

**CHILD SAFETY SEATS
TALKING POINTS FOR LINDA HALL DASCHLE
FAA DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
MAY 2, 1995**

Safety is a shared responsibility, and we all must do our part: government, industry and individuals. Parents are responsible for the safety of their children; airlines are responsible for the safety of their passengers; and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is responsible for achieving and maintaining a high standard of safety for the aviation community and the American people.

The FAA shares the goal of the Association of Flight Attendants and Congressman Lightfoot, which is to ensure the safety of children on airplanes through the use of approved and effective child restraint devices. The FAA has recommended the use of child restraint devices on aircraft for more than 10 years.

Mandating the use of child safety seats would escalate the cost of air travel for families and could actually cause more infant deaths and injuries, by forcing parents to choose modes of transportation that have lower costs but higher accident rates. Since 1978, the U.S. aviation system has carried almost four billion passengers. In those 17 years, there have been five infant deaths that perhaps could have been prevented by use of a child safety seat. Compare that to the 278 children under the age of two who died as passengers in motor vehicles in 1993 alone.

According to a study published by the Cato Institute in 1990, if one-third of all families who choose not to fly at higher airfares decided to travel by automobile, they would drive an additional 185 million miles annually. That decision could result in more than 175 disabling injuries and approximately 5 additional highway deaths *every year*.

The FAA is not alone in its concerns about the consequences of a mandatory rule. For the past several years, Congress has rejected such a proposal.

Child safety, and the use of child safety seats, is a high priority for the Clinton Administration, the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration. The FAA currently is engaged in several programs to improve the safety of children who travel by air:

- The FAA has asked the airlines to develop incentives and affordable programs for families, and we are developing a public awareness campaign to educate and advocate programs that help us achieve our safety goal.

- The FAA and NHTSA are working aggressively to revise FMVSS 213 and develop new aircraft specific standards for certification of CRDs. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) has regulatory authority for the design of child restraint devices (CRD), including certification for aviation use. Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) 213 has not kept pace with changes in transportation technology and currently does not account for design differences between automobile and aircraft seats. Not all CRDs perform the same in both types of seat.
- NHTSA, in cooperation with the FAA, is now testing CRDs on both automobile and aircraft seats.
- In the past, child seat manufacturers and designers have not had the information and testing standards necessary to build CRDs that will perform well in aircraft. The FAA research program at the Civil Aeromedical Institute (CAMI) -- to test the efficacy of CRDs -- is a first step in developing and providing this information.

The FAA is working closely with several designers and manufacturers who are working on CRDs specifically for use on aircraft. The FAA also is exploring the feasibility of developing an integral CRD, which would be built into airline seats.

- The FAA is continuing its research program at CAMI. Among other efforts, the agency is working to improve the performance of forward-facing child safety seats -- by looking at alternatives for installation, possible changes in airline seat padding, etc. -- as an interim solution until aircraft specific CRDs can be developed.

The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) has recommended that the FAA pass new regulations mandating that infants on commercial air flights be secured in an approved child safety seat.

Unlike the NTSB, the FAA is required by law to consider the potential costs associated with every rule it issues. Past estimates indicate that mandating the use of child safety seats on commercial airlines could be one of the most expensive rules the agency has ever issued -- perhaps costing families as much as \$1 billion over the next 10 years. The increased cost to each family of four could be more than \$200 per trip.

FAA RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE USE OF CHILD RESTRAINT DEVICES ON AIRCRAFT

In 1994, the FAA tested several types of child restraint devices at the Civil Aeromedical Institute (CAMI) in Oklahoma City. Based on those tests, the FAA has developed the following safety recommendations for children traveling on airplanes:

- children under 20 pounds should be restrained in a rear-facing child safety seat;
- children 20-40 pounds should use a forward-facing child safety seat (there are still some problems with forward-facing seats -- and the FAA is working with manufacturers and other federal agencies to address those problems -- but they are currently the best and safest alternative available for children in this weight range);
- children over 40 pounds should use the standard lap belt that is attached to all airline seats.

The CAMI research also showed that booster seats, harness and vest restraints, and "belly belts" do not provide adequate protection for young children who are traveling by air. The FAA is in the process of preparing a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) which will propose a ban on the use of these devices on aircraft.

###

Remarks prepared for delivery by
Linda Hall Daschle
Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration
Siouxland Washington Conference
Washington, D.C.
May 9, 1995

I am truly delighted to be here today and to have this opportunity to tell you how one of your Federal agencies -- the Federal Aviation Administration is changing.

I know that so many of you have been active supporters of your local airports and the aviation system so it won't come as any surprise in telling you that the FAA is busier today than ever before.

