COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

House Transportation Committee
Public Hearing on
Small Airports

Pages 1 through 94

Sewickley Country Inn Ohio River Boulevard Sewickley, Pennsylvania

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Met, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

REPRESENTATIVE SUSAN LAUGHLIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Aviation
REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD J. CESSAR
SENATOR GERALD LAVALLE
REPRESENTATIVE LARRY ROBERTS
PAUL PARSELLS,
Executive Director, Transportation Committee
PAUL LANDIS,
Minority Executive Director,
Transportation Committee

Commonwealth Reporting Company, Inc.

700 Lisburn Road Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17011

(717) 761-7150

1-800-334-1063



CONTENTS

. !		
2	<u>SPEAKER</u>	PAGE
3	Opening Remarks - by Chairman Laughlin	3
4 5	Keith Chase, Deputy Secretary for Aviation Department of Transportation	4
6	John Rinehart, Executive Director Reading Regional Airport and President of the Aviation Council of Pennsylvania	33
7 8	Homer King, President Aero Club of Pittsburgh	53
9	Rosemary Palmer, Director Erie International Airport	64
11	Dan Donatella, Chairman of the Board Beaver County Airport	73
12	Jim Dunbar, Vice President Aero Club of Pittsburgh	81
13		
14		
15		

Any reproduction of this transcript is prohibited without authorization by certifying reporter.

PROCEEDINGS

10:15 a.m.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: I would like to introduce some members on the panel here. On my far left we have Julie Boyle who is the Transportation Committee secretary. Paul Landis is on the staff of Representative Rick Cessar, and Rick Cessar is on my immediate left here. He is the Minority Chairman of the Transportation Committee. We have Senator Jerry LaValle, who is my Senator from Beaver County, and we have Paul Parsells who is the Executive Director of the Transportation Committee.

It's very nice to see so many people here. I have been asked to conduct this hearing since I became Subcommittee Chairman of the Aviation Committee. By the way, Russ Fairchild, who is the Minority Subcommittee Chairman of Aviation, was unable to make it. I talked to him last week, and he wished that he could be here with you but he had another commitment. I just wanted you to know that he really wanted to come down.

We have some very good testimony, and we have some very good people here testifying on some of the concerns of the small airports, and possibly, through legislation, we may be able to make some changes that need to be done.

The first person to testify is Keith Chase, who is the Deputy Secretary for Aviation with the Department of

Transportation. I am so happy that he was able to come down here and give us this testimony.

So, you may start right now, Mr. Chase.

MR. CHASE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. One of the things I will ask even before I begin is that, so our Legislators can see the charts, if possibly someone could position the two charts I have here, maybe, at each end so that you can see them. I will refer to them at a couple of points in my remarks.

The other point I will make, even before I give you my prepared testimony, is that I have attached a map at the back of the testimony that is similar to that map of Pennsylvania airports, and you may want to refer to that as well.

Finally, I know I have about a 15-minute time limit. While I believe that I have somewhat of a lengthy presentation, I will try to go through it quickly, and hopefully it's informative despite the possibility of exceeding my allotted time.

I do appreciate the opportunity to address the Committee regarding the Commonwealth's aviation programs focusing on the needs and challenges of small airports.

There is much attention today to the larger elements of our aviation system, as seen through the President's recent National Commission to Ensure a Strong and

Competitive Airline Industry and the construction of a few major airports, such as Denver's and the tremendous new Pittsburgh Mid-field terminal, but it is indeed laudable that you underscore the value of small airports by holding this hearing today.

Just as the interstate highway system works in concert with lower volume traffic routes, so we must plan for an aviation system comprised of large and small airports in order to provide access and efficiently move people and goods.

The Bureau of Aviation works to promote, develop and preserve Pennsylvania's airport system. Act 164 of 1984 authorizes the Bureau to provide assistance to all public airports, including those are privately-owned but publicly accessible. Act 164 also provided for expanded airport development.

Over the years, program appropriations have steadily increased from \$1 million annually in the 1980's to the current \$6.75 million level. If that chart could have been shown going back to the early 1980's, the growth in the rate of state assistance airports would be even more steep. These funds frequently are tied to federal assistance and are key to ensuring the growth and development of Pennsylvania's airport system.

Our airport programs are funded through a tax on

jet fuel, 1.8 cents per gallon, and AvGas at 3.6 cents per gallon. In addition, Acts 117 and 223 of 1990 provided nearly \$21 million in bond financing for over 130 improvement projects and 40 public airports. Act 188 of 1991 authorized another \$7.49 million in bond financing for capital projects at five public airports. Another \$6.7 million was authorized in Act 47 of 1993.

With this major infusion of capital budget assistance, Pennsylvania is a national pacesetter in financial support for small airports. In the fiscal year '92-'93, we had over 250 active projects to show on the chart with \$29.3 million in state funds.

