULD INDEED BENEFIT FROM A UNITED STATES AIR AND TRADE SHOW. SUCH A SHOW COULD STRENGTHEN THE INDUSTRY'S MARKETING EFFORTS, BOTH NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY.

UNTIL NOW, OUR BUYERS AND MANUFACTURERS HAVE HAD TO GO OVERSEAS TO TAKE PART IN A TRULY WORLD-CLASS INDUSTRY EXPOSITION. BUT IF THE SPONSORS OF THIS SHOW HAVE THEIR WAY, THAT SITUATION IS GOING TO CHANGE.

THEY'RE GOING TO MAKE THIS INTO AN AEROSPACE EXPOSITION THE EQUAL OF THOSE HELD IN FARNBOROUGH, PARIS, AND SINGAPORE.

AND I CAN'T THINK OF A BETTER PLACE TO DO THAT THAN DAYTON -- THE HOME OF THE WRIGHT BROTHERS, THE U.S. AIR FORCE MUSEUM, AND THE NATIONAL AVIATION HALL OF FAME.

THE GOAL IS TO ATTRACT EXHIBITORS FROM EVERY PART OF THE AVIATION WORLD AND EVERY MAJOR AEROSPACE MARKET -- COMMERCIAL, MILITARY, BUSINESS, SPORT AND GENERAL AVIATION, AND THE WORLD OF SPACE AS WELL.

NOW THAT'S AN AMBITIOUS GOAL, BUT I'M CONFIDENT IT WILL BE ACHIEVED. IN FACT, WE'VE ALREADY MADE A GOOD START. MORE THAN 250 EXHIBITORS ARE HERE THIS YEAR, INCLUDING A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER FROM OTHER COUNTRIES.

BY THE TIME OF THE NEXT SHOW, AEROSPACE COMPANIES WILL BE ABLE TO SHOW THEIR WARES IN A \$7 MILLION DOLLAR PERMANENT TRADE PAVILION TO BE BUILT HERE. AND THE SCHEDULE FOR FUTURE SHOWS WILL BE SET SO AS TO COMPLEMENT, RATHER THAN CONFLICT WITH, OTHER MAJOR SHOWS.

AND, AS YOU KNOW, REFLECTING ALL THESE CHANGES, THE NAME OF THE SHOW HAS BEEN CHANGED FROM THE DAYTON AIR AND TRADE SHOW TO THE UNITED STATES AIR AND TRADE SHOW.

WE LIVE IN AN ERA OF INCREASING GLOBAL COMPETITION. THE DAY OF THE PURELY DOMESTIC MARKET IS GONE. EVERY MARKET TODAY IS PART OF THE WORLD MARKET. COMPETITION IS TOUGH AND GETTING TOUGHER. AND NOWHERE IS THIS MORE EVIDENT THAN IN THE AEROSPACE

THE WORLD OF AVIATION IS TRULY INTERNATIONAL. LARGE AIRCRAFT TODAY ARE MADE ON AN INTERNATIONAL BASIS, WITH COMPONENTS FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD.

AND THEY ARE FLOWN ON AN INTERNATIONAL BASIS, OFTEN WITH OWNERS IN ONE COUNTRY LEASING EQUIPMENT TO OPERATORS IN ANOTHER COUNTRY AND FLOWN BY CREWS FROM A THIRD COUNTRY ON A WORLDWIDE BASIS. NATIONAL BORDERS NO LONGER HAVE THE IMPORTANCE THEY ONCE HAD.

THIS GROWING INTERNATIONALIZATION OF AVIATION PRESENTS A TREMENDOUS CHALLENGE TO AGENCIES LIKE THE FAA AND TO THE COMPANIES THAT MUST COMPETE IN THESE TOUGH WORLD MARKETS.

THE FAA IS CHALLENGED TO FIND WAYS TO PROMOTE COMMONALITY WITH OTHER COUNTRIES IN OUR AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS AND IN OUR OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE AND CERTIFICATION REGULATIONS.

THIS WILL HELP ASSURE SAFETY. AND IT WILL ALSO ASSURE AMERICAN AVIATION MANUFACTURERS AND OPERATORS THAT THE SAME STANDARDS THAT APPLY TO THE PRODUCTION OF COMPONENTS FOR U.S. AIRCRAFT ALSO APPLY TO FOREIGN-PRODUCED AIRCRAFT. WE MUST MAKE SURE THAT EVERYONE PLAYS ON A LEVEL PLAYING FIELD.

THE FAA IS ALSO CHALLENGED TO PROMOTE THE USE OF ADVANCED AND RELIABLE U.S. AVIATION EQUIPMENT ON A WORLDWIDE BASIS. AND WE ARE WORKING WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES TO DO THAT.

THE COMPANIES THAT WILL SUCCEED WILL BE THOSE THAT BUILD A SUPERIOR PRODUCT AND THAT CAN MARKET THAT PRODUCT AGGRESSIVELY. AND THAT'S WHY WE NEED A GREAT AIR AND TRADE SHOW HERE IN AMERICA.