We operate an air traffic control system which handles an average of two flights per second, every minute, every hour, 365 days a year.

With our help, U. S. commercial aircraft will move, today, approximately 1.5 million passengers safely to their destination.

Our safety inspectors perform more than 350,000 individual inspections annually, and almost 1,000 aircraft and airmen inspections per day.

Last fiscal year, FAA's security inspectors conducted 1,025 security inspections at domestic airports.

But like every other federal agency and department, we're also being asked to be even better custodians of the public's trust.

The President, the Vice President, Secretary of Transportation Peña and the Congress have asked us to do more with less -- and do it better.

Well, FAA is stepping up to the challenge big time.

Our budget for the current fiscal year is about \$8.4 billion.

That may not seem all that important, except I should point out that it is approximately the same budget we had 1991.

Yet our responsibilities have grown tremendously.

For example, last year, 555 million passengers boarded flights on U.S. carriers.

That's an increase of more than 8 percent, and the strongest gain in eight years.

We're also downsizing--or as we like to call it, "rightsizing" -- in numbers of people.

By the end of this fiscal year, we will have reduced our full-time employees by more than 4,240 -- an 8 percent drop since fiscal 1992.

This has been achieved while at the same time we are increasing our safety workforce.

FAA has not only been getting smaller. We're getting better.

We've started some bold new safety initiatives that will benefit everyone who boards a civilian aircraft.

We've adopted a whole new way of doing business inside the Agency and with our external customers.

And we've taken concrete steps to make sure we include the aviation community as a valued partner in the things that we do.

After all, air safety is a shared responsibility.

It's the responsibility of the airline CEO who must factor in safety costs when arriving at the bottom line.

It's the responsibility of the pilot in the cockpit, whether he or she is at the controls of a 30-seat commuter aircraft or a 300-passenger jumbo jet.

It's the responsibility of airport directors who oversee something like 200,000 takeoffs and landing per day.

And most of all, safety is FAA's Number One priority.

That was true when I came to FAA.

It's true now, and it will continue to be true.

It's the fundamental thread that runs through everything we do.

If you read or watch the news, you might question how safe the system is.

A plane goes down. A runway collision occurs. Suspect engine parts are discovered.

The FAA is mentioned, of course, but often for acting too slowly or ineffectively.

I certainly don't mind seeing aviation stories on the front page or on the news magazine shows.

If anything, close scrutiny by the media has made us change our mindset.

It raises safety issues in our conscience as well as the public's.

It makes us work even harder and faster to reach a goal of "zero accidents."

I do wish the stories had a better balance between positives and negatives.

Sometimes, unjust accusations are made and misinformation spreads.

But in the "big picture" scheme of things, I think the benefits of intense media coverage far outweigh its less desirable aspects.

To me, what makes the real news is very different.

Safety is our primary business, and very few of our ongoing safety initiatives ever make the news.

For example, we issue an average of more than one airworthiness directive per day throughout the course of a typical year.

These are preemptive steps that we take to improve safety and avoid accidents.

And I'd also point out that they are prompted by our own inspections and safety analyses, not from the National Transportation Safety Board recommendations that follow an accident.

Recently, we took two steps unprecedented in the history of aviation safety.

Last January, Secretary Peña and FAA Administrator David Hinson sponsored a safety conference that involved more than 1,000 people from industry and government.

The goal was to start developing plans for a revolutionary way of thinking about air accidents.

That is, they don't have to happen.

Zero accidents.

We should no longer accept a safety level of less than 100 percent.

That's an enormous challenge.

Eliminating accidents requires a fundamental change in the way we think.

It demands a new emphasis on human factors, the latest in advanced technology, and it requires a road map for changing the way we do things.

A road map is just what came out of the January meeting.

In February, we produced an Action Plan detailing 173 government and industry safety initiatives that address 45 concrete safety issues.

The conference also underscored the FAA policy of "shared responsibility" that I talked about earlier.

It recognizes that the goal of zero accidents requires a full commitment from everyone who flies, regulates or maintains airplanes.

That's why we've taken real steps to lower the barriers to information exchange.

As a result of the safety conference, all segments of the aviation community will have access to safety data that can help predict trends and anticipate problems.

And they can contribute that data without fear that it might backfire and be used to enforce actions against them later.

We took another step toward the zero accidents goal in March.

We put out a proposal that would require all commuter flights to meet the same rigorous safety standards imposed on the major air carriers.

We call it the "One Level of Safety" concept.

I sometimes get the question, "Isn't this going to hike up the cost of commuter fares?"

The answer is: Yes.

But we believe the increase will be negligible, an average of only about \$2.00 per trip.

Clearly, "One Level of Safety" is worth the price in both dollars and lives saved.

I've talked a lot about safety for a couple of reasons.

