Remarks by Admiral James B. Busey
Administrator,
Federal Aviation Administration
Before the Airport Consultants Council
Washington, DC
Tuesday, September 11, 1990

Introduction:

Welcome to Washington. I recognize some familiar faces so I know you're not all from out of town. But your organizational brochure shows that the Airport Consultants Council draws its membership from 27 different states, so I suspect we probably have a pretty good geographic cross section of America sitting here.

That's good because the issues I want to talk about today are national in scope. I'll get to them in a few minutes.

First, let me give you some background. I've been the FAA Administrator for a little over 14 months now. Actually, it's been 174 days, but who's counting.

In that time, I think we have made some significant strides in moving the agency in the direction of increased efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness - in short, toward the goal of what a public service agency ought to be. Let me cite a few examples:

Accomplishments 1989-90:

* We have a new Statement of National Transportation Policy that emphasizes the need to increase system capacity for aviation and the other travel modes.

* We have sent a reauthorization bill to the Congress that would significantly increase FAA funding for capital improvements and permit large airports to levy a Passenger Facility Charge.

* We are developing a new Capital Investment Plan that will supersede the National Airspace System Plan with a more comprehensive and flexible document.

* We have implemented significant internal reforms in the procurement, personnel, and regulatory areas and, in the process, have redefined our working relationship with the Office of the Secretary.

* We have overhauled our compliance and enforcement program for general aviation to promote safety through voluntary means wherever possible.

* We have a parallel initiative underway with the air carriers to foster the establishment of effective self-audit procedures.

FAA-OST Relationship:

FAA's relationship with the Office of the Secretary has been the subject of considerable discussion in this town for several years. There have been numerous bills introduced in the Congress aimed at restoring FAA's independence.

I've stated my position on this issue repeatedly in quite unequivocal terms, but let me repeat it for the record. I believe the agency would have to pay too high a price for independence, including the loss of Cabinet-level access to the President.

Moreover, working closely with Secretary Skinner and his staff, we have devised a new and more productive FAA-OST working relationship -- one that addresses the basic concerns of Congressional and industry critics alike.

As a result, the FAA Administrator now has greater operational authority in such areas as procurement, personnel, and regulatory matters with the Secretary focusing more on critical policy matters and oversight. It's a relationship that -- in my view -- reflects the original intent and purpose of the Department of Transportation Act.

Procurement Reforms:

Of the various internal reforms I mentioned, none is more important than our effort to strengthen and streamline the FAA procurement process. As you know, the FAA has not had the best reputation in government in this area. That's changing. I am determined that our capital investment and modernization programs will be run on schedule and within budget.

I'm happy to say that I've had the full support of Secretary Skinner in this undertaking. As a result, the FAA Administrator once again has the authority for source selection on major procurements. We've also made some much needed organizational changes, such as the creation of a new Executive Director for Acquisition, who is serving as my point man in this whole exercise.

When I first came to FAA, I took a hard look at our procurement process and found two main problems. One was the lack of focus for major programs. The other was the lack of discipline in applying the procurement process.

Regarding the lack of focus, we had people who were called "program managers" but, in reality, they lacked the authority they needed to function effectively in that capacity. Sometimes too many people were trying to run the show; other times, nobody seemed to be in charge.

That's being changed. We're working to create a solid procurement matrix with strong program managers who have the authority they need to do their jobs effectively. They also know they have my full support, and I am looking to them to provide the leadership that can spell the difference between a successful program and a losing one. Of course, it's something of a two-edged sword for the program managers because with responsibility comes accountability.

The other problem I identified was a lack of discipline in using the procurement process. To correct that, we're going to be using the A-109 process for managing major programs.

Very briefly, that means we will go through an orderly four-step process: (1) to define our needs, (2) to thoroughly assess all the ways to satisfy those needs, (3) to go through a full fledged development program, and (4) after adequate operational testing, to contract for production and installation of the system in the field.

The Contractors' Responsibilities:

In addition to putting our own house in order, we're asking our contractors to do the same. We want to see them do a better job of assessing business opportunities, writing proposals, conducting contract competitions and -- finally and most importantly -- executing their contracts.

We also would like to see an end to the almost automatic protest by the losing contractor at the end of what seems like every competition. That doesn't mean that contractors should abandon their right to protest if they honestly think they've been short changed. But all too often, the protest has become a management crutch. It's management's way of avoiding responsibility by crying, "We wuz robbed!"

Moreover, the process generally turns out to be a tremendous waste of time and money on both sides since FAA has been upheld in more than 90 percent of the protests filed in recent years. These are resources I know we could put to better use and I'm sure industry could, too.

Capital Investment Plan

Parallel with this effort to improve the procurement process, we're also developing a Capital Investment Plan to guide us through the 1990s and into the 21st century. This will be the successor to the National Airspace System Plan, or NAS Plan, which has served the interests of the aviation community so very well over the past 10 years.

Let me emphasize that we are not starting from scratch here or trying to reinvent the wheel. The Capital Investment Plan will incorporate the original 90 or so NAS Plan projects as well the follow-on projects. At the same time, it will be more comprehensive in scope, defining the agency's total capital investment needs, not just facilities and equipment requirements. Infrastructure improvements also will be addressed.

In addition, it will be a more flexible document, distinguishing clearly between near-term and longer-range planning. We do not want to be locked in to what is perceived as an immutable document and find ourselves the center of controversy every time we try to accommodate changing technology or conditions. That's a lesson we learned from the NAS Plan.

Reauthorization Bill

Making sure that FAA knows where it's going and just exactly how it is going to get there by the shortest route is especially critical at this point in time because we are seeking significant increases in capital spending over the next five years to fund major programs like the Advanced Automation System.

I know you are familiar with the reauthorization bill that went to the Congress earlier this year. But to refresh your memories, it calls for an approximately 75 percent increase in spending for aviation capital investment programs through Fiscal Year 1995 when compared with expenditures for the preceding five years. Facilities and Equipment would rise 130 percent and AIP money by 28 percent.

That AIP number is a bit misleading, however, because the bill also would authorize large airports to levy Passenger Facility Taxes. Estimates are that the PFC could bring in an additional $1 billion a year or more in airport development funds.

Moreover, everyone would benefit since airports collecting PFCs would forego a certain percentage of their entitlement funds which then would be available for projects at smaller fields.

We have known from the start that this was going to be a tough legislative battle... and it has been. But last month, the House of Representatives -- with solid bipartisan support -- voted out a very favorable bill that gives us most of what we asked for, including the PFC. The major disappointment was the bill's two year term which means -- depending on what the Senate does -- we may have to go through this exercise again in 1992.

But right now, that's the least of our concerns. We're focusing our efforts on winning Senate approval. Although there are some influential Senators opposed to the bill -- primarily because of the PFC -- we're still hopeful of winning them over and getting legislation passed in this session. We don't want to wait until next year.

Airport Capacity

We really can't wait because airport capacity is an issue that must be addressed and dealt with now. Time is not on our side here.

That was the bottom-line message in the National Transportation Policy released by Secretary Skinner six months ago. It stressed the urgency of getting on with the job of upgrading and expanding our transportation infrastructure. Nowhere is this more critical than in air transportation.

The editors of Fortune magazine have reached the same conclusion, judging from an article they ran recently entitled "Airport 2000." It carried this warning right under the title:

> "You all know about delayed flights, gridlocked runways, crowded terminals. You haven't seen anything yet. Only a burst of building can head off more trouble."

Business-oriented publications, like Fortune, are concerned about airport capacity because the editors recognize full well that there simply is no way America can compete on a global scale unless it has a safe, efficient, and cost-effective air transportation system.

And what does that mean exactly? It means we have to have an adequate airport network that can accommodate projected traffic demands with a minimum of congestion and delay. We simply cannot be competitive in the world marketplace if we hobble our air transportation system with outmoded airports.

Airports long have suffered from a lack of public understanding of their economic value to their communities. Too often, people see them as sort of hi-tech bus stops rather than as generators of jobs and revenues and opportunities for their communities. Yet, frequently, the airport is the largest employer in the community or the region -- or in the case of Atlanta Hartsfield, for example -- the state.

Those of us in aviation often tend to think that these economic arguments ought to carry the day. But, then, maybe we're guilty of being a bit short sighted.

For example, Oris Dunham, the executive director of the Dallas-Ft. Worth Airport, was quoted in the Fortune magazine article I mentioned earlier as saying that the two new runways planned for DFW would bring an extra $30 billion into that community over the next 10 years.

But Dunham is a realist. He noted that even a community that appreciates an airport's economic benefits can grow weary of noise and congestion.

"Living near an airport," he told the Fortune writer, "is like being married to a very wealthy person who snores."

Noise Policy:

One of the keys to enlisting wider community support for airports, then, is the development and implementation of a comprehensive national noise policy. Noise continues to be the principal obstacle to airport construction nationwide.