THIS MAY BE AN AGE OF COMPUTERS AND SATELLITES AND INSTANT COMMUNICATIONS, BUT WE STILL NEED A TIME AND PLACE WHERE WE CAN GET TOGETHER TO LOOK AT THE COMPETING PRODUCTS IN ONE PLACE, MAKE CONTACTS, EXCHANGE IDEAS, AND GET TO KNOW ONE ANOTHER. THAT'S WHAT A TRADE SHOW THAT COVERS THE WHOLE RANGE OF AEROSPACE PRODUCTS CAN OFFER.

CERTAINLY, THERE'S NO QUESTION THAT THE UNITED STATES IS THE WORLD AVIATION LEADER. WE HAVE BEEN THE LEADER SINCE THE DAY OF THE WRIGHT BROTHERS. BUT IF WE ARE TO KEEP THAT LEAD, OUR MANUFACTURERS MUST BE ABLE TO MARKET THEIR PRODUCTS EFFECTIVELY IN WAYS THAT MEET THE COMPETITION HEAD-ON.

IT WOULD BE HARD TO EXAGGERATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY TO THE ECONOMY AND ITS PLACE IN THE AVIATION WORLD.

THE VALUE OF AEROSPACE PRODUCTS DOUBLED DURING THE PAST DECADE AND IS EXPECTED TO CONTINUE GROWING STRONGLY IN THE 1990S. THE WORLD'S PASSENGER JET FLEET, FOR EXAMPLE, IS EXPECTED TO INCREASE 60 PERCENT OVER THE NEXT 12 YEARS, FROM MORE THAN 7000 AIRCRAFT IN 1988 TO CLOSE TO 12,000 BY JUST AFTER THE

THE INDUSTRY EMPLOYS 1.3 MILLION PEOPLE AND HAD A GROSS INCOME OF MORE THAN 105 BILLION DOLLARS LAST YEAR. IT HAD NEARLY 32 BILLION DOLLARS IN EXPORTS, MAKING IT THE LEADING POSITIVE CONTRIBUTOR TO THE U.S. BALANCE OF TRADE.

SO THE INDUSTRY IS A MAJOR PLAYER IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY, AND THAT MEANS WE MUST DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO KEEP IT STRONG.

THE FAA IS GLAD TO SUPPORT THE UNITED STATES AIR AND TRADE SHOW. AND WE'VE SET UP A COUPLE OF INTERESTING DISPLAYS, WHICH I HOPE YOU'LL VISIT.

ONE OF THEM COVERS OUR RECRUITING PROGRAMS, AVIATION MEDICINE, FLIGHT STANDARDS, AND CIVIL AVIATION SECURITY. IT ALSO OFFERS YOU A CHANCE TO TAKE A RIDE IN OUR "VERTIGO CHAIR." IF YOU WANT TO FIND OUT JUST HOW DIZZY YOU CAN GET, GO SIT IN THAT CHAIR.

OUR OTHER DISPLAY IS FROM OUR TECHNICAL CENTER. IT COVERS A LOT OF HIGH TECHNOLOGY, INCLUDING THE COMING ADVANCED ENROUTE AUTOMATION PROGRAMS, TCAS, MLS, AND MUCH MORE.

BUT THAT'S NOT ALL. THIS AFTERNOON, WE'RE GOING TO RUN THREE FAA SEMINARS ON SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT, OPERATIONS, AND AIRPORTS. WE WANT TO GIVE YOU A CHANCE TO TALK TO OUR PEOPLE IN CHARGE OF THESE PROGRAMS -- TO FIND OUT, DIRECTLY FROM THEM, WHAT WE'RE DOING AND WHY.

I'M SURE THAT MANY OF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT OUR PROGRAMS, ABOUT WHAT'RE DOING AND WHAT WE'RE PLANNING TO DO. WELL THIS IS YOUR CHANCE TO GET THOSE QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

SO I HOPE YOU'LL COME TO OUR SEMINARS THIS AFTERNOON AND ASK JOE DEL BALZO ABOUT OUR MULTI-BILLION DOLLAR PROGRAM TO GIVE THE FAA THE MOST ADVANCED AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL TECHNOLOGY AND SYSTEMS IN THE WORLD.

OR YOU CAN TALK ABOUT OPERATIONAL ISSUES WITH ED HARRIS, WAYNE BARLOW, AND BILL POLLARD, WHO ARE THE FELLOWS RESPONSIBLE FOR OUR ATC OPERATIONS AND REGULATIONS.

AND, IF YOU'VE GOT AN AIRPORT QUESTION, LEN GRIGGS, OUR TOP AIRPORT GUY, WILL BE ON HAND.

THEY'LL TELL YOU BRIEFLY ABOUT THEIR PROGRAMS. BUT THEY REALLY WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU. SO I HOPE YOU'LL JOIN US.

THERE'S NO QUESTION THAT THE WORLDWIDE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY WILL BENEFIT FROM A WORLD-CLASS AIR AND TRADE SHOW IN AMERICA.

AND THERE'S NO QUESTION, EITHER, THAT THAT'S WHAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE RIGHT HERE IN DAYTON. THE TIME IS RIGHT. THE PLACE IS RIGHT. ALL WE NEED NOW IS THE DETERMINATION TO SUCCEED. AND I'M SURE WE HAVE THAT, TOO.