As air travelers, I know it's on your minds.

But the way we've handled safety issues in the last year or so is also a reflection of the new way of doing things that we now live by at FAA.

When I became Deputy Administrator in November 1993, FAA had too many layers of management.

We could not focus effectively on our highest-priority goals.

We were not as responsive as we could be to the needs of the aviation community.

In the last 18 months, all that has changed.

Today, FAA is a leaner organization that I firmly believe is more in sync with our aviation customers.

About six months ago, we restructured FAA along our six key functions: regulation and certification, air traffic, research and acquisitions, airports, security and administration.

Each of the six offices now serves as a clearly accountable focal point for its products and services.

Our goal is to make FAA run more like a business--the best-run "business" in the government.

We also are working very hard with the aviation community to review and reform the regulatory process.

A major initiative the FAA undertook last year was the 1994 Presidential Regulatory Review.

That review was aimed at eliminating or amending existing regulations to reduce regulatory burdens.

Informally dubbed the "Hate-a-Reg" project, FAA asked the public to identify the three regulations they viewed as unwarranted, inappropriate, or unduly burdensome, and to recommend alternatives that would still ensure the level of safety found in the current regulations.

We had over 180 commenters, who submitted more than 426 recommendations.

Also by listening to our customers, the FAA developed the National Route Program.

Not long ago, planes traveling in the highest altitudes had to line up single file, sometimes hundreds of miles from their destinations, and follow zigzag routes along navigation waypoints on the ground.

Now, we let pilots pick the most fuel-efficient routes between 104 city pairs.

Last year, the airlines estimated that the National Route Program saved them more than \$40 million.

With an expansion of the program that was effective in January, we believe the cost savings could double to \$80 million.

Changing our regulatory procedures also helps speed up the rulemaking process.

Consider the new safety standards for commuter aircraft that I talked about a few minutes ago.

Within 100 days of the deadly crash last December of a commuter flight in North Carolina, we had that rule ready to roll out.

It was the shortest time ever for development of a new air regulation.

In the past, it has sometimes taken years from the time a rule was conceived until the time we proposed it.

There were over 100 decisions to be made, from changes in emergency lighting to the number of first aid kits available on the aircraft.

It took a team of 50 of our best FAA people working long, long hours and many weekends to pull it off.

There's one point that I'm especially proud of.

Both the overall manager of the effort and the rulemaking program manager were women.

That's the kind of commitment to diversity we must continue to have for FAA to reflect the true face of America.

The recent certification of the Boeing 777 jetliner is another perfect example of how FAA now exercises its regulatory authority while being flexible enough to meet American aviation's needs.

The 777 was literally designed inside Boeing's computers.

The plane's innovative design and engineering challenged us at FAA.

We had to develop a certification process flexible and efficient enough to ensure comprehensive testing of the new airplane.

At the same time, we had to be sure it fully complied with our rigorous safety standards.

To certify the 777, FAA employees invested more than 84,000 hours -- about twice as much as the agency has invested in any other certification program.

We were involved deeply and directly in every phase of the certification program.

FAA was also involved earlier in the design phase of the 777 than on any other project.

This was at Boeing's request. We were able to alert Boeing early on to design areas that might pose potential problems or delays in certification -- and that made everybody's job easier.

And perhaps something that is closer to home are the changes we are contemplating to our administration of airport grants.

Under our AIP Reengineering Project, we are completely redesigning FAA's airport planning and grant process.

Here's one example of how, in the past, we had been reluctant to change our grant application process.

For over 50 years, we've asked Chicago O'Hare to tell us their address on government forms requesting airport grants.

I'm not sure why, O'Hare has never moved.

This new way of doing business isn't unique to FAA.

Secretary Peña has announced his plans to restructure the Department of Transportation, FAA's governmental home for the last 29 years.

The current plan is to combine the Department's 10 agencies into three, focusing on land, sea and air transportation.

Of course, the final structure will be put in place only after the statutory changes are approved by Congress.

But the goal will be the same as what has driven us to reorganize FAA.

It will foster a better environment to deliver essential transportation services.

In a sense, the details are not as important as the principle.

We in Washington are listening to what you have to say.

In our regulatory functions, we're trying to be less monolithic, less rigid in the way we deal with business and state and local government.

We realize that keeping American aviation Number One in the world requires a team effort, whether we're inside the Beltway or in the heart of Siouxland.

I'd like to think we can all pull together for this common good the way the citizens of Siouxland banded together to cope with the United 232 accident.

The images from that ordeal stick vividly in my mind.

The faces of the victims.

The faces of the thousands of people in the community who gave of themselves in the aftermath.

We saw the same faces of tragedy and triumph a few weeks ago in my birthplace, Oklahoma City.