It also is a big factor in limiting the use of existing airports. We currently have more than 400 airports in the United States with some form of operational restriction in place. And local and state governments are trying to add more every day.

It's not that we haven't made progress in reducing noise exposure around airports. We have. And it's been pretty dramatic.

Fifteen years ago, five to six million people were affected by unacceptably high aircraft noise levels. Today, despite a 50 percent increase in traffic levels, that figure has been cut almost in half due primarily to the introduction of quieter new aircraft. Indeed, if time we're on our side here, we would have that number down to about one million in 20 years when all the airlines are flying Stage 3 jets.

But we don't have 20 years. We either move expeditiously on this issue or other people will. And I can guarantee we won't like the results.

So we need to tackle the issue head on and forge a national noise policy that addresses such major issues as the phaseout of Stage 2 aircraft, the impact of local noise restrictions, and compatible land use around airports.

But FAA can't do it alone. A national noise policy must be the result of a consultative process with the aviation industry, local and state governments and the private sector. Otherwise, this effort is preordained to fail.

The Future Challenges

Essentially, this is the message I would like to leave with you today. We all need to work together to keep America's air transportation system the best in the world.

The challenges we face simply are too big and too complex to be solved by the FAA alone. They require commitment and action by everyone involved in aviation.

But I know I'm preaching to the choir here, so I'll let you off the hook with a reminder that we will be covering much of this same ground in more detail tomorrow and Thursday at the first annual FAA Aviation System Capacity Conference in Crystal City. I'm going to be there along with Sam Skinner, key Congressional leaders and a great many industry spokepersons.

I hope to see many of you there too.

####

REMARKS BY ADMIRAL JAMES B. BUSEY
BEFORE THE
QUALITY IN COMMERCIAL AVIATION CONFERENCE
DALLAS, TEXAS
SEPTEMBER 17, 1990

Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be with you today.

It's almost standard practice these days for speakers to start by telling the audience how important they are. You've probably heard that so often you take it with a grain of salt.

Well, today you can put your salt shakers away.

When I say that you folks are one of the most important groups in aviation, and therefore very important to this FAA Administrator, I'm not trying to win friends and influence people.

I'm just telling the plain and simple truth.

Safety is my number one priority, as it is for everyone in commercial aviation. Everything else -- and I mean everything -- takes second place to safety.

Many things affect aviation safety, but none more than the quality we build into our aircraft and the quality we achieve in maintaining them.

We can be proud of the record so far. We've got the best air transport system in the world. It's the most productive. It's the safest.

And I think a lot of the credit goes to all of you. The tremendous efficiency, vitality, and safety of our air system is due in no small part to you and the corporations you represent.

Yes, the FAA sets the rules. And we do our level best to make sure they're the right ones to do the job. But they're only part of the quality picture.

The other, more important part, is the way you design, manufacture, test, and maintain the aircraft that millions of passengers depend on for safe transportation every day.

We set the rules and regulations and the standards. But you do the work.

And, most importantly, you follow the rules and regulations and meet the standards voluntarily.

We can't have an FAA inspector looking over everyone's shoulder all the time. And we wouldn't even if we could. That's not the American way. And it's not the best way to get compliance with the regulations.

Our experience over many years shows that cooperation is better than coercion.

To put it simply, we get better results by relying on the expertise, the good judgment, and the freedom of action of everybody in aviation -- far better results, I might add, than we could ever hope to get by 100 percent over-the-shoulder monitoring.

So here's a fundamental truth: The foundation of American aviation safety is voluntary compliance with the rules and regulations. It was our reliance in the past, and it will continue to be in the future.

In fact, the time has come to strengthen our reliance on voluntary compliance.

To do that, as many of you know, we've made major changes in the way we run our enforcement and compliance activities for general aviation and the air carriers.

We've shifted the emphasis away from inflexible, mandatory penalties to education and remedial training. We've made it easier to comply with the regulations and easier to correct shortcomings when they occur.

I believe these changes will give us a more positive atmosphere -- an atmosphere more conducive to communication and cooperation.

For the air carriers, we're saying "if you find an inadvertent violation, and if you correct it on a permanent basis and report it promptly to the FAA, you will not be penalized. Period."

Now, we're going to make the same changes in our compliance policies for manufacturers of commercial aircraft and parts. We want to use the same approach with manufacturers that we're using with the airlines.

In brief, the new policy will say that if you identify a violation of the regulations, fix it permanently, and report it to us, you won't face a civil penalty.

The details will be spelled out in a new Compliance/Enforcement bulletin to be issued shortly.

We want manufacturers to become even more involved in monitoring their own regulatory compliance. Why? Because we know that self-auditing and self-correcting is the only way to get the level of compliance we need to assure the utmost quality in manufacturing and therefore the highest possible safety in aircraft performance.

Now, do these policy changes mean that we're backing down from our goal of total compliance with the rules and regulations?

Absolutely not. The regulations are not at issue. We're not going soft on safety. We're not stepping back from our insistence on 100 percent compliance.

But, under our system, the manufacturer has the primary responsibility for complying with the regulations. As I said before, we can't have an FAA inspector looking over everyone's shoulder all the time.

We have 1350 manufacturers with production approvals, but only six with an FAA inspector on site full time. Nationwide, we have only 100 manufacturing inspectors. We're asking Congress for 60 more, but even with that increase, we still won't be able to cover the territory.

So we must still rely on the manufacturers themselves.

And here I want to express my personal appreciation for the great job that's being done by the company employees who serve as my representatives, the FAA designees. We've got about 1500 of these designees who make sure the requirements are met, and we simply could not operate our certification activities without them.

Now obviously, if we want to rely even more on voluntary disclosure and self-correction, then we'd better make sure that manufacturers really monitor their performance.

Accordingly, many industry people feel that the time has come to require manufacturers to have an approved internal quality audit program. And we agree. Our studies show that companies with such programs perform at a considerably higher level than those who don't have them.

So we're working with the industry on a change for Part 21 that will require production approval holders to have approved internal quality self-audit programs.

As you know, the quality requirements in Part 21 are about a quarter-century old. The industry has changed a lot. We've got new methods, new materials, new technologies, and new products. So it's time to modernize the regulations too.

And we're going use the standards published by the American Society for Quality Control and the International Organization for Standardization as a model for these changes.

Quality in our business is a special challenge. We must aim at nothing less than perfection.

Now perfection may be impossible in the real world, but it's still our goal. And it makes aviation unique. Few other industries must meet such high standards.

Detroit's auto makers would be in seventh heaven if they could build cars with one defect in a 100. But an airliner is probably the equivalent of 10,000 cars -- which means that if we did as well as the auto manufacturers would like to do, we'd end up with a thousand defects per plane -- and that's way too many.

Now what does this drive to perfection mean? It means that quality in our industry is more than just a technical issue. It's a production issue. And, most of all, it's a management issue -- a question of management emphasis and commitment.

A management that really cares about quality will make sure the goal is understood by everyone. It will instill a commitment to quality. It will ensure that the resources are available to do the job. It will measure results honestly. And it will correct errors promptly.

These principles apply just as much to the small maintenance facility with ten employees as they do to big manufacturers with thousands.

I'm sure that many of you have heard of the Total Quality Management concept, or TQM. If you're not using it now, I recommend that you look into it. It works.

In my view, TQM is not just another management fad that will soon fade away. It can revolutionize the way we do business. And I think it could significantly increase the aviation industry's competitive strength in world markets.

TQM is not a program. It's a process. It's based on training and teamwork. Its goal is the continuous improvement in quality.

It reaches that goal by instilling an attitude that makes everyone strive continuously to produce a better product and provide a better service.

That means it's not something imposed from on high. You can't instill the right attitude and commitment by issuing fiats from above. Under TQM, management's role is not just to issue orders or to be just a task-master. Rather, it's to empower people, to be a coach and cheerleader as well as a goal-setter.

As you can tell, I'm pretty high on TQM. We're starting to use it in the FAA, and I think it's well worth your consideration if you're not already using it.

I said earlier that the FAA and all of you folks are really partners. And, I'm glad to say, I could list a number of instances where the industry and the FAA are working together.

I've already mentioned the industry's assistance in changing Part 21. We're also working together on the problem of the so-called "bogus" parts.

No one really knows what a "bogus" part is. The word is often used inaccurately. It's become a catch-all for all kinds of situations -- maybe there's no paperwork available, maybe the mechanic installed a good part on the wrong plane, and so on.

One of our people looked at more than 60 accident reports in which "bogus" parts were mentioned, and he found only two or three where the so-called "bogus" part may have played a role in the accident.

If there is a bogus part problem, I suspect it affects the maintenance area more than the large air carriers and manufacturers, who have strong, ongoing relationships with their suppliers.