IT'S A PLEASURE BEING HERE WITH YOU
THIS MORNING. AND I LOOK FORWARD TO
SEEING MANY OF YOU AGAIN AT OUR
SEMINARS THIS AFTERNOON.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

STATEMENT OF ANTHONY J. BRODERICK, ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR FOR
REGULATION AND CERTIFICATION, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION,
BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION, CONCERNING H.R. 4025. JULY 12, 1990.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee today to provide the Federal Aviation Administration's views on H.R. 4025, which is currently pending before the Subcommittee.

H.R. 4025 would mandate the use of child safety seats in air transportation. We applaud the safety concerns that underly H.R. 4025 but are opposed to its enactment because mandating the use of child safety seats would lead to more lives lost than saved, and to more disabling injuries than avoided.

At the outset, I want to make clear that the use of approved child safety seats for infants provides a greater level of safety in the event of an airplane crash. Parents should be aware that the use of a child safety seat can increase the likelihood of their child surviving a crash which is otherwise survivable. There should be no debate about that point nor should there be any question about whether the FAA believes that child safety seats should be used. We do. We strongly encourage parents to use approved safety seats for their children.

We cannot support, however, the requirement in H.R. 4025 that the use of child safety seats be made mandatory. Our concern is that, while the chance of survival aboard an airplane may be slightly improved, the costs associated with mandating the carriage of a child in a separate seat will divert a significant number of families from our safest form of transportation--air travel--to the far less safe travel by automobile.

Simply stated, we believe that more people would die each year as the result of the enactment of H.R. 4025 than would be saved by its provisions. This concern has been reinforced by four separate studies which have been performed by outside organizations, and which I shall make available for the record. Let me elaborate.

We believe that passengers would be diverted to automobile travel since it would be extraordinarily expensive for consumers if child safety seat use were mandated. Unlike the costs of TCAS or windshear detection systems or aging aircraft modifications, the costs of mandated safety seats would not be imposed on the airlines to be accepted as a cost of doing business or to be distributed as a modest price increase among passengers generally. Instead, the cost of requiring safety seats would be borne by a select group--the families of infants. One study projects that cost to be an average of \$185 per child, amounting to \$250 million each year. The 100% use of child safety seats

would save approximately 1 life aboard an aircraft over a 10-year period, at a potential cost of \$2.5 billion to children's families.

In our view, and in the view of others who have assessed this issue, a significant number of families who would have flown will elect to travel by automobile instead, leading to a greater risk of death not only to the children, who are the intended beneficiaries of H.R. 4025, but to their parents and brothers and sisters who will be in the automobile with them. A December 1987 study by Richard B. McKenzie and John T. Warner entitled "The Impact of Airline Deregulation on Highway Safety," found that the lower costs of airfares resulting from deregulation had improved highway safety by encouraging more people to fly rather than to drive. The converse would appear to be equally true--increased costs can divert passengers from airplanes back to the highways.

Dick Smith, Chairman of the Australian Civil Aeronautics Authority, in a June 6, 1989, article--"You'll live longer in the air"--which was published in the Australian business periodical, The Bulletin, says: "the figures show that all forms of paid air travel are safer than travelling by car--varying from about twice as safe if you have chartered a small plane, to five times as safe in a small commuter aircraft, to 400 times safer with the airlines. . . . After a study of the safety comparisons between air and road, it is fair to ask why there seems to be so little concern about road safety."

A study performed by Apogee Research, Inc., in behalf of the FAA finds that "the required use of child safety seats will decrease the expected number of infant fatalities in air transportation, but increase the expected number of infant and non-infant family member fatalities as some families switch to automobiles for travel." The study also concludes that, in the first year of implementation of mandated safety seats, the deaths of those who would be diverted to automobiles would be 20 times greater than the potential lives saved aboard aircraft through safety seat use. ("An Impact Analysis of Requiring Child Safety Seats in Air Transportation," Apogee Research, Inc., June 4, 1990.)

Richard B. McKenzie (professor of economics and finance at the University of Mississippi) and Dwight R. Lee (professor of economics at the University of Georgia), who serve as adjunct fellows at the Center for the Study of American Business at Washington University in St. Louis, also researched the effect of mandating the use of child safety seats. ("Ending the Free Airplane Rides of Infants: A Myopic Method of Saving Lives", 1990.)

Professors McKenzie and Lee observe that those who support a rule change requiring the use of child safety seats "are understandably concerned about the safety of traveling children." They go on to note, however, that such a mandatory requirement, if adopted,

"could have precisely the opposite effect of the one intended: The rule change could increase the travel injuries and deaths of infants and toddlers--and their parents and siblings. These perverse results would likely occur because the rule change would drive up the cost of travel by air and drive many families back to the nation's highways. And car travel remains far more dangerous, at least 30 times more so in terms of death-rate per mile traveled for all travelers--parents and children alike--than air travel by all scheduled (large and commuter) airlines."