No one who watched those events unfold could ever use the term "faceless bureaucrat" again.

It brought home that federal employees are real people who work long hours at difficult jobs for one reason: to serve their country.

That's really the bottom line message I'd like to leave with you today.

We at the FAA aren't just a legion of bureaucrats preoccupied with process and procedures.

We're the air traffic specialist in a control center handling hundreds of planes safely.

We're the engineer at our technical center in Atlantic City, working overtime to develop new technology that will put more planes and passengers in the sky, more safely and at lower fares.

We're the analyst in Washington who tries to find ways to make the rules work better for everyone in the aviation community.

So when you return to the Heartland, I hope you will remember that FAA isn't just a government agency.

It's people--real people--working together with you to strengthen the future of aviation in America.

Talking Points

Linda Hall Daschle, FAA Deputy Administrator
Groundbreaking: Cessna Single Engine Aircraft Manufacturing Plant
Independence, KS
Friday, May 19, 1995
4:30 p.m.

- The FAA is committed to working with Cessna to spur the growth of general aviation.
- The passage of the General Aviation Revitalization Act of 1994 has paid direct dividends -- as we see here today with this ground breaking.
- I'm pleased to announce that the agency is committed to working with Independence and Cessna officials to improve Independence Municipal Airport in Kansas.

Cessna Develops Spare Parts Tracking System

- Cessna initiated a spare parts tracking system -- tagging each and every spare part -- to verify FAA approval for each spare part it ships to customers.
- Tagging spare parts simplifies the burden of proof for Cessna's parts distribution customers who must comply with FAA spare parts standards.
- Tagging its spare parts as FAA-approved holds Cessna accountable to its customers and the flying public for conforming to FAA safety standards.

ILS Coming to Independence Municipal Airport

- We are working with Cessna and city officials to install an instrument landing system at the Independence Municipal Airport.
- The Independence ILS will accommodate up to 30,000 operations per year when it is installed.
- The ILS is planned for runway 35; no plans for a back-course approach at this time.
- The Independence Municipal Airport currently has three non-precision instrument approaches.
- The new ILS will be better able to accommodate increased air traffic from the new Cessna manufacturing plant.

Linda Hall Daschle
Cessna Plant Groundbreaking
Independence, KS
May 19, 1995

- This is a great day for Cessna, a great day for Kansas and a great day for American aviation.
- And on behalf of the Clinton Administration, I am delighted to participate in this celebration. Supporters of a strong aviation industry are numerous, but the really strong supporters are with us today. Senator Dole, Congressman Tiahrt, Secretary Glickman, Governor Graves, Ed Stimpson, Phil Boyer. And I would also like to mention Senator Kassebaum, whose efforts helped us get to this point today.
- Maybe there's something about Cessna and the month of May. You know, it was 50 years ago this month that Cessna engineers first put the two-seat 140 on the drawing board.
- That immensely popular airplane and its successors helped make Cessna the world's most successful manufacturer of light aircraft in the years following World War II. Year after year, Cessna set the pace in making airplanes and flight instruction available to the American public.
- We're now poised for a similar renaissance today. And again, Cessna is leading the way.
- This new plant is going to be a tremendous economic boon to Kansas. It will create about one thousand new jobs right here in Independence, and as many as six thousand more jobs among suppliers and support organizations around the state.
- We at FAA know the new plant will increase operations at the airport as the new Cessnas come rolling off the assembly line. I am pleased to tell the community leaders and Cessna that the FAA wants to work with you to make needed airport improvements, and Administrator Hinson and I are committed to commissioning an Instrument Landing System here in the near future. There are, of course, many details to work out. But the bottom line is that we want to be partners in making this airport even safer and more useful.
- But this plant will not only benefit Kansas and the city of Independence, it will also stimulate the general aviation industry as a whole.
- Last year, general aviation manufacturers shipped just 928 aircraft. By 1998, 2,000 single-engine airplanes per year will be produced in this plant alone. Those numbers signal a true renaissance for general aviation manufacturers and the entire general aviation community.
- It is clear that this bright outlook was made possible by the passage of the General Aviation Revitalization Act last year. Your chairman, Russ Meyer, predicted that it would lead to "a rebirth of our industry." I wholeheartedly agree.