There are specific regulations that apply to the relationship between FAA-approved manufacturers and their suppliers, but none that apply to distributors, who may supply parts from second-rate manufacturers who are not FAA approved.

So we need some answers. What really is a bogus part? How extensive is the problem? And if it is extensive, what can we do about it?

We'll get those answers from a task force we've just set up with the Air Transport Association, the General Aviation Manufacturers Association, the Aerospace Industries Association, and others.

If there really is a bogus parts problem, we're ready to take whatever action may be needed.

Finally, we need to work together on a number of issues that are becoming more important as aviation becomes more international.

The way we make transport aircraft today is a wonderful example of international cooperation. Almost every large plane is the result of work by many people in many countries.

And aircraft are being used increasingly on an international basis as well. It's not uncommon for an aircraft to be certificated and manufactured in one country, owned by a company in another country, operated by another organization in a third country, and maintained by someone in a fourth country.

But that situation makes it nearly impossible for a government to monitor an aircraft's operational safety and maintenance.

What's the answer? Well, we must harmonize the aviation rules and regulations of the major aviation nations. And I have made that a primary goal for the FAA.

We've been fairly successful in harmonizing our certification standards. Now we need to do the same thing on the maintenance and operational side as well.

Last June, I challenged a joint meeting of the FAA and the European Airworthiness Authorities to move faster toward commonality in our rules and regulations. I'm glad to say that I found wide agreement on the need to do that.

We realize that American manufacturers will be undertaking more co-production agreements with foreign manufacturers, and this is one area where our push for greater international harmony in aviation rules may help.

In these cases, we need to extend the production certificate to the co-producer, which means we must evaluate the foreign facility's manufacturing and quality control system. But, as you know, we just don't have the resources and manpower to evaluate more than a few co-production agreements at this time.

It may be that with greater commonality in the international standards, we can make some headway on this problem.

Make no mistake about it. We know that production efficiency is essential for competitive success in tough world markets. And we want to do everything we can to help.

I think we demonstrated that in the recent revisions we've made in the "airworthiness/conformity approval" tag that is becoming a kind of worldwide "passport" for aviation parts.

Not long ago, the industry asked for major revisions in the parts release form. So we changed it, and we thought we'd solved the problem.

But we soon learned we had unknowingly created new problems, including a requirement for industry to issue thousands of additional export tags.

So we recently got back together with the JAA and the industry to make further changes. I think the new format and instructions will now make it far easier to ship parts internationally. We've leveled the playing field so everyone can compete on an equal basis.

Believe me, we are listening to the industry. We share common goals. And we should be marching to the same beat.

One of my goals is to have open lines of communication with every part of the aviation world.

We've got 34 FAA people here in this room with us today. Talk to them. Give them your ideas. Ask questions. That's why they're here.

Let's communicate with each other here at this great conference and throughout the rest of the year as well. I mean it when I say I want to hear from you if you've got a problem or an idea or a suggestion.

My phone is never off the hook. My door is always open.

Thanks very much.

Opening Remarks
FAA Administrator James Busey
Symposium on Cosmic Radiation
Exposure of Air Carrier Crewmembers
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
September 18, 1990

Thank you for coming today.

This seminar reflects one of my major objectives as FAA Administrator. That is, to increase the FAA's outreach to the aviation, academic and scientific communities. We want and need your participation in developing policies that may affect aviation activities around the world.

FAA's interest in the subject of cosmic radiation dates back to the early planning stages for the civil supersonic transport, or SST. The reason is that the SSTs were expected to cruise at altitudes of up to 60,000 feet.

In 1965, the agency created an Advisory Committee on Radiation Biology Aspects of the Supersonic Transport that continued to function until the United States SST project was cancelled in the mid-1970s. The committee, in turn, established a working group to study radiation exposure during air travel in the United States in conventional jet aircraft.

Using computer models, the working group concluded that neither airline passengers nor airline crewmembers were at risk from excessive exposure to cosmic radiation. That conclusion was generally accepted by the aviation community and guided FAA policy for the next decade.

In 1984, FAA published a petition for rule making from a private health physicist who essentially wanted the agency to classify airline crewmembers as radiation workers, establish appropriate standards, and require monitoring and record keeping of their operational exposure. He supported his argument by citing the rise in airline activity resulting from deregulation, the introduction of new equipment with extended range capabilities and the increased use of polar routes.

FAA subsequently denied the petition citing the lack of data to support a regulatory program of such size and scope.

In lieu of rulemaking, FAA promised to provide educational and advisory information to crewmembers on the radiation environment that would help them plan their flight schedules to preclude overexposure. The agency then initiated a program here at the Civil Aeromedical Institute to develop this information in the form of an Advisory Circular.

Also, you'll remember, that Congress in 1984 mandated a study of cabin air quality by the National Academy of Sciences. The study's primary purpose was to assess the health effects of tobacco smoke on air travelers. But other contaminants and pollutants, including cosmic radiation, were examined as well.

Published in 1986, the report recommended a ban on in-flight smoking that was the basis for subsequent Congressional legislation. The report also recommended that the Department of Transportation sponsor a more detailed study of cabin air quality that would quantify pollutant levels and calculate the associated health risks to passengers and crew.

That led to a DOT study contract with Geomet Tech of Germantown, MD., in December 1988. The Geomet report was released in February 1990 and -- as something of an anticlimax -- endorsed the Congressionally-imposed smoking ban "as providing the greatest benefit at the least cost."

The report also included an assessment of the health risks from cosmic radiation based on a study conducted by FAA's Civil Aeronedical Institute and this section received the lion's share of media attention. Perhaps the reason was that the smoking issue already had been decided.

The report concluded that exposure management is the only viable option for reducing cabin crewmember and passenger exposure to cosmic radiation. In the case of crewmembers, this means careful scheduling to avoid persistent exposure to higher cosmic radiation levels associated with flights at high-altitude and flights at extreme northern and southern latitudes.

That, in a nutshell, is the purpose of the FAA Advisory Circular, "Radiation Exposure of Air Carrier Crewmembers," issued in March 1990. Since a discussion of this publication is one of the items on the afternoon agenda, I won't go into any detail. Let me just summarize it briefly:

> It provides information on cosmic radiation exposure and associated health risks for aircrew members;
>
> It estimates dose equivalents from galactic cosmic radiation for each of 32 nonstop flights on key domestic and international routes;
>
> It offers sample calculations for estimating radiation-induced risks of fatal cancer, genetic defects and harm to an embryo or fetus.

Let me add that the circular includes the latest National Academy of Sciences data on exposure to low levels of ionizing radiation. This data did not become available until after the Geomet study was completed.

We plan to supplement the Advisory Circular with a plain-language publication aimed at the medical community and the general public. It will provide the same basic information in terms that can be more readily understandable by non-technical individuals.

We think it will be a useful reference for physicians in answering questions from patients and for frequent flyers who may have concerns about their own well being.

Conclusion:

FAA will be looking at the proceedings of this symposium for policy guidance in such areas as educational programs, monitoring of pregnant crewmembers and solar flare activity.

If you look at your agenda, you will see that there are many questions that remain to be answered.

In the area of education on cosmic radiation, for example, what remains to be done? Should air carriers provide formal training in this area? What should be included in these training programs? Should FAA require such training?

Regarding the monitoring of pregnant crewmembers, there is evidence that the radiation exposure of an unborn child on some routes would exceed the the recommended monthly limit if the expectant mother worked a full schedule. Should the airlines be required to establish a monitoring program for these individuals? What would be the elements of this program?

On the subject of solar particle events associated with flares, there are many questions about notification procedures for the airlines and the general public. Essentially, what is the best and fastest way to do this? And what kind of information should be included?

That pretty much concludes my part of the program. As you can see, there are very definite advantages to being the lead off speaker. All you're asked to do is set the tone for the meeting. No one really expects you to resolve all the outstanding issues. That's your job and now I'm going to let you get to it.

Again, thank you for coming today and thank you for your attention.

0251A
speech
0461P
pres

REMARKS BY ADMIRAL JAMES B. BUSEY
FAA ADMINISTRATOR
TO
THE NATIONAL BLACK COALITION OF FEDERAL AVIATION EMPLOYEES
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
SEPTEMBER 19, 1990

I am pleased to be with you today. As you know, most FAA national meetings and conferences have been canceled because of the budget situation. However, I wanted this one to go on as scheduled, not just because I think the work you are doing is very important--which I do.

I also wanted to send a signal to the rest of the agency that we are not going to allow EEO to be put on the shelf during this temporary budget squeeze.

It is important that managers and supervisors, in particular, understand that we are determined to keep up the momentum in EEO and we are not going to allow anything to sidetrack us. The fact that we are all here today should help to underscore this commitment and determination.

As for the budget situation, which I know is of great concern to you, the situation looks a bit brighter now. There are indications that the Congress and the Administration might reach an agreement on funding levels and priorities before October 1. If that happens, we can avoid the dread effects of sequestration.