Using what they believe to be "reasonably conservative" assumptions, Professors McKenzie and Lee find that the shift to automobile travel caused by higher fares to families of children "could translate into more than 1,600 additional automotive accidents each year, and the increase in accidents could result in more than 175 additional disabling injuries and just under five additional deaths each year. . . . If the fare increase is much greater than the FAA conservatively assumes, the increase in highway injuries and deaths would, of course, be greater."

They further point out that "[a]n unknown number of the victims will surely be infants who would have traveled quite safely on their parents' laps in airplanes. However, many of the automotive

victims will be the infants' parents, brothers, and sisters, but many will also be travelers who had never contemplated air travel as an alternative means of transportation. They just happened to be at the wrong time on the nation's roads, made marginally more congested by the infant-seat requirement."

Professors McKenzie and Lee conclude in their research paper that as a consequence of requiring child safety seats "the resulting increase in automotive deaths, although quite small, could easily be several times--quite possibly more than 35 times--the reduction in airline deaths. Congress and the FAA should not be in the business of creating a travel-safety problem that is bigger than the one being solved."

Professors Robert J. Windle and Martin E. Dresner of the College of Business and Management of the University of Maryland also examined the issue of requiring child safety seats in an April 1990 paper entitled "Mandatory Child Safety Seats in Air Transport: Do They Save Lives?"

Their model considered a variety of possibilities, ranging from different percentages of passengers who would be diverted to automobile travel to varying trip lengths on the road. Using the average auto fatality rate, under virtually every scenario, more lives would be lost by mandating child safety seats.

Only with the most conservative assumptions--only 10% of passengers would be diverted to automobiles; automobile trip lengths replacing airplane travel would average only 77 miles--did the lives lost due to diversion not exceed the lives that would be saved on airplanes. Even in this case, the researchers cautioned against mandating child safety seats, observing that

"it would be better to not change the regulatory system from an injury point of view. Using data from the Statistical Abstract of the United States (United States, Department of Commerce, 1989, p. 590), it is clear that whereas in air transportation the injury rate is only one-half the death rate, in automobile transportation, the injury rate is 39 times the death rate. From an injury point of view, air transport has an even greater safety advantage over auto transport, than from a fatality viewpoint."

Professors Windle and Dresner note that

"[t]he conclusions from this analysis are clear - mandating the use of child safety seats will result in an INCREASE in fatalities, given the assumptions of the paper, and given almost all of the scenarios discussed. Air passengers will be diverted to auto travel, and given

auto travel's poorer safety record, more travellers will die in fatal accidents. Even when it is assumed that tickets for children under 2 will be given away for free, enough traffic will be diverted from the airways to the highways to increase the fatalities total. Only under unrealistically favorable assumptions - all travel on interstate highways, very low diversion rates and very low trip lengths - will the safety seats even come close to saving as many lives in the air as they cost in lives to diverted auto traffic."

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to reemphasize that parents who travel on aircraft with small children should use an approved safety seat for their children. There is no question but that the use of a safety seat will improve their child's chance of surviving an accident. Despite the safety benefit associated with use of a child safety seat, however, we cannot in good conscience support legislation that would mandate the use of child safety seats in view of the research which demonstrates that to do so would result in greater numbers of travelers' deaths. Although the studies differ in terms of numbers of fatalities to be expected, based on different assumptions they have used, all project that there would be additional deaths from requiring safety seats.

As the Subcommittee knows, we are currently involved in a

rulemaking process that has sought public comment on alternative approaches to this issue, and we are giving it a high priority.

That completes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. I would be pleased to respond to questions you may have at this time.

REMARKS FOR ADMIRAL JAMES B. BUSEY
FAA ADMINISTRATOR
BEFORE THE FAA SEMINARS
DAYTON AIR AND TRADE SHOW
DAYTON, OHIO
JULY 19, 1990

Good afternoon and welcome to all of you.

I'm not going to make a speech. I've already done that today. But I do want to set the stage for the three FAA seminars this afternoon.

First of all, let me introduce my associates who will conduct these seminars.

Joe Del Balzo is the FAA's Executive Director for System Development, and he will lead our first session, which will focus on the advanced technology that we're getting to increase the safety, efficiency, and capacity of our air system.

The second session this afternoon will be handled by Ed Harris, our Executive Director for System Operations, Wayne Barlow, Executive Director for Regulatory Standards and Compliance, and Bill Pollard, Associate Administrator for Air Traffic. This session will zero in on what we're doing in the operational area.

Len Griggs, our Assistant Administrator for Airports, will handle the third session, and he will concentrate on what we're doing to increase airport capacity across the country.

Now these are the guys who are really on the front line in the effort to modernize our air transport system. They're the ones in charge of the new programs that will give our country an air system that can handle 21st Century demands.

Now, as I mentioned this morning, we're not going to do all the talking. We want to give you an overview of what we're doing and what we plan to do, and then we'll give you a chance to ask questions.

Don't hesitate. We came here today to give you an opportunity to learn more about what we're up to at the FAA.

I've set many goals for the FAA. The most important, of course, is to preserve and increase safety, which is one of the major goals of Secretary Sam Skinner's new National Transportation Policy.

Safety comes ahead of everything else. And many of the things we'll be talking about this afternoon relate to safety.