Pennsylvania ranks fourth nationally in the number of airports per square mile. There are 141 public-use airports and over 350 private airstrips. Of those 141 public-use airports, 16 provide scheduled commercial service. The remainder are smaller general aviation airports. There are six scheduled-service airports that provide service by large commercial carriers. The remaining 10 provide commuter service.

Pennsylvania's 125 public-use general aviation airports and more than 350 private-use airstrips provide access and important services to the many businesses, future pilots and pleasure flying groups that utilize general aviation aircraft.

The economic significance of these airports, however, is easily overlooked. Our 1988 Aviation Economic Impact Study estimated that general aviation airports and heliports annually contributed approximately \$250 million in economic output, capital expenses, sales and taxes, \$53 million in payroll and were associated with the creation and sustaining of 3,700 jobs.

Local general aviation airports serve as catalysts in attracting and sustaining industry in the Commonwealth. Surveys show that companies consider proximity to a general aviation airport to be either essential or important in their site selection criteria.

I can tell you first-hand that Tioga County, for example, has forfeited opportunities to attract firms in that county because the only airport, state-owned Grand Canyon, could not accommodate business aircraft with its tiny 2,200-foot runway. That runway will be extended to 3,600 feet next year.

It is also essential to remember that many of these smaller airports add to the capacity of our larger airports by relieving them of general aviation traffic which could cause delay and heighten the safety challenge.

It is news to no one that the aviation industry has been experiencing turbulent times in recent years. We've seen the demise of Eastern Airlines, Pan Am and Braniff

Airlines, as well as the problems encountered by TWA and Continental, among others. The airline industry has lost a whopping \$10 billion over the last three years, and recently the elimination of 28,000 jobs at Boeing jolted this segment of our economy.

General aviation, as well, has felt the impact of the prolonged economic recession. Some of the major causes of the general aviation downturn include a decrease in corporate and recreational flying, the cost of complying with new environmental laws, insurance liability demands on airport owners and operators as well as aircraft manufacturers, inadequate or nonexistent local zoning ordinances to protect airports, insufficient local revenue, private or public, to assist in maintenance, development or expansion and pressure by land developers to acquire property in close proximity to existing airports with the resultant degradation of safety.

The picture may not be all negative, however. Some forecasts do indicate that the downward trend may soon level or even reverse. The General Aviation Manufactures' Association reports the general aviation manufactures are well-positioned for growth once the economy recovers. The third quarter increase in GNP in this regard is encouraging.

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association also expresses confidence for the future of general aviation, and

it is worth noting as an aside that a new general aviation airport will open in Bedford, Pennsylvania next year.

I will briefly overview the revenue base of small airports to simply demonstrate their huge financial challenge today. Airports derive their revenue from several sources. Larger commercial airports receive most of their revenue from passenger and freight carriers and related operations. Smaller scheduled-service airports and general aviation airports have a variety of revenue sources, none of which, however, are large in and of themselves.

Airline service at small commercial service airports generally does not contribute substantially to operating revenue and capital improvements. The contribution is usually limited to landing fees and terminal space rentals. Given the size of the aircraft normally operated and the counter space required, this income is usually minimal. A few smaller airports provide some terminal concessions which also contribute to airport revenue.

Almost all general aviation or commuter airports rely significantly on aircraft maintenance operations and services as the main source of operating revenue. Whether operated by the airport or contracted to a fixed-based operator, this generally comprises the bulk of airport income. Aviation services cover a wide variety of activities and the mix varies from airport to airport.

If an airport has the space available and financing can be arranged, aircraft storage facilities, hangars, are provided. However, the cost of constructing these facilities has become so expensive that net revenues rarely break even with expenses.

Recently, T-hangar storage for 20 aircraft was built at Lancaster Airport. Even with full occupancy the facility barely breaks even, providing no addition net revenue from this airport cost center.

Aircraft storage is, however, a source of operating revenue in those cases where the buildings have been in place long enough to be amortized. Many airports would like expanded subsidies for hangar construction. To date, this has not generally been a priority for the either the FAA or the state DOT's in light of larger capital improvement needs and due to the somewhat private nature of these projects.

The subsidy question aside, there is a bona fide need for more hangars. Many GA airports have long waiting lists of aircraft owners desirous of such facilities.

In several communities, county or municipal financial support -- general aviation airports -- provides enough revenue to offset small operating shortfalls. There is no single source of revenue, however, that can be regarded as a base for operating funds. Our small airport operators continue to display much resourcefulness and creativity to

survive a very trying and difficult operating environment.

Some select issues: Among key issues for small airports are compliance with environmental mandates and land encroachment associated with housing and business development. Many of Pennsylvania's airports were designed and built in an era of little development outside large population centers.

Some communities are also increasingly concerned and active in efforts to control airport-related noise. The Pennsylvania Bureau of Aviation has been assisting airport owners and operators concerning these new and high visibility challenges.