If they don't, though, we still face stiff measures in about ten days or so, with the beginning of a new fiscal year.

So, I am not ready to put the contingency plan in my "out" box for filing. I am keeping it on my desk within reach in case we have to deal with the automatic cuts of 32 percent that would go into effect government-wide if the White House and Congressional budget summit fails to reach an agreement.

As some of you know, these are the major items that we are considering in our contingency plan: a freeze on hiring, elimination of overtime, suspension of PCS moves, elimination of all but essential travel, suspension of most training. In addition, we may be forced to let our temporary employees go.

Finally, as a last resort, we would need to impose an across-the-board furlough within the FAA. This would affect all services--and all of you. It could mean that everyone in the workforce would be on furlough for approximately two to two and a half days per pay period--or more than one day per week starting Monday, October 1.

But, I guarantee you we are doing everything to make furloughs an absolute last resort. However, if Congress doesn't act--and act quickly--our hands will be tied. So keep your fingers crossed because you know better than I the impact this would have on some of your friends and colleagues--maybe some of you right here in this room.

Think, for example, of the young, single mother who is a GS-6 clerk-typist trying to take care of three youngsters and is barely able to make ends meet now. With a furlough, she would have to face the prospect of paying that same rent, utility bills, and day care expenses, with 20-25 percent less money in her paycheck every two weeks.

Moreover, a furlough would come along at a particularly bad time for the agency. The scare and uncertainty over the lump-sum retirement issue triggered a large number of retirements earlier this month. In fact, a total of 419 employees retired at that time. This tripled the number of retirees we normally experience at this time of year and doubles the number we had for the same period in 1989.

Of these 419 retirees, 148 were air traffic controllers, many of them seasoned supervisors and managers. Another 124 were electronics technicians, 17 were engineers, and 14 aviation safety inspectors. So, this has put a hurt on us--particularly at the New York Center and some facilities in the Southern Region.

On top of this, 48 of our employees who are military reservists were called up to active duty because of the crisis in the Middle East. There is no telling when we are going to get them back.

So, a furlough would put us in a bigger bind. And, besides the hardship for our employees, it also would have a severe impact on the level of service we provide for our customers, the flying public. Whatever we do, though, it will be done consistent with safety. That is, and must always remain, our number one priority.

So, that's how the budget situation looks at the moment. However, while things look more hopeful now than they did a few weeks ago, we are not out of the woods even if a budget agreement is reached.

Don't think for a moment that we won't still be facing a tough budget situation in FY 1991. We may not have to face across-the-board cuts called for by Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. And we may get by without furloughs and some of the more drastic measures I just cited. But, the $169 billion deficit government-wide projected for this year will not go away overnight. And FAA will have to do its share of belt-tightening to help reduce this deficit.

So, while we may dodge the sequestration bullet, this is no time for euphoria. Austerity will still be the name of the game at FAA and other Federal agencies for the foreseeable future.

In fact, the President, in his recent speech to Congress, cited the budget and the excessive dependence on foreign oil as top priorities for this country. So we all have a responsibility, and FAA is no exception.

Yet, while we will be trying to cut back wherever possible, at the same time we will be working hard in the Congress to secure passage of the $22 billion reauthorization package we sent to Capitol Hill at the end of March. This package faces some tough hurdles, but it's essential to get it passed, so we will be spending a lot of time on that in the weeks and months ahead.

This is a politically difficult time to be asking for large increases in program spending authority. But we cannot afford to defer the tough political decisions any longer. The number of airline passengers doubled in the past ten years. And it will come close to doubling again in the next ten years. So providing the necessary facilities and equipment is critical to meeting this challenge. And we need to start building that system now.

Providing the right people to run this future system is the other side of the coin. And this is equally challenging. And that is why we need to stay on course in pursuing an aggressive recruitment program for minorities and women. In fact, I have instructed all Human Resource managers to concentrate their efforts on targeted recruitment programs.

As I said earlier, I want this EEO initiative to move forward--even within the severe, but temporary constraints of the budget situation. I don't want our managers to use this situation as an excuse to lay back and do nothing. There are many things we can do--and are doing.

And, it's no secret there's a lot we need to do to catch up. At the moment, the minority population at FAA is running at about 14.6 percent compared to an 18.4 percent representation in the civilian labor force nationwide. For women, the picture is even worse. Only 21.5 percent of the FAA work force are women, versus 42.5 percent in the civilian labor force.

At FAA, there has been minimum improvement over the past decade. Black representation is now at 8.1 percent of the workforce--only 2.3 percent higher than the 5.3 percent representation in 1980. In terms of the 1988 projected census versus the 1980 census, we have actually regressed.

To be fair, we are making progress in some offices and some areas of the country, but other areas are lagging far behind. So to make sure this recruitment effort is not just sporadic, determined largely by the zeal of those who happen to be personally committed to EEO, I have directed that a number of actions be taken to institutionalize the program nationwide.

Among these actions are the development of a national recruitment program and a multi-year recruitment plan. If we are going to do a better job of recruiting generally--and targeting certain audiences for special attention in particular--I think we need to focus our resources into a coordinated, national effort.

We also need to sustain that effort over several years. We can no longer afford to approach EEO on a hit and miss basis, giving it a lot of attention one year, then moving on to something else the next. The problem we have inherited took a long time in the making and it's going to take time and sustained effort to turn it around.

What will help a great deal, in my judgment, is the establishment of full-time recruitment specialists in headquarters and the regions. Recruitment won't be a collateral duty for them--or another "duty as assigned," as the saying goes. Recruitment is their job and they will be evaluated on how well they do on that one major task.

A two-week pilot training program for recruiters was held in Washington in May. Some 18 new recruiters attended this session and they are now back at their jobs in headquarters and regions.

A major key to the success of this EEO effort is to make managers up and down the line accountable for EEO, starting with my top management team. Everyone at the AMT level has been provided specific figures on where he or she stands with respect to minority representation in the national labor force. And we have asked each of them to spell out specifically what he or she intends to do to increase minority hiring in their own bailiwicks. We are going to hold their feet to the fire on this issue.

In a related matter, we also have directed the AMT to make sure that minorities and women within their organizations are developed and prepared for management and executive positions. We cannot allow talented women and minorities to languish in dead-end positions.

We have not done enough to identify and prepare women and minorities for these positions. When they meet eligibility criteria, women and minorities do well in the selection process. The problem is that relatively few of them meet the basic eligibility requirements due to lack of experience, training, and/or development.

Our recent experience with the Candidate Development Program for the SES program is a case in point. Of the 365 applicants, only six Black women applied. Only one Black woman survived the initial cut and none made the final list of 30. This shows me the FAA has not done a good enough job of identifying promising Black women in our ranks and providing them the necessary training and development to make that next step up.

So, we are asking the AMT members to provide such training and development. And to make sure they do, we are establishing a new critical job element for SES performance appraisals on this very issue. It will go into effect for the appraisal period beginning this October.

So, now, everyone knows where we stand and what is expected of them. In addition, we've got the Executive Committee for Equal Employment Opportunity in place to provide the necessary oversight to make sure we achieve tangible, measurable results.

As I have said before, the FAA can no longer afford to operate from vague wish lists, or just from good intentions, however sincere these may be. In EEO, as in every phase of FAA's operations, we need to set specific goals to aim for and then see how we stack up at the end of the year.

To make more people understand this, we need to reframe the whole discussion of EEO. It is important to put the issue in the proper perspective so that more people will understand what we are trying to accomplish.

Certainly, promoting EEO is a good thing to do from a moral standpoint. And when you look at the numbers, it's really the only fair thing to do. Those are good reasons in themselves for pursuing a vigorous EEO program.

But let's face it, as Secretary Skinner mentioned in his videotaped message, it also just makes good business sense for DOT and FAA to promote quality recruitment and training of women and minorities. And I think more supervisors and managers ought to understand that.

We also are bettering the FAA where management is composed of a diverse population of managers who bring a different cultural awareness to their jobs. At the same time, they also bring with them the tools of providing new problem solving techniques, management operation and styles, and management effectiveness.

Diverse management teams also will prepare us for anticipated population changes predicted by Department of Labor's WORKFORCE 2000 Report. By the year 2000, women and minorities will constitute a larger percentage of the workforce. That is the clear trend. Those are the demographics.

The FAA of the year 2000 will require a more highly technical, better trained workforce than we have today. We face high retirement rates in some of our major job categories in the years ahead.

And, trust me, those technically proficient employees we want to replace them won't just show up one day to take over when today's older employees are ready to retire. We need to actively seek them out and convince them FAA is a good place to work. And, for that, we will need your help.

It won't be easy. The competition for quality employees will be stiff. And, in many cases, private employers have a leg up in this competition because they can offer higher entry level salaries and other attractive benefits that we cannot.