Of course, the new transportation policy spells out a number of aviation goals:

- * We must increase the system's capacity and efficiency,
- * install a new generation of air control technology,
- * expand airport capacity,
- * and strengthen our aviation research and development programs.

Those are ambitious goals. And they are absolutely essential to the nation's economic strength in the years ahead.

To reach those goals, we've got to move forward on a number of fronts simultaneously. And that's exactly what we're doing. In modernizing our air control system, for example, we're going after the most advanced technology available. And that includes:

- * more powerful computer systems that will let us automate much of our air control activities,
- * more accurate surveillance and weather radars,
- * improved communications system, such as digital datalink,
- * new airborne collision avoidance systems,
- * microwave landing systems,
- * satellite navigation and communications technology,
- * and many other advances, too numerous to mention today.

In addition, as I said, the National Transportation Policy calls for more research and development into new technology that can pay off in increased safety, efficiency, and capacity.

And, wherever possible, we must streamline our air control operations to speed the flow of traffic both enroute and in terminal areas. At the same time, we've got to keep our regulatory and certification standards in step with changing demands and evolving technology. And we must learn more about the human factors that affect both flight and maintenance operations.

We've also got to eliminate the bottlenecks in the system. We all know, first-hand, about overloaded and congested airports. Airport delays are costing us billions of dollars a year. And it could get worse, as traffic increases.

Part of the answer will come from new technology and systems that can increase airport capacity and use the facilities more efficiently.

But we also need more runways and airports. Here we run into two problems: noise and money. We need less of one and more of the other.

On the noise problem, I'm convinced we need a national aviation noise policy. But we won't get that without a consensus that reflects the interests of everyone involved. One of my goals is to help build that consensus as soon as possible.

The other airport problem, the scarce supply of money, affects all of our modernization programs.

As you know, Uncle Sam is getting as tight as the bark on a hickory tree with his money. Everyone in Washington is under the gun to pinch pennies. And, believe me, I'm determined to run our acquisition programs on time and on budget.

But the unavoidable fact is that we absolutely must have increased funding if we are to modernize the system. And here I have some good news.

Last week the House passed a fiscal 1991 FAA appropriations bill that will give us a 14 percent increase in our budget next year.

I think that's significant. We asked for and are getting a hefty increase. True, we still have to get the appropriation through the Senate. But passage by the House is a good omen. It shows there's a lot of understanding of the need to keep America's air transport system strong and efficient.

Right now the House is considering a two-year FAA reauthorization bill that also reflects the trend toward increased funding for our modernization programs.

In addition, the House is considering a new airport funding proposal from the National Transportation Policy. The legislation would let airports collect a passenger facility charge and use the money for new runways and other improvements.

If our top 50 airports collect a three-dollar head tax, they would collectively raise an additional 1.2 billion dollars a year.

We all know that the future of the aerospace industry is bright. The industry should experience strong growth through the rest of this century and beyond.

But those great expectations could be undercut if we don't have adequate airport facilities and airway capacity.

Let me assure you, I am determined that we will have those facilities and that capacity. And so are my associates here today.

Now let's get right into the first session.

Joe....

REMARKS BY JAMES B. BUSEY
FAA ADMINISTRATOR
BEFORE THE DAYTON AIR AND TRADE SHOW
DAYTON, OHIO
JULY 19, 1990

Thank you. It's great to be here today.

This is where it all started.

This is where a couple of home-grown geniuses, Orville and Wilbur Wright, developed the technology that finally fulfilled mankind's age-old dream of flight. This is where they opened the Air Age -- and changed the world forever.

As we all know, the work they did here in Dayton led to the first powered flight in history -- at Kitty Hawk on a December day eighty-seven years ago.

It was a humble beginning, that first flight. Just a hundred feet, lasting only 12 seconds. But humble though it may have been by today's standards, it brought unparalleled opportunities and challenges.

Today, nine decades later, we're still learning what the gift of flight really means. We have only just tapped the surface.

After their triumph at Kitty Hawk, the Wright brothers spent the next two years out at Huffman Prairie, eight miles east of Dayton.

They weren't running an air show. They were concentrating on advancing the technology of flight. But every time they flew, they were putting on a show. And people came to see it. Finally, in late 1905, the Wrights stopped flying there because, as Orville Wright put it, "so many people were attracted to the field".

The people of Dayton of that time were privileged to see the first air shows in history. And that fascination with flight is still alive today. From the days at Huffman Prairie to now, air shows have never lost their popularity.

At one time, they helped develop aviation technology. They offered opportunities for courageous and creative flyers to advance the technology -- and develop their own skills -- to the absolute limit. And they whetted the appetite of thousands of youngsters who would someday become fliers themselves.

Today air shows no longer play much of a role in the development of aerospace technology. But the wonder and thrill of flight is still alive -- and people need to experience it. And that's why we have air shows.

But air shows also serve another purpose. They give manufacturers a chance to show off their products, and they gives buyers a chance to touch and feel and kick the tires and watch the machines do what they're designed to do.

I believe that America has gone too long without a major aerospace exposition. We're the leading aerospace nation, yet, until now, we haven't had a truly international show that is industry-wide in scope.