- I had the pleasure of being in the Oval Office when President Clinton signed this bill. It was a great moment for aviation, and in particular, for general aviation.
- Many people worked for many years to get a good general aviation product liability bill. But I want to especially cite the tenacity and determination of GAMA President Ed Stimpson. Ed made passage of the bill a personal crusade for nearly a decade.
- In fact, his efforts were recognized earlier this week by the Aero Club of Washington, which gave him its Trophy for Aviation Excellence. Ed, I'd like to join in that salute to your dedication. The thousands of people who make up the nation's general aviation community owe you their gratitude. **[Note: Stimpson is scheduled to attend groundbreaking.]**
- The new product liability law will help manufacturers generate innovative product lines, higher sales, and thousands of new jobs. It's bound to give U. S. industry a boost in the highly competitive global marketplace. Ultimately, it's going to mean that more pilots will be able to fly more hours in more airplanes.
- Like Cessna, the FAA is at the forefront of the general aviation revival. We developed a new General Aviation Action Plan with a coalition from the aviation community. And we're working with the industry on new incentives to improve safety, lower costs and develop new products.
- Cessna is one of our most highly valued industry partners in these efforts. We hope your new plant is just the start of a new era of success, not only for Cessna, but for the entire general aviation community in this country.
- Thank you.

###

**Remarks prepared for
Linda Hall Daschle
FAA Deputy Administrator
Transport Workers Union Legislative Conference
May 24, 1995**

I'm happy to be here today to talk with you about the future of aviation, and how we can work together to embrace the changes and challenges the future will bring -- and turn them into opportunities.

FAA employees and members of the Transport Workers Union are all on the same team. We may not always agree about all of the details, but we share many of the same goals.

We all believe that safety is our number one priority. It permeates everything we do -- and that shows in the results we've achieved. Thanks to our combined efforts, air travel in the United States is the safest in the world today.

We all believe safety is a shared responsibility -- that it takes the hands-on, eyes-open commitment of every person who flies, services or repairs an airplane.

It concerns every FAA employee at every FAA facility across the nation. And it concerns every aviation maintenance technician who lays a wrench on an airplane, large or small.

We all believe that the American public must have absolute trust and confidence in the safety of air travel. We work every day to earn and reaffirm that trust.

We are determined to do everything possible not only to *maintain* our high standards of safety and performance, but to improve them.

And we all believe that aviation plays a vital role in the long-term economic health and wealth of this great country.

But we cannot ensure the nation's economic well-being by relying on old strategies. The world is changing quickly. To stay competitive, to continue to succeed, we must change with it. That applies equally to government and to the private sector.

From Seattle to Savannah, Americans are demanding changes that will make their government work better and cost less.

You work with the aviation system every day, so it won't surprise you to learn that the FAA is busier today than ever before.

We operate an air-traffic control system that handles an average of two flights per second, every minute, every hour, 365 days a year.

With our help, U. S. commercial aircraft will carry -- today and every day -- about 1.5 million passengers safely to their destinations.

FAA safety inspectors perform more than 350,000 individual inspections annually -- almost 1,000 aircraft and aircrew inspections daily.

In fiscal year 1994, FAA's security inspectors conducted 1,025 security inspections at U.S. airports.

But like every other federal agency and department, the FAA is being asked to be an even better custodian of the public trust.

I'm sure you have read or heard about the recent Senate and House budget actions. I can truthfully say I have never seen a time quite like this -- and I have worked on FAA's budget for more than a decade.

Over the past two years, the FAA budget has declined by more than 6 percent: \$600 million. At the same time, aviation traffic has grown by more than 6 percent.

We have stepped up to the challenge. We have canceled programs that outlived their usefulness. We have overhauled others, like the Advanced Automation Program, and gotten them back on track.

We have reduced the FAA workforce by nearly 5,000 employees, while adding controllers and inspectors to the safety workforce.

I can tell you that we honestly do not yet understand the full impact of the recent budget proposals. They will be debated in Congress and additional details will be worked out.

But one thing is certain. We are reaching the point where the FAA will not have the funds to do the job America expects us to perform.

The Senate budget is particularly troubling. It assumes the traveling public would pay at least \$14 billion in taxes and fees to get the same level of service offered today.

We could be forced to cut 13,000 FAA jobs by 2002, with immediate cuts in FY96. So far, we've been able to protect out safety workforce from the budget ax. But cuts of this magnitude can't be absorbed by just chopping overhead or administrative staff.

We could lose nearly 20 percent in our capital investment accounts. Putting new technology in the field will be delayed. Every program -- from weather and windshear detection equipment to terminal automation -- will be affected.

The Airport Improvement Program might be eliminated. No more airport grants to upgrade for safety and capacity. And where will airports look to make up for the loss of federal money? Most likely, to airport users.

Yes, we've been threatened by such Draconian proposals before, and we've survived.

But counting on the idea that FAA will survive these cuts because we are somehow unique...that our mission is so critical...is terribly risky.

That is one reason the Clinton Administration has proposed creating a new government corporation for air traffic services.