So, there a very utilitarian but compelling reasons for actively pursuing an aggressive recruitment program aimed at women and minorities. It just makes sense to me to have a FAA work force that is reflective of the cultural diversity in the United States. This diversity has helped the United States become the great country that it is. And I am convinced it can help the FAA become a better agency.

Before closing, I want to take a minute and pay a long overdue tribute to this group. For many years, the Black Coalition has been at the forefront in the struggle for greater representation of minorities and women at FAA.

At times, in the past, yours was often a lonely voice crying in the wilderness. But, I have been made aware of your long and valued history of service to the agency, and I want you to know I sincerely appreciate all you have done and are still doing.

Thanks for inviting me to be with you. I have enjoyed it.

REMARKS BY JAMES B. BUSEY
FAA ADMINISTRATOR
BEFORE THE
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL ASSOCIATION'S AWARD BANQUET
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS
SEPTEMBER 20, 1990

Thank you.

I want to start with a confession. I really don't have a lot to say tonight.

I knew I had a problem when I looked at the conference agenda a couple of weeks ago. I may be the main speaker, but Scott Crossfield is the main attraction.

But I don't mind playing second fiddle to a guy like Scott.

And I thought I'd still have a lot to say about our air traffic control system -- until I looked at the schedule for the technical sessions. Then I knew I was in trouble.

It was obvious that by now you've heard everything that can be said about air traffic control -- and I mean everything. I started to feel like a broken field runner who has run out of room.

But I don't think that matters very much. The truth is that the main speaker at a dinner like this is a lot like the corpse at an Irish wake -- very essential but not expected to contribute much.

My situation reminds me of the fellow mentioned by Abraham Lincoln. He was tarred and feathered and run out of town on a rail. When someone asked him how it felt, he said: "Well, if it weren't for the honor of the thing, I'd have rather walked."

So I think I'll follow President Roosevelt's advice. He said when you make a speech you should: "Be sincere; be brief; and be seated."

And I'll start that process by saying that it's great to be with you this evening.

I am proud of our air traffic control system.

It's just plain good.

As a matter of fact, it's better than good. It's safe. It's open. It's flexible ... I guess I could use a couple of dozen superlatives. But I can summarize it all by saying, quite simply, that we've got the best air control system in the world.

Now that's not so much a reflection of the job that the FAA has done, although I'm proud of that.

It's a reflection on what all of us have done together.

It's a reflection on the contributions of people like Scott Crossfield, people with the skill and the courage to make flying safer and better for all of us.

It's a reflection on the people in this room and the contributions that all of you have made.

It's a reflection on the contributions of American industry. I've worked with the aerospace industry for many years, and I'm constantly impressed by the energy, the expertise, and the creativity of the industry and its people.

The greatness of our system is also a reflection on the partnership that we've built, a partnership that includes every sector of American aviation.

Finally, our superb ATC system is a reflection of the work of thousands of FAA people -- especially the air controllers and technicians who run and maintain the system. They do a tremendous job -- a job that is not often seen or appreciated by the flying public.

So tonight, on behalf of the millions of passengers who depend on the system every day, I want to say to all of the men and women who run the system and keep it going: "Thank you for a difficult job well done. We're counting on you to keep up the good work."

Now, of course, our air control system is not without problems. Nothing ever is in this world.

But we understand the problems. We're working together to get them solved. We're making progress every day.

And this is an area where ATCA is playing a leading role in our partnership. You can see that by what has gone on here this week. The list of participants and exhibitors reads like a "Who's Who of the American Aerospace Industry". The technical sessions were the best in the world.

You've spent a lot of time this week looking at what's coming in the future. I'm sure you'll agree with me when I say that we're going to revolutionize the air control system. We're going to make the best system even better.

And that will be no small accomplishment.

But while we're doing that we've also got to turn our sights outward, from the United States to a global perspective.

Why? Because the air traffic control system of tommorrow must be a global system. And it must be the best we can build. It's got to give us the highest levels of efficiency and safety that advanced technology can provide.

If it falls short of that goal, then we will not realize the full potential of air transportation. The growth of the world economy will be slowed, and the efforts of many nations to raise their standards of living will be frustrated.

How, then, can we make the global system good enough?

The answer is easy: Pattern it after the best we have today.

In my view, what we have done here in America is a forerunner of what needs to be done internationally.

Now that means all of us have a special responsibility to do whatever we can to extend the benefits of our experience and our technology on a worldwide basis to other nations that must upgrade their air systems.

One of our major goals must be to get far greater international commonality in operations and aircraft certification and maintenance.

And we're going to need that same level of commonality in our airspace management systems, in our air control procedures, and especially in our new technology -- GPS, Glonass, MLS, and all the rest.

Those are the building blocks of a global air control system, and those blocks must fit together around the world, regardless of national boundaries.

It won't be easy, but I have made the achievement of such international commonality a major goal for the FAA. And I'm counting on all of you to join me in that effort.

We won't get that system of the future unless we become more international in our outlook. We need greater understanding. We need better communications. We need more cooperation.

The whole world must be involved.

That's why I'm especially pleased to see so many people from other countries here this year. That's a good omen. It shows there's real interest in working together to build the global system of tommorrow.

Here again, I want to note ATCA's real contributions, this time in the international arena. Not only is the Association beefing up its international membership, it's also contributing significantly to the success of the FAA's international outreach program.

ATCA serves as a host for just about every group of international visitors to FAA headquarters. Gabe Hartl and his people really go out of their way to help us create an environment that makes friends and improves communications.

Best of all, they do this without a nickel of FAA money. Believe me, in this Age of the Tight Budget, I really appreciate that.

We are struck with wonder when we look at the tremendous changes aviation has brought to the world over the past half-century. It has literally transformed the way we live.

But I believe the changes we've seen so far are nothing compared to what's coming.

Aviation is about to enter a golden age.

Think about what's just over the horizon -- an incredibly accurate, worldwide satellite communications and navigation system, hypersonic transports that will bring nations and people even closer together, VTOL aircraft that will speed directly from city center to city center, jumbo transports with maybe a thousand seats, automated air traffic control systems, advanced weather systems, and on and on and on.

Those changes, and many more that we can't predict today, are coming. And with them will come unbounded opportunities -- and challenges -- for everyone in aviation.

Today, more than ever before in human history, we depend on science and technology. We take miracles for granted. And we never stop asking for more. Indeed, the pace of technological change seems to increase with each passing day.

I have no doubt that the changes we've seen in the past half-century will pale by comparison with what's coming. And the individual, the company, or the nation that refuses to join the race will inevitably fall behind. There is no other choice.

I'm confident that America will maintain its preeminent position in aviation. And I am equally confident that we will do everything we can to help build the global system of the future, a system that will bring the benefits of efficient, safe air transportation to people everywhere.

It's been a pleasure being with you this evening.

Thank you.

REMARKS BY JAMES B. BUSEY
FAA ADMINISTRATOR
BEFORE THE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF AIRPORT EXECUTIVES
DALLAS/FORT WORTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
SEPTEMBER 24, 1990

Thank you. It's good to be here today. I'm always glad to meet people who are helping to make America's air transport system the best in the world.

That's what it is, you know. The best in the world. We've got a dynamic aerospace industry. We've got aggressive, competitive airlines. We've got a marvelous air control system. And we've got the greatest airports in the world. Put them all together, and they add up to the best.

Now we like to talk about the "system", as if it were some miraculous thing that created itself. But the truth is that the excellence of our air transport system is really the sum total of the hard work of a lot of people -- each striving in his or her own way to make everything work better.

Without the right people, any system, no matter how well-designed and equipped, would ultimately fail.

So we're all part of the team -- which means that each of us has a responsiblity to help make the system run even better in the years ahead.

America depends on efficient air services, not just for vacation trips, but for the competitive business strength we need to succeed in tough world markets.

So we can't afford to let our air system deteriorate. We must keep it modern and efficient. And that's what I want to talk about today.

We all have the same goal, which is to get our air system ready to handle the demands of the 21st Century. To reach that goal, we must work together.

Each major sector of American aviation can affect the whole system. But no one sector can ensure on its own that we achieve our national goals.

We all have to pull in the same direction. It can't be the FAA versus the airports, or the airports versus the air carriers, and so on. It's got to be a team approach, with everyone on the same team -- you folks, the air carriers, the aerospace industry, and the FAA.

Now the record shows that the FAA and the people who run our airports -- I mean all of you and this Association -- can work together.

The Airport Safety and Operations Specialist Schools we've run jointly this year prove that point. This is the first time we've gotten together to provide a forum to review operational safety issues. I'm glad to say these meetings have been well attended.

Now I think we must turn our attention to other mutual problems.

Let's focus on three. The first is airport capacity. The second is airport noise. And the third is airport security.

Let's take capacity first.

I think you know the problem we face here. We've got 21 major airports with more than 20,000 hours of flight delays a year. That's too much.