As Senator John Glenn said in April, "The U.S. aerospace industry deserves a home-based international arena where new technology can be showcased." The Senator is absolutely right.

A study by the Congressional Research Service concluded that the aerospace industry would indeed benefit from a United States air and trade show. Such a show could strengthen the industry's marketing efforts, both nationally and internationally.

Until now, our buyers and manufacturers have had to go overseas to take part in a truly world-class industry exposition. But if the sponsors of this show have their way, that situation is going to change.

They're going to make this into an aerospace exposition the equal of those held in Farnborough, Paris, and Singapore.

And I can't think of a better place to do that than Dayton -- the home of the Wright brothers, the U.S. Air Force Museum, and the National Aviation Hall of Fame.

The goal is to attract exhibitors from every part of the aviation world and every major aerospace market -- commercial, military, business, sport and general aviation, and the world of space as well.

Now that's an ambitious goal, but I'm confident it will be achieved. In fact, we've already made a good start. More than 250 exhibitors are here this year, including a significant number from other countries.

By the time of the next show, aerospace companies will be able to show their wares in a \$7 million dollar permanent trade pavilion to be built here. And the schedule for future shows will be set so as to complement, rather than conflict with, other major shows.

And, as you know, reflecting all these changes, the name of the show has been changed from the Dayton Air and Trade Show to the United States Air and Trade Show.

We live in an era of increasing global competition. The day of the purely domestic market is gone. Every market today is part of the world market. Competition is tough and getting tougher. And nowhere is this more evident than in the aerospace industry.

The world of aviation is truly international. Large aircraft today are made on an international basis, with components from all over the world.

And they are flown on an international basis, often with owners in one country leasing equipment to operators in another country and flown by crews from a third country on a worldwide basis. National borders no longer have the importance they once had.

This growing internationalization of aviation presents a tremendous challenge to agencies like the FAA and to the companies that must compete in these tough world markets.

The FAA is challenged to find ways to promote commonality with other countries in our airworthiness standards and in our operating and maintenance and certification regulations.

This will help assure safety. And it will also assure American aviation manufacturers and operators that the same standards that apply to the production of components for U.S. aircraft also apply to foreign-produced aircraft. We must make sure that everyone plays on a level playing field.

The FAA is also challenged to promote the use of advanced and reliable U.S. aviation equipment on a worldwide basis. And we are working with other federal agencies to do that.

The companies that will succeed will be those that build a superior product and that can market that product aggressively. And that's why we need a great air and trade show here in America.

This may be an age of computers and satellites and instant communications, but we still need a time and place where we can get together to look at the competing products in one place, make contacts, exchange ideas, and get to know one another. That's what a trade show that covers the whole range of aerospace products can offer.

Certainly, there's no question that the United States is the world aviation leader. We have been the leader since the day of the Wright brothers. But if we are to keep that lead, our manufacturers must be able to market their products effectively in ways that meet the competition head-on.

It would be hard to exaggerate the importance of the aerospace industry to the economy and its place in the aviation world.

The value of aerospace products doubled during the past decade and is expected to continue growing strongly in the 1990s. The world's passenger jet fleet, for example, is expected to increase 60 percent over the next 12 years, from more than 7000 aircraft in 1988 to close to 12,000 by just after the turn of the century.

The industry employs 1.3 million people and had a gross income of more than 105 billion dollars last year. It had nearly 32 billion dollars in exports, making it the leading positive contributor to the U.S. balance of trade.

So the industry is a major player in the American economy, and that means we must do everything we can to keep it strong.

The FAA is glad to support the United States Air and Trade Show. And we've set up a couple of interesting displays, which I hope you'll visit.

One of them covers our recruiting programs, aviation medicine, flight standards, and civil aviation security. It also offers you a chance to take a ride in our "vertigo chair." If you want to find out just how dizzy you can get, go sit in that chair.

Our other display is from our Technical Center. It covers a lot of high technology, including the coming advanced enroute automation programs, TCAS, MLS, and much more.

But that's not all. This afternoon, we're going to run three FAA seminars on system development, operations, and airports. We want to give you a chance to talk to our people in charge of these programs -- to find out, directly from them, what we're doing and why.

I'm sure that many of you have questions about our programs, about what're doing and what we're planning to do. Well this is your chance to get those questions answered.

So I hope you'll come to our seminars this afternoon and ask Joe Del Balzo about our multi-billion dollar program to give the FAA the most advanced air traffic control technology and systems in the world.

Or you can talk about operational issues with Ed Harris, Wayne Barlow, and Bill Pollard, who are the fellows responsible for our ATC operations and regulations.

And, if you've got an airport question, Len Griggs, our top airport guy, will be on hand.

They'll tell you briefly about their programs. But they really want to hear from you. So I hope you'll join us.

There's no question that the worldwide Aerospace industry will benefit from a world-class air and trade show in America.

And there's no question, either, that that's what we're going to have right here in Dayton. The time is right. The place is right. All we need now is the determination to succeed. And I'm sure we have that, too.

It's a pleasure being here with you this morning. And I look forward to seeing many of you again at our seminars this afternoon.

Thank you very much.