This is more than a clever way to get 40,000 employees off the federal payroll. We believe that this is the best way to advance aviation safety, efficiency and economy at a time when the industry is experiencing almost exponential growth.

Current FAA forecasts estimate that U.S. airlines will be carrying more than a billion passengers annually by 2010 -- double the number of last year.

Establishing a government-owned corporation to run air traffic services would help us cut through the red tape that currently hampers our procurement planning.

It would give us flexibility in personnel policies, to make sure that the best people can be placed where they are needed.

And it would help guarantee that new technology moves as quickly as possible into the nation's airspace system.

A new air traffic services corporation will make American aviation safer and more efficient. That's in everyone's best interests.

We talk a lot about reducing the number of government workers and handling budget cuts. But even as FAA is getting smaller, we're getting better.

We've adopted a whole new way of doing business inside the agency -- emphasizing efficiency, productivity and accountability.

We've taken concrete steps to make sure we include the aviation community as a valued partner in many of the things we do.

And we've continued to advance bold new safety initiatives that will benefit everyone who boards a civilian aircraft.

One of the most recent and most comprehensive, of course, is the proposed Commuter Rule, which will require commuter airlines to abide by the same rigorous safety standards as the major air carriers.

Our reason for proposing this rule is simple: there must be one level of safety. The American public must know that every scheduled flight is equally safe -- whether the plane has 10 seats, 30 seats or 300 seats. The commuter industry has grown tremendously since 1978, and the number of annual commuter passengers are expected to triple within the next 10-15 years.

We're really proud of this proposal. We developed it in just 100 days -- a record for such a complex rule -- and we believe it is a critical step in making a safe system even safer.

As you know, the proposed rule would require commuter operators to establish and use flight dispatch systems. It includes dispatcher qualification, record keeping and flight release requirements.

The FAA strongly believes that directing commuter operators to have trained, certified dispatchers will be an important boost to safety. Dispatch services are particularly critical with the short turn-arounds common in the commuter industry.

When it is implemented, the proposed commuter rule could have a profound effect on the number of working dispatchers.

Today, operators that will be affected by the new rule employ about 89 dispatchers. We estimate that the new requirements could create 294 new dispatcher jobs in 1996, and another 90 positions between 1997 and 2005.

That's almost 400 new dispatchers over the 10-year period -- about a 450 percent increase over today's level.

Dispatchers aren't the only people whose jobs are affected by the demands for an even safer system. Many TWU members are aviation maintenance technicians -- men and women who are on the front line of aviation safety. You are charged with keeping the nation's air fleet running safely and efficiently -- and you do an outstanding job.

In Part 66 of the Federal Aviation Regulations, we have proposed significant changes in the way aviation maintenance personnel are certified and trained.

These changes, if authorized, will be good for your members, the maintenance industry as a whole, and the safety of air travel.

We don't believe it should be up to the repair station or the operator to make sure maintenance personnel are qualified.

We think the training and currency requirements for transport and other classes of aircraft should be clearly defined. And that's just what Part 66 will accomplish.

We also believe that the rule will result in more and better opportunities for aviation maintenance technicians and their employers.

The chance to be certified for more specific areas of maintenance should make workers better qualified to move up the ladder in terms of wages and responsibility. And the companies who employ those highly skilled technicians will be that much more competitive in the world marketplace.

Remaining competitive is a major factor in the bottom line today. The increased globalization of aviation has forced the industry to change profoundly the way it does business.

The good old days, when the United States could dominate the market just because we were the biggest kid on the block, are gone forever.

That's true whether we're talking about building and selling airplanes or maintaining them.

I truly believe that the best way to deal with foreign competition is to confront it head on.

What you must do is to build an absolutely impeccable reputation for quality work, for fair pricing, and for on-time delivery of services. And do some smart planning. Look carefully at the industry's maintenance needs -- then develop capabilities that satisfy those demands.

Consider the maintenance contract that American Airlines just got from FedEx for its Boeing 727 fleet.

Yes, it was part of the sales agreement for some American MD-11s. But the deal was made that much more likely because American had created a winning combination at its Tulsa, Oklahoma repair station.

American had invested substantially in research and modernized equipment at Tulsa. The facility also had developed -- with help from the TWU -- cost-effective, high-quality solutions to the maintenance challenges faced by many carriers.

If labor and management work together to build a reputation for quality and capability, the contracts will come to U. S. companies. That's economic reality. And that will translate into more jobs, and better jobs, for your members.

As I said earlier, we may disagree over some of the details of how we can make our nation and our citizens more prosperous. But we all agree that long-term economic growth and a better quality of life for American families should be our goal. And I believe that the best way for us to achieve that goal is by working together.

The Clinton Administration and U.S. labor make a winning team. We believe that the best way to sustain and increase the prosperity of American workers is to accept and manage change.