And now here's the bad news. It's going to get worse if we don't move fast.

We've got more than a half-billion passengers a year already, double the load just ten years ago. With continuously growing demand, we'll have a billion passengers a year not long after the turn of the century.

Think what that'll mean. We'll have twice as many people coming through the gates and twice as many cars in the parking lots. And probably 50 percent more flights on the runways and in the air.

I don't want to be an alarmist, but let me ask a couple of questions. Are you getting ready to handle twice as many passengers and planes? If we work together, can we get the system in shape in time to handle the demand? Or will congestion and delays skyrocket?

The answers to those questions are in our hands. Either we will increase system capacity, or it won't be increased at all.

So we have our work cut out for us.

I'm confident we can -- and I'm confident we will -- do what is required. But it's going to mean concerted, cooperative action by every part of our national air system and by everyone who works in the system. And you folks have a pivotal role to play.

To increase system capacity, we must modernize both the air traffic control system and our airports.

Now the air traffic control system is my piece of the pie. We've got a multi-billion-dollar capital investment program going right now that is giving us the advanced technology we need to get ready for future demand.

There are well over a hundred major projects in the program, far too many to cover in detail today. But I'd like to mention a few that will directly affect the efficiency of airport operations.

For one thing, we're already getting some real capacity payoffs from a computerized central flow control system that lets controllers monitor traffic on a national basis and take corrective action before serious delays develop.

We've also designed computer simulations to analyze and reduce terminal delays. And we're working on new technology that will increase operational safety and efficiency in terminal areas during poor weather.

To speed the flow of traffic through our major airports, we're developing a terminal area automation program that will give us more precise control over the sequence and timing of traffic in and out of terminal areas.

And we'll also be improving the movement of aircraft on the ground with an automation program that will help prevent runway incursions and provide more efficient sequencing of aircraft departures.

In addition, as you know, we'll get increased terminal area safety and capacity from the microwave landing systems that will be installed on many runways during the coming decade.

And we're now running a couple of tests of new radar techniques that can give us the increased landing capacity on parallel runways in bad weather.

I could go on for hours talking about the exciting things we're doing to modernize our command and control system. Suffice it to say, that I'm determined to make sure that we continue to have the best in the world.

Of course, this capital investment program will not solve all of our capacity problems. There's another side to the capacity equation -- YOUR side, the airport side.

The FAA doesn't build or run airports. That's your piece of the pie. Decisions to improve existing airports and build new ones are made at the state and local level.

But while these are strictly local decisions, they affect the entire system.

Airports really are the switching centers, you might say, of a national transportation system. Delays and congestion at one airport can ripple through the system and affect passengers thousands of miles away.

So when you decide to expand an airport or build a new one -- or, conversely, when you decide not to do those things -- the decision may be purely local but the effects will be national.

We need better airports. We need more airports. That's just not debatable.

And, in my view, this is one case where local interests and national interests coincide. When you take the lead in raising your community's airport capacity, you are not only serving your community, you are serving the nation as well.

Here's something to consider. The demand will be served. If your airport can't serve the demand because it doesn't have the capacity, then some other airport will get the traffic -- and the income and the jobs and all the rest. You can be sure of that.

A limit on an airport's growth will not stop the growth of air traffic. That traffic will just show up somewhere else -- maybe at the airport down the road, or in the next state.

You can already see that process at work in the Chicago region. Airlines are re-routing flights to avoid delays there. O'Hare's share of the nation's total domestic travel has slipped 15 percent in the last ten years. One study predicts that, over the next 30 years, 15 million passengers will choose to use other terminals.

Chicago, I'm glad to say, is considering building a third major airport in the region. The people there are determined to hold their lead position in air transportation.

The point is that airports that want to maintain or increase their business must ensure they have the capacity to handle the business. Cities and regions that prepare for growth will profit from it. Those that fail to prepare will be left behind. It's just that simple.

The challenge is obvious -- create more airport capacity.

But there are two major problems: Not enough money and too much noise.

And we've got to work <u>together</u> on both of those issues.

As you know, the FAA disburses quite a chunk of money through the Airport Improvement Program. In fiscal 1990, the total will be about 1.4 billion dollars, of which about 87 percent is going for 170 projects at our primary airports.

The pressing need to increase airport capacity means that we must invest more, and our 1991 budget proposal calls for an increase in airport improvement grants.

In addition, we're requesting additional funding for airports through a new funding source, the passenger facility charge, or head tax, that will provide significant additional funds for airport development.

This could bring in a lot of money -- well over a billion dollars a year collectively for our larger airports -- which could be used to ease congestion, reduce delays, and make air travel more comfortable.

Not only will the PFC mean more money, it will give airports greater control. The FAA won't always be telling you folks how to spend it. And this new funding source could help to break what some people characterize as a "stranglehold" that airlines have over some airports.

You're going to have to exercise very tight control over how the money is spent.

Congress will be looking at this, and so will the GAO. And they'll want to see that projects paid for with PFC revenues are well orchestrated, well thought-out, and well controlled from a monetary standpoint.

So that means right from the start we've all got to work together to establish mutual trust and respect concerning how this money is going to be spent.

Your airport planning will have to be very good. And I would urge you to bring the FAA into the review process at an early stage. Work with the people in our regional offices. That way you'll get a better product that has gone through the scrub-down by the technicians and experts.

I'm happy to say that your Association strongly supports the PFC proposal and is working with us to get it enacted. We certainly appreciate that cooperation.

Now let's take a quick look at the problem of aircraft noise and its impact on the people who live near airports. Here again we must work together to find a solution.

In instance after instance around the country, people who live near airports are advocating strict noise restrictions on aircraft operations. More than 400 airports today have some kind of noise restrictions. By our count 47 major airport projects have been cancelled or significantly delayed by noise concerns.

While Iam concerned about the adverse impact that aviation noise has on some residents, I am equally concerned about the potential adverse effects on interstate commerce. Costs can be increased. The efficiency of the whole air system can be adversely affected. How can we accommodate another doubling of air passengers in the next 20 years if we gradually choke off the limited capacity available.

I don't think this problem can ever be solved by relying solely on airport authorities to deal with it from a local viewpoint. The valid local perspective must be balanced with the national interest.

The best way to do that will be to get together and develop a consensus on a national strategy for managing aviation noise.

Now the FAA can't develop an effective noise policy by itself. Everyone has to help -- the aviation industry, the people involved in land development near airports, the airport proprietors, the federal government, everyone.

Here again, I'm glad to say, we're working together. I very much appreciate this Association's work with our noise working group on the Aviation System Capacity Task Force.

And now I'd like to focus that same spirit of cooperation on another of our mutual problems -- air carrier security.

As you know, we've already done a lot to tighten up security. We've elevated security work within the FAA. We've beefed up our security staff around the world. We've doubled the budget for research and development on security. And we've started building a new laboratory that will evaluate new security technology.

We've also replaced older x-ray machines with more sophisticated ones. We've raised the standards for metal detectors. We've required a positive match of passengers and their luggage. And we've taken many other steps too numerous to mention today.

As you know, we're currently running test demonstrations on the Thermal Neutron Analysis systems. I've heard all the criticisms of TNA. But I'm encouraged by the results we're getting in our test program. The technology works, and I think we can make further improvements.

As you probably know, I recently classified as secret the changes we're making in this technology. In my view, it would be foolish to let terrorists know what we're doing.

At the same time, of course, we're trying to develop even better systems. TNA is the first of a new breed of detectors. Eventually we may have smaller, less costly systems. But until we do, we have no choice but to use TNA, which is the only system in production now.

Now, of course, the struggle against terrorism can't be won by the FAA alone, or even by the FAA, law enforcement agencies, and the airlines. We need the cooperation and understanding of the flying public. And we need <u>your</u> involvement too.

To use an old cliche: We're all in the same boat, and we've all got to man the oars.

I know I can count on all of you to work with us in a spirit of cooperation and respect. If we work together, we can achieve any goal.

It's a pleasure being with you today.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS BY JAMES B. BUSEY
FAA ADMINISTRATOR
FOR THE CEREMONY MARKING THE OPENING
OF THE NEW TERMINAL BUILDING
JACKSONVILLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
SEPTEMBER 27, 1990

IT IS A PLEASURE TO BE WITH YOU TODAY. THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL COMPLEX AND YOU SHOULD BE VERY PROUD OF IT. I CONGRATULATE ALL WHO HAVE MADE IT POSSIBLE--THE MAYOR, THE GOVERNOR, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PORT AUTHORITY AND, MOST OF ALL, THE CITIZENS OF JACKSONVILLE.