Remarks by Admiral James B. Busey,
Administrator - Federal Aviation Administration
Experimental Aircraft Association's Annual Fly-In
Oshkosh, Wisconsin
July 29, 1990

This is one speech I don't have to begin by saying "I'm very happy to be here."

You know I am.

Any true-blue pilot would give his or her eye teeth to be in Oshkosh at this time of year.

Indeed, I suspect that the EAA Fly-In is what most pilots think about when they try to imagine what Heaven is like. You get to spend the rest of eternity kicking tires and peering under engine cowlings and swapping war stories.

Of course, that vision may be irrelevant because the majority of the pilots I know are not going to Heaven. Not unless they mend their ways anyhow!

This, unfortunately, is only my second visit to Oshkosh. As a career military pilot, I always seemed to be some place else when this event was going on. But I came last year, together with Transportation Secretary Sam Skinner, and enjoyed myself so much that there was no way anyone was going to keep me from coming back.

Getting out and meeting with the aviation community is one of the "perks" of being the FAA Administrator. In the past year, I think I have talked to every major aviation user group and trade association in the country as well as to many smaller organizations at the grass roots level. It can get pretty hectic and some times when I stand up in front of an audience and say, "I'm very happy to be here," I probably could leave out the word "very." Not tonight, however!

It all goes with the territory, of course. One of the top priorities I set for myself when I took this job 13 months ago was to increase the FAA's outreach to the aviation community. I wanted to establish a genuine and effective two-way flow of information between the agency and the user.

In part this approach reflected my concern that FAA had lost the respect and, perhaps, confidence of large segments of the aviation community. FAA was being perceived increasingly as "the enemy" (quote/unquote), particularly among general aviation pilots. One reason was the agency's rigid compliance and enforcement policies that reminded me a bit of Vince Lombardi's coaching methods when he was with the Green Bay Packers.

Let me quote one the Packer's All-Pro linemen on the subject: "Coach Lombardi doesn't discriminate against any player," he said rather proudly. "He treats us all like dogs."

That's why Secretary Skinner and I used last year's EAA Fly-In to announce jointly a special FAA in-depth evaluation and review of the agency's compliance and enforcement program. Many of you probably were there at the "Meet the Boss" session when we made the announcement and, I'm sure, your first reaction was, "Oh, no, not another government study."

But over the period of the next six to eight months, I think we demonstrated that we were totally serious about getting to the bottom of your complaints and developing action programs to address those issues. Some of you may have participated in the listening sessions which were ran at various places around the country and, if you did, you will remember that they were... ah, quite spirited.

We announced the results of our review in March of this year at a meeting of general aviation user groups in Washington. The basic conclusion was that FAA needs to strike a better balance in its compliance and enforcement policies. To put it another way, we need more carrot and less stick in our dealings with general aviation pilots.

The report listed 34 recommendations, encompassing 42 action items, designed to shift the emphasis in the compliance and enforcement area from punishment to educational and remedial actions. We sincerely believe this approach will further the long-term interests of aviation safety without derogating the agency's regulatory responsibilities.

You're no doubt already familiar with some of the actions we've taken as a result of our review. For example, we acted immediately to suspend the mandatory 60-day suspension of pilot certificates for TCA violations. We also initiated a new five-year "Back to Basics II" program which is proving even more popular than the original.

In all, we've complete action on 29 of the 42 action plans. That's almost 70 percent. Moreover, we're tracking the remaining items very carefully and we are going to see each of those through to completion as well. You have my word on that.

One of the things that strikes me about the EAA Fly-In is the number of foreign visitors it attracts. It's just a shame we can't follow those people back to their homes and listen to them try to explain Oshkosh to their families and friends.

The reason, of course, is that there is nothing like this event anywhere else in the world. In fact, general aviation, as we know it, doesn't exist in any other part of the world. It's a uniquely American institution and, as such, an immensely valuable national asset.

In fact, I've said before that if we didn't have general aviation in America today, we would have to invent it. General aviation is more than just a means for transportation, although that certainly is important. It's the very foundation of our air transportation system -- the testing ground for new ideas and new technology and the training ground for many of the present and future generations of commercial pilots.

Accordingly, it needs to be carefully cultivated and nurtured.

You'll find this view expressed in the Statement of National Transportation Policy that Secretary Skinner released in March. Let me quote: "It is essential that Federal aviation policies be sensitive to the needs of general aviation, and that continuing efforts be made to accommodate general aviation within the evolving aviation system and alleviate special problems such as aircraft product liability."

You all know how Sam Skinner feels about general aviation. Believe me, you couldn't have a better or more influential friend in high places.

Still, I don't believe most Americans really understand or appreciate how general aviation fits into the big picture, despite the GAME Plan and other industry and government educational programs. There is something like a size prejudice at work where the public's perception of airplanes are concerned. Bigger is better. Small is, well, suspect.

Part of the problem probably is widespread ignorance of the continuing improvement in the general aviation safety record. It gets better and better despite modest gains in flight activity over the past couple of years.