The world will continue to change. Our challenge is to accept those changes, transform them into opportunities to create a new era of long-term economic growth and prosperity for the United States and American aviation.

Thank you.

###

FAA News



Washington, D.C.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Friday, May 26, 1995

APA 51-95

Contact: Kay Templeton Garvey

Tel.: (202) 267-3883

Fred O'Donnell

Tel: (310) 297-1431

FAA SPONSORS ANNUAL AIRPORT BUSINESS DIVERSITY CONFERENCE

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), with the Airport Minority Advisory Council and the San Diego Airport and Unified Port District, will sponsor the 11th annual Airport Business Diversity Conference, May 30 - June 1. FAA deputy administrator Linda Hall Daschle will be the featured speaker at the three-day conference in San Diego's Hyatt Regency Hotel.

"The small and disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) program, legislated in 1988, has a solid record of achievement," said Daschle, a long-time advocate of entrepreneurship and public-private partnerships. "When airport authorities receive FAA grants for airport or development projects, they turn to DBEs to help get the jobs done. In 1994 alone, \$363 million out of the FAA grants to airport authorities went for DBE contracts. FAA and airport officials recognize that DBEs can be counted on to deliver quality goods and services on time and within budget."

The annual conference offers workshops to facilitate airport sponsors' compliance with DBE rules and to help DBEs learn about contracting opportunities. Sessions on marketing, joint venture arrangements, airport issues, legislative developments and legal updates are also part of the conference agenda.

"We are proud to sponsor this conference for building partnerships with representatives of airport authorities, DBEs, DOT and FAA," Daschle said. "It facilitates networking with majority firms for small and disadvantaged business owners who create jobs and enrich our national economy by nurturing the next generation of entrepreneurial talent. Working together, we help the transportation industry to stay healthy and our national economy to continue its upswing."

The grant legislation sets participation goals for small, disadvantaged businesses in airport concessions. The legislation also covers FAA-assisted contracts such as professional services, construction and equipment purchases on airports.

###

**Remarks Prepared for
Linda Hall Daschle
Deputy Administrator,
Federal Aviation Administration
Airport Business Diversity Conference
May 30, 1995**

I'm extremely pleased to be here today to participate in this Airport Business Diversity Conference.

I'm proud of what FAA does in working with airport sponsors and businesses involved in the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program. I'm proud of the progress we've made together, even though we aren't yet exactly where we want to be.

I'm sure at least some of you wonder what all the changes in Washington mean for the DBE program.

Will a smaller FAA be as responsive to your needs? Will we be caught up in the debate over affirmative action?

Given today's turbulent political landscape, people are naturally concerned about what the future holds for them. That's as true for us at FAA as it is for you, your airports and your businesses.

Local airports and businesses work together every day. You know the aviation system. So it won't come as a surprise when I say that the FAA is busier today than ever before.

We operate an air traffic control system that handles an average of two flights per second, every minute, every hour, 365 days a year.

With our help, today U. S. commercial aircraft will move approximately 1.5 million passengers safely to their destination.

Our safety inspectors perform more than 350,000 individual inspections annually, and almost 1,000 aircraft and aircrew inspections per day.

Last fiscal year, FAA's security inspectors conducted 1,025 security inspections at domestic airports.

But like every other federal agency and department, we're also being asked to be even better custodians of the public's trust.

I'm sure you have read or heard about the recent Senate and House budget actions. I can truthfully say I have never seen a time quite like this -- and I have worked on FAA's budget for more than a decade.

Over the past two years, the FAA budget has declined by more than 6 percent: \$600 million. At the same time, aviation traffic has grown by more than 6 percent.

We have stepped up to the challenge. We have canceled programs that outlived their usefulness. We have overhauled others, like the Advanced Automation Program, and gotten them back on track.

We have reduced the FAA workforce by nearly 5,000 employees, while keeping the nation's airspace as safe -- if not safer -- than ever.

I can tell you that we honestly do not yet understand the full impact of the recent budget proposals. They will be debated in Congress and additional details will be worked out.

But one thing is certain. We are reaching the point where the FAA will not have the funds to do the job America expects us to perform.

The Senate budget is particularly troubling. It assumes the traveling public would pay at least \$14 billion in taxes and fees to get the same level of service offered today.

We could be forced to cut 13,000 FAA jobs by 2002, with immediate cuts in FY96. So far, we've been able to protect our safety workforce from the budget ax. But cuts of this magnitude can't be absorbed by just chopping overhead or administrative staff.

We could lose nearly 20 percent in our capital investment accounts, which would seriously delay new safety technology. Every program -- from weather and windshear detection equipment to terminal automation -- would be affected.