JACKSONVILLE IS IN AN ENVIABLE POSITION AS FAR AS AVIATION IS CONCERNED. YOU HAVE EXCELLENT AIR SERVICE WITH 216 OPERATIONS DAILY, A CONTINUALLY GROWING AIR BUSINESS--PLUS THE LUXURY OF 7,000 ACRES AROUND THE AIRPORT AVAILABLE FOR COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT. THERE IS PLENTY OF ROOM FOR EXPANSION, AND NOT MANY AIRPORTS ARE IN THAT POSITION.

WHAT THIS REPRESENTS, IN MY JUDGMENT, IS A CONTINUING COMMITMENT TO AVIATION WHICH HAS BEEN A FLORIDA TRADITION FOR DECADES.

AND IT SHOWS ME THAT JACKSONVILLE AND THE STATE OF FLORIDA ARE LOOKING AHEAD, BEYOND THE NEXT TOURIST SEASON, TO THE 21ST CENTURY. THAT'S THE KIND OF FORESIGHT AND PLANNING THAT AVIATION NEEDS ALL OVER THIS COUNTRY.

OF COURSE, AVIATION IS VITAL TO THIS STATE'S TOURISM INDUSTRY AND ECONOMY. LAST YEAR, FLORIDA RECEIVED ALMOST 39 MILLION VISITORS TO THE STATE AND 45-50 PERCENT OF THEM ARRIVED BY AIR. WHILE HERE, THOSE VISITORS SPENT $26 BILLION IN THE STATE AND CONTRIBUTED 20 PERCENT OF ALL SALES TAXES COLLECTED IN THE STATE.

THE STATE OF FLORIDA HAS EIGHT AIRPORTS AMONG THE TOP 100 AIRPORTS IN THE UNITED STATES IN TERMS OF PASSENGER BOARDINGS, WITH JACKSONVILLE RANKING NUMBER 69 WITH 1.35 MILLION PASSENGER ENPLANEMENTS.

LAST YEAR, THE FAA PROVIDED THE STATE OF FLORIDA MORE THAN $77 MILLION IN GRANT AGREEMENTS UNDER THE AIRPORT AND AIRWAY IMPROVMENT ACT--THE FIFTH LARGEST AMOUNT OF AIRPORT GRANTS OF ALL THE STATES.

FAA HAS TWO AIR ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTERS IN FLORIDA--AT MIAMI AND HERE AT JACKSONVILLE. JACKSONVILLE, YOU MAY BE INTERESTED TO KNOW, RANKS NUMBER 11 AMONG ALL 22 EN ROUTE CENTERS NATIONWIDE IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER OF AIRCRAFT IT HANDLED LAST YEAR.

IN FACT, FAA HAS FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT ALL OVER THIS STATE. JUST SOUTH OF HERE, AT PALM COAST, FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE OUR CENTER FOR MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT WHERE WE TRAIN MORE THAN 4,000 OF OUR PEOPLE EVERY YEAR.

SO, WHAT THIS ALL MEANS IS THAT FAA HAS A LARGE INVESTMENT IN FLORIDA AND I BELIEVE THIS PUBLIC MONEY IS BEING WELL SPENT.

WHILE AVIATION IS GROWING HERE IN FLORDIA AND THIS NEW TERMINAL IS PROOF THAT JACKSONVILLE IS PLANNING AHEAD TO COPE WITH PROJECTED GROWTH, THIS IS NOT THE CASE ALL OVER THE COUNTRY. SO I COMMEND YOU FOR YOUR INITIATIVE AND FORESIGHT.

SOMETIMES I THINK THE TREMENDOUS SUCCESS OF AVIATION IN THE UNITED STATES HAS CREATED A SENSE OF COMPLACENCY.

LET THERE BE NO DOUBT--THE UNITED STATES HAS THE BEST--THE SAFEST, MOST EFFICIENT AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM IN THE WORLD. WE HAVE THE BEST AIRPORTS IN THE WORLD. AND ALL THESE COMPONENTS ADD UP TO A MAGNIFICENT NATIONAL AVIATION SYSTEM--OF WHICH WE ARE ALL VERY PROUD.

YET, ALL THIS SUCCESS HAS BROUGHT WITH IT PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES. AND IT IS ABOUT TWO OF THESE THAT I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT BRIEFLY TODAY.

LET'S TAKE CAPACITY FIRST.

I THINK YOU KNOW THE PROBLEM WE FACE HERE. WE'VE GOT 21 MAJOR AIRPORTS WITH MORE THAN 20,000 HOURS OF FLIGHT DELAYS A YEAR. THAT'S TOO MUCH AND IT'S GOING TO GET WORSE IF WE DON'T MOVE FAST.

WE'VE GOT MORE THAN A HALF-BILLION PASSENGERS A YEAR ALREADY, DOUBLE THE LOAD JUST TEN YEARS AGO. WITH CONTINUOUSLY GROWING DEMAND, WE'LL HAVE A BILLION PASSENGERS A YEAR NOT LONG AFTER THE TURN OF THE CENTURY.

LET US REFLECT FOR A MOMENT ON WHAT THIS ALL MEANS. WHAT IT MEANS IN PRACTICAL TERMS IS THAT WE'LL HAVE TWICE AS MANY PEOPLE COMING THROUGH THE GATES AND TWICE AS MANY CARS IN THE PARKING LOTS. AND PROBABLY 50 PERCENT MORE FLIGHTS ON THE RUNWAYS AND IN THE AIR.

SO WE HAVE OUR WORK CUT OUT FOR US.

I'M CONFIDENT WE CAN MEET THIS CHALLENGE. AND IT IS ENCOURAGING TO COME TO PLACES LIKE JACKSONVILLE AND SEE PROJECTS LIKE THIS NEW TERMINAL COMPLEX WHICH INDICATE THERE IS THE WILLINGNESS AND FORESIGHT TO PREPARE FOR THE CHALLENGE.

BUT IT'S NOT GOING TO BE ENOUGH FOR ISOLATED CITIES AND COMMUNITIES TO WORK ON THIS PROBLEM. IT'S GOING TO MEAN CONCERTED, COOPERATIVE ACTION BY EVERY PART OF OUR NATIONAL AIR SYSTEM AND BY EVERYONE WHO WORKS IN THE SYSTEM.

TO INCREASE SYSTEM CAPACITY, WE MUST MODERNIZE BOTH THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM AND OUR AIRPORTS.

THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM IS THE FAA'S RESPONSIBILITY, AND WE HAVE A MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM GOING RIGHT NOW THAT IS GIVING US THE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY WE NEED TO GET READY FOR FUTURE DEMAND.

THERE'S ANOTHER SIDE TO THE CAPACITY EQUATION--AND THAT'S THE AIRPORT SIDE. AND THAT'S WHERE YOU COME IN.

THE FAA DOESN'T BUILD OR RUN AIRPORTS. DECISIONS TO IMPROVE EXISTING AIRPORTS AND BUILD NEW ONES ARE MADE AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL.

BUT WHILE THESE ARE STRICTLY LOCAL DECISIONS, THEY AFFECT THE ENTIRE SYSTEM.

SO WHEN YOU DECIDE TO EXPAND AN AIRPORT OR BUILD A NEW ONE --OR, CONVERSELY, WHEN YOU DECIDE NOT TO DO THOSE THINGS--THE DECISION MAY BE PURELY LOCAL BUT THE EFFECTS WILL BE NATIONAL.

WE NEED BETTER AIRPORTS. WE NEED MORE AIRPORTS. THAT'S JUST NOT DEBATABLE.

AND, THIS IS WHERE LOCAL INTERESTS AND NATIONAL INTERESTS COINCIDE. WHEN YOU TAKE THE LEAD IN RAISING YOUR COMMUNITY'S AIRPORT CAPACITY, YOU ARE NOT ONLY SERVING YOUR COMMUNITY, YOU ARE SERVING THE NATION AS WELL.

THAT'S WHY I SAID AT THE OUTSET THAT THIS NEW TERMINAL COMPLEX IS A PLUS NOT ONLY FOR THE REGION BUT FOR THE ENTIRE UNITED STATES AVIATION SYSTEM AS WELL.

MY POINT IS THAT AIRPORTS THAT WANT TO MAINTAIN OR INCREASE THEIR BUSINESS MUST ENSURE THEY HAVE THE CAPACITY TO HANDLE THE BUSINESS. CITIES AND REGIONS THAT PREPARE FOR GROWTH WILL PROFIT FROM IT. THOSE THAT FAIL TO PREPARE WILL BE LEFT BEHIND. IT'S JUST THAT SIMPLE.

NOW LET'S TAKE A QUICK LOOK AT THE SECOND PROBLEM, AIRCRAFT NOISE, AND ITS IMPACT ON THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE NEAR AIRPORTS.

IN CASE AFTER CASE AROUND THE COUNTRY, PEOPLE WHO LIVE NEAR AIRPORTS ARE ADVOCATING STRICT NOISE RESTRICTIONS ON AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS. MORE THAN 400 AIRPORTS TODAY HAVE SOME KIND OF NOISE RESTRICTIONS. BY OUR COUNT, 47 MAJOR AIRPORT PROJECTS HAVE BEEN CANCELLED OR SIGNIFICANTLY DELAYED BY NOISE CONCERNS.