I think a lot of people who consider flying in general aviation airplanes inherently dangerous would be very surprised to learn that more people are killed every year in recreational boating accidents. In 1989, the death toll in boating accidents was 896, compared to 763 in general aviation. And that was the best year the boaters have ever had.

Also, more people were killed last year in grade crossing accidents -- 791 -- than died in general aviation aircraft.

So I think we can be proud of general aviation's improving safety record although we certainly can't afford to be smug or complacent about it. You know what the Bible said about pride coming before a fall.

The bad news, of course, is that general aviation continues to have serious economic problems. We're just not attracting young people in the numbers we need to reestablish the general aviation growth curve or meet the projected demand of commercial aviation for future pilots.

And the general aviation aircraft and engine manufacturers continue to struggle from year to year, always looking for that upward trend that might signal a return to the halcyon days of the late 1970s. Meanwhile, the fleet grows older.

According to GAMA, the average single-engine airplane is more than 23 years old and one-quarter of the fleet is more than 33 years old. That means a lot of you people out there are flying antique airplanes without really meaning to.

I hardly need explain the reason. Money is said to be the root of all evil and it's certainly true in this case. The cost of flying really has taken off -- no pun intended -- in the last decade. Everything is up and up drastically.

Our FAA economists tell me that the nominal cost of buying a single-engine airplane increased by 126 percent between 1978 and 1986, the last year for which data is available. Moreover, the cost of operating and maintaining that airplane is up by 73 percent. I have a gut feeling those numbers are pretty conservative. You tell me.

But I didn't come here tonight to deliver a eulogy for general aviation. It may be a sick puppy but I don't believe the illness is terminal. General aviation will survive and, perhaps, even prosper again because it performs a whole range of useful -- even indispensable -- services. But it's not going to be the same.

We already are seeing a significant change in the purpose and character of general aviation. It is becoming more and more a commercial and business-related activity. A quick look at the fleet mix and hours flown confirms this. In fact, our aviation forecasters project that there will be fewer single-engine airplanes in the year 2001 than there are today.

What all this means is that we are going to see fewer people coming in to aviation who just like to go up there and bore holes in the sky for the Hell of it. Indeed, a pilot's best friend today may not be his flight instructor but his tax accountant. As you may have heard, even Donald Trump is having problems holding on to his airplane.

I wish I could stand up here tonight and tell you I have a ready-made list of remedies for all of general aviation's afflictions. I don't and I rather doubt anyone else does either.

Last year, as you know, we introduced the Recreational Pilot's certificate at the urging of EAA and various other general aviation organizations. The idea was and is to provide a lower cost entree into aviation for young people as well as accommodate those individuals who -- as I said before -- just like to go up there and punch some holes in the sky.

So far, the response to the Rec Pilot initiative could be characterized as underwhelming. The last report I saw indicated that we have issued a grand total of 25 Rec Pilot certificates since last August.

You may have seen the editorial on the subject by Mac McClellan in the July issue of Flying. The point of the editorial was that we in the aviation community haven't done a very good job of marketing the Rec Pilot's license.

Given the results to date, I can hardly argue with that. I think there are some misconceptions -- and no doubt some prejudices -- about the Rec Pilot's certificate, particularly in the area of safety.

So I think we have some missionary work to do. As Mac McClellan said, we need to give the Rec Pilot certificate a chance to prove itself.

Another idea for cutting the cost of airplane ownership is the creation of a new category of "primary aircraft" that would be less expensive to build, buy, certificate also and maintain. This idea been kicking around for number of years and EAA has been one of its principal supporters. FAA finally issued a notice of proposed rulemaking in March 1989, giving the industry six months to comment.

The fact that we still don't have a final rule should give you a clue that all is not going as smoothly as we all might like. EAA, among others, has raised some objections to our proposal and we have had several meetings on the subject -- what the lawyers call "ex parte" discussions.

The upshot is that we expect to issue a supplemental NPRM later this year that will address these concerns. And, since we still are in a rulemaking mode, I guess that's all I should say on the subject right now. Otherwise, I'll become part of the ex parte record, too.

Probably nothing would do more to control the rising cost of flying and get the light aircraft production lines moving again than some sensible and workable product liability legislation.

It's not a simple black or white issue, of course. Nothing is. Consumers certainly deserve to be protected against design flaws, manufacturing defects, and shoddy workmanship. But there have to be some common sense limits. The way things are now if someone stole the Wright Flyer from the Air & Space Museum in Washington and then cracked it up on the Mall, I have a feeling that he or she or the next of kin would sue the Wright brothers estate... and probably collect.

Remember, nobody ever said the world was supposed to be fair. Still, we would like level the playing field a bit and that's what the product liability legislation pending in the Congress is all about. Maybe this is the year, we'll finally see some action.

I hope I haven't been too downbeat for you tonight. It was not my purpose. The EAA Fly-In is supposed to be a fun event -- a celebration of our continuing love affair with aviation -- and I certainly don't want to ruin the party.

Let me just close by congratulating EAA for another outstanding Fly-In. I really can't say enough about the work the Poberenzys and the rest of EAA are doing to keep alive the values and traditions and ideals that have characterized aviation from the very beginning. I'm just happy to be a part of it. Thank you, Paul and Tom, for inviting me.

#####