The Airport Improvement Program might be eliminated. No more airport grants to upgrade for safety and capacity. And where will airports look to make up for the loss of federal money? Most likely, to airport users.

Yes, we've been threatened by such Draconian proposals before, and we've survived.

But counting on the idea that FAA will survive these cuts because we are somehow unique...that our mission is so critical...is terribly risky.

It was this combination of personnel reductions, budgetary constraints, and an ever-growing demand for our services that led to the restructuring we announced last November 30.

The new organization is formed along the six operating arms of the agency, all of which represent very distinct product and service lines. I believe we will now find it much easier to manage our programs like a well-run business.

Streamlining and reorganizing alone can't solve all our problems.

In the history of the FAA, there have been 25 reorganizations. Yet we continue to manage contracts, allocate money and handle personnel as we always have.

The FAA is faced with modernizing an aging aviation system at a time of growing customer demands and shrinking budgets.

We have to work under rigid personnel rules that make it hard to hire the best and brightest people, and to put them where we need them.

We are slowed down by a procurement system that handicaps us in getting the latest technology into your airports.

And we must compete for funds even as entitlements and interest on the national debt consume more and more of the federal budget.

We need a new form of organization. It must be flexible and be able to adopt new technology to meet the changing needs of the industry.

The Clinton Administration's solution is a not-for-profit, government-owned U.S. Air Traffic Services Corporation.

The corporation will be fully funded from fees charged to users of the air traffic control system. And -- like any other business -- it will be able to borrow money to finance major capital programs.

Alternatives have been offered in Congress. It's certain there will be lively debate on the various bills.

But I think there is a broad consensus that the time has come to change. We have to get on with the job of assuring the future growth of American aviation.

I believe that the U.S. Air Traffic Services Corporation is the best way to achieve that goal. We need the corporation, and I am confident that it will succeed.

So, even in this demanding environment of change, we have some reasons to be optimistic. And I'm particularly encouraged by the success of the DBE program.

Over the past few years, the program has a solid record of achievement.

Every year since 1988, when DBE legislation was put in place, airport sponsors have surpassed the statutory goal of not less than 10 percent for federally assisted projects.

Those numbers weren't just barely over the target. They surpassed them by a wide margin.

For example, in 1994 DBE firms received \$363 million in contracts under the Airport Improvement Program. That's more than 20 percent of the total.

While these numbers are encouraging, we have to expand the range of DBE activities.

Much of the DBE participation in airport improvement projects is in construction contracts.

We want to make sure DBEs have the same level of success in other areas, particularly the professional services sector.

For example, there have been few opportunities for disadvantaged businesses in architectural, engineering, and planning services. These areas also are covered by goal-setting requirements when federal funds are used.

We've asked our regional civil rights offices to ensure that the overall DBE participation goals include professional services contracts under AIP projects.

We must ensure that airport sponsors fully consider DBEs for these opportunities and reach out to seek qualified DBEs.

We also have made good progress toward the DBE goal for airport concessions.

For FY93, the last year for which we have results, DBEs took in 7.8 percent of the gross revenues from all concessions at primary airports.

On a nationwide basis, we haven't reached the minimum 10 percent goal. But we have seen substantial increases in getting DBEs involved in concession activities at many airports.

The Department of Transportation is now reviewing a rule that will make it easier for airports to meet their concession goals. The rule will broaden the range of businesses that qualify as DBE firms.

I feel certain that disadvantaged businesses will participate in more areas of concession operations. They will gain a greater foothold in activities such as management contracts and subcontracts. And they will be able to provide a full range of goods and services to airport concessionaires.

By expanding the definition of DBE participation, we will extend opportunities to a host of new businesses.

Throughout government we need to be open to new ideas, because the old ways just aren't working too well anymore.

But as the winds of change blow through Washington, we have to be sure that they don't sweep away valuable programs that work well, all in the name of "reform."

Both government and the corporate world are finding that dealing with disadvantaged enterprises just makes good business sense.

Larger firms profit -- literally and figuratively -- by doing business with the many aggressive, highly qualified small, disadvantaged companies.

These businesses often offer unique products or services at very attractive prices because they are hungry to build their reputations.

In government, we've discovered the same thing. Disadvantaged businesses deliver quality goods and services on time and on budget. They broaden our horizons and give us new and different ways to serve our ultimate customer: the American taxpayer.

Our society can grow and succeed only if its opportunities are as diverse as its people. The same is true for aviation -- and for every other industry.

I'm confident that, even in a changing political world, programs to assist small businesses will continue to thrive.

We look forward to helping you create opportunities and to help you enrich our national economy by nurturing the next generation of entrepreneurial talent. Thank you very much.

###