WHILE I AM CONCERNED ABOUT THE ADVERSE IMPACT THAT AVIATION NOISE HAS ON SOME RESIDENTS, I AM EQUALLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE. THE EFFICIENCY OF THE WHOLE AIR SYSTEM CAN BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED. AIR TRANSPORTATION COSTS CAN INCREASE. HOW CAN WE ACCOMMODATE ANOTHER DOUBLING OF AIR PASSENGERS IN THE NEXT 20 YEARS IF WE GRADUALLY CHOKE OFF THE LIMITED CAPACITY AVAILABLE?

I DON'T THINK THIS PROBLEM CAN EVER BE SOLVED BY RELYING SOLELY ON AIRPORT AUTHORITIES TO DEAL WITH IT FROM A LOCAL VIEWPOINT. THE VALID LOCAL PERSPECTIVE MUST BE BALANCED WITH THE NATIONAL INTEREST.

THE BEST WAY TO DO THAT WILL BE TO GET TOGETHER AND DEVELOP A CONSENSUS ON A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR MANAGING AVIATION NOISE.

THE FAA CAN'T DEVELOP AN EFFECTIVE NOISE POLICY BY ITSELF. EVERYONE HAS TO HELP -- LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS, THE AVIATION INDUSTRY, THE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN LAND DEVELOPMENT NEAR AIRPORTS, AIRPORT AUTHORITIES, AIRPORT PROPRIETORS, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, EVERYONE.

TO USE AN OLD CLICHE: WE'RE ALL IN THE SAME BOAT, AND WE'VE ALL GOT TO MAN THE OARS.

WHEN I SEE THE PLANNING AND FORESIGHT EMBODIED IN THIS COMPLEX, I FEEL CONFIDENT THAT WE CAN GET THE JOB DONE IF WE GET ENOUGH PEOPLE LIKE YOURSELVES PULLING TOGETHER.

SO, I HOPE YOU WILL FORGIVE ME FOR COMING DOWN HERE ON THIS HAPPY OCCASION AND TALKING ABOUT SERIOUS NATIONAL PROBLEMS LOOMING ON THE HORIZON.

I JUST DIDN'T WANT TO LOSE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SOLICIT YOUR HELP IN MEETING THIS CHALLENGE BECAUSE YOU'RE PRECISELY THE KIND OF PEOPLE WE'LL NEED TO GET THE JOB DONE.

IT'S BEEN ENJOYABLE BEING WITH YOU. CONGRATULATION ON HAVING ACHIEVED THIS SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENT.

THANK YOU FOR INVITING ME.

GOOD AFTERNOON FAAERS....

9/28/90

I WANT TO TAKE THE NEXT FEW MINUTES TO SHARE WHAT UPDATED INFORMATION I HAVE ON THE ISSUE THAT MOST CONCERNS US ALL--THE STATUS OF THE 1991 BUDGET.

TO PUT IT SIMPLY, AS OF THIS MOMENT THE ISSUE HAS NOT BEEN RESOLVED. CONGRESS AND THE WHITE HOUSE CONTINUE TO NEGOTIATE, BUT THERE IS STILL NO WAY I CAN PROMISE--OR PREDICT--A SOLUTION BEFORE WE REACH MONDAY'S OCTOBER 1 DEADLINE.

I FULLY REALIZE THAT THIS IMPASSE HAS PUT MANY OF YOUR LIVES "ON HOLD". BECAUSE OF THIS, I WANT TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT YOU HAVE THE BEST POSSIBLE GUIDANCE WE CAN FORMULATE TO HELP YOU IN MAKING THOSE DECISIONS WE ALL MUST MAKE TO KEEP OUR DAILY LIVES IN ORDER.

THEREFORE, I WANT YOU TO HAVE THE FOLLOWING GUIDANCE:

FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, ALL OF YOU SHOULD REPORT TO WORK AS IF IT WERE A NORMAL WORK DAY.

NOW, HAVING MADE THAT DECISION--AND GIVEN YOU THAT WORD--LET ME DISCUSS THE THREE POSSIBLE SCENARIOS THE FAA FACES AS WE "CLOSE" ON THE MONDAY DEADLINE.

SCENARIO ONE OCCURS IF THERE IS NO CONTINUING RESOLUTION IN EFFECT -- THAT IS, IF THE PRESIDENT VETOS AN UNACCEPTABLE CR OR IF CONGRESS HASN'T PASSED ONE. IF THAT HAPPENS THE AGENCY WILL GO INTO THE SO-CALLED "SHUTDOWN" MODE THAT WE'VE SEEN ON SOME OCTOBER "FIRSTS" IN THE PAST.

UNDER "SHUTDOWN," EMPLOYEES ESSENTIAL FOR THE SAFETY OF LIFE AND PROPERTY OR FOR THE ORDERLY SHUTDOWN OF ACTIVITIES STAY ON THE JOB. EMPLOYEES IN ALL OTHER CATEGORIES ARE TO GO HOME. THIS FORMULA WILL ALLOW THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM TO OPERATE SAFELY.

THIS CR SITUATION WILL BE RESOLVED TO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING SCENARIOS EITHER LATER IN THE DAY ON MONDAY, OR LATER IN THE WEEK. GUIDANCE WILL BE AVAILABLE THROUGH AGENCY MANAGEMENT CHANNELS AND IN THE PRESS BECAUSE THE WHOLE GOVERNMENT WILL BE AFFECTED.

SCENARIO TWO ASSUMES THERE IS A CONTINUING RESOLUTION THAT SUSPENDS THE GRAMM-RUDMAN-HOLLINGS SEQUESTER FOR 10 OR 20 DAYS. THIS WILL ALLOW US TO DEFER ALL FURLOUGH PLANS UNTIL CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT AGREE ON A PLAN LATER IN OCTOBER.

IN EFFECT, THIS SCENARIO IS GOOD NEWS BECAUSE IT SUSPENDS THE FURLOUGHS AND MAY BE A SIGNAL THAT A BUDGET AGREEMENT IS NEAR. NEVERTHELESS, EVEN THOUGH WE WOULD OPERATE UNDER MORE OR LESS NORMAL CONDITIONS, PRUDENCE DICTATES THAT WE IMPLEMENT AUSTERITY MEASURES, INCLUDING RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL, TRAINING, OVERTIME, AND PROCUREMENT.

SCENARIO THREE ASSUMES THAT A CONTINUING RESOLUTION IS SIGNED BY MONDAY THAT DOES NOT SUSPEND GRAMM-RUDMAN-HOLLINGS.

FROM MY STANDPOINT, THIS IS THE WORST CASE. WHAT WE WILL NEED TO DO IN THIS CASE IS TO IMPLEMENT OUR FURLOUGH PLANS STARTING RIGHT AWAY. THOSE EMPLOYEES WHO HAD BEEN SCHEDULED FOR FURLOUGH ON MONDAY WILL THEN BE SENT ON FURLOUGH BY THEIR SUPERVISORS.

THERE IS A POTENTIAL FOURTH SCENARIO, BUT ITS EFFECT IS SIMILAR TO A SUSPENSION OR RELAXATION OF GRAMM-RUDMAN-HOLLINGS AS I JUST DESCRIBED. THAT SCENARIO WOULD BE A CONTINUING RESOLUTION THAT REQUIRES THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM TO BE OPERATED NORMALLY. THERE IS SOME DEBATE UNDERWAY IN CONGRESS ALONG THESE LINES. WHETHER IT SEES THE LIGHT OF DAY WON'T BE KNOWN UNTIL NEXT WEEK.

I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS OPTION AS I CONSIDER US AS A TEAM IN THE FAA AND NO ONE IS MORE OR LESS IMPORTANT TO THE OPERATION THAN ANYONE ELSE.

LET ME SUM UP. I WANT EVERYONE TO REPORT TO WORK AS USUAL ON MONDAY MORNING. FOR OUR PART WE IN MANAGEMENT WILL PROVIDE THE APPROPRIATE FOLLOW-UP GUIDANCE ON MONDAY AS SOON AS WE POSSIBLY CAN.

ONE FINAL WORD. I REALIZE THE HARDSHIP THIS UNCERTAINTY CAUSES FOR ALL OF YOU. I ALSO KNOW HOW WASTEFUL IT IS TO HAVE HAD TO DIVERT SO MANY OF YOU INTO FURLOUGH PLANNING. HOWEVER, HOPEFULLY WE ARE CLOSE TO A RESOLUTION OF THE BUDGET IMPASSE AND WE ALL WILL BE ABLE TO GET ON WITH THE JOB WE DO BEST--RUNNING THE FAA.

THANK YOU.