A recent example is the Van Sant Airport in Bucks County. The local municipality issued airport noise restrictions exceeding federal standards. The new ordinance imposed a \$500 daily fine on the airport exceeding the local noise standard.

The airport faced possible closure since the new requirements were not possible to meet, especially since the airport had no control over transient aircraft using that airport. As a further obstacle, the municipality imposed an amusement tax on glider operations which would further reduce the airport's ability to remain financially viable.

The Bureau and the Federal Aviation Administration proved in federal court that the FAA has responsibility for

regulating aircraft noise. Therefore, the local noise ordinance was preempted. Local governments find themselves frequently pressured by new residents, developers and others to close airports or drastically curtail operations.

I do not want to depict the airports as helpless victims, though. More now than ever they must adapt to change and reach out to their community. This is especially so in the arena of environmental regulation. New requirements for underground fuel tank removal, contaminated soil, storm water runoff and development pressures will greatly challenge many of Pennsylvania's small airports.

We must also carefully weigh the pros and cons of unfunded mandates on airports. House Bill 2157, for example, would require airport authorities that purchase additional property or easement by eminent domain to remit the amount of lost tax revenue to the municipality in which the property is located.

These acquisitions are almost always pursued for reasons of public safety and therefore have public benefit.

This proposal could discourage such efforts and could further squeeze already thin airport pocketbooks.

I'd like now to overview some of PennDOT's aviation programs. Many of the Department's programs are indeed tailored to the needs of airports that are not eligible for federal assistance.

First, aviation development; it's on your bar chart -represents the blue portion. Our Aviation Development
Program funds most airport development projects. Runway and
taxiway construction, airport lighting systems and
obstruction marking, land acquisition, installation or
improvement of nav-aids, navigational aids, are but a few
examples.

The Bureau generally funds 50 percent of the non-federal share of federally funded projects and 75 percent for non-federally funded projects. Of the 92 projects to be funded under the '93-'94 Aviation Development Program when Representative Cessar and the rest of the Commission considers it on Thursday, 53 projects, or 58 percent, are federal aid projects. The remaining 39, or 43 percent, are funded through the 75/25 state local participation.

Approximately \$13 million in requests were received this year for consideration. The current level of funding provided is \$6 million, \$4 million for all category airports and \$2 million that is a special appropriation for business category airports, which are the blue dots as you look at the map.

This year we will allocate considerable more funds for smaller general aviation airports than in prior years.

If discretionary federal aid continues to contract, the importance of state funding will, of course, increase.

I would like to note, as an aside, that we are working to produce standard designs for certain projects like fuel system replacements in order to reduce project costs and further stretch our resources.

The Capital Budget: Beginning in fiscal year 1990-1991 -- and the Capital Budget, for everyone in the room today, is the pinkish-type bar over there. That's really responsible for the major growth in Pennsylvania aviation funding.

Beginning in '90-'91 and each fiscal year since, the General Assembly has included in the Commonwealth's budget, Capital Budget, a cumulative total over that period of over \$35 million in bond-financed airport projects.

Almost all of these projects assist small commercial and general aviation airports.

Our Department has been diligently working with the airport sponsors to promptly let these projects. Projects in over 40 airports are included in the first four years of our Department's 12-year planning program.

The Capital Budget funding has helped to free up additional dollars within our annual development program for projects at small general aviation airports. For example, several scheduled-service airports have used the Capital Budget funds to leverage 90 percent federal funding for federal improvement projects.

Our tax rebate program: The real estate tax reimbursement program provides tax relief for public airports. Portions of airport property which are not revenue-generating, like runways, taxiways, clear zones, are eligible for tax reimbursement. Our 1992 program provided approximately \$155,000 in relief to 35 public airports.

Pennsylvania is one of only a few states that offer this type of assistance to help preserve privately-owned public-use airports. This program is funded from the 3.6 cents tax of AvGas which I mentioned earlier. It usually yields about \$400,000 to \$500,000 annually in revenue, and any unused funds, anything over that \$155,000, we reprogram for additional development projects.

Our runway and taxiway rehab -- kind of a highway maintenance of airports: The runway rehab program provides \$500,000 annually to preserve runways and taxiways by filling cracks, sealing pavements and performing minor repairs. The program began four years ago to help small airports preserve and protect their facilities.

The Department provides 75 percent of eligible project costs. This year we will issue approximately 14 grants to eight airport sponsors. For any of these programs, if you would like me to provide you with lists of the grantees, I would be glad to mail that to each of you.

Runway marking: Our runway marking, or painting

program, is unique. It provides, at no cost to the airport, painting for touchdown bars, center lines, runway numbers, taxiway center lines, etcetera, for public airports. The Bureau provides the labor, the equipment, which is paint, and material to perform these projects. About 15 airports are completed each year.

Airport licensing is a major responsibility for the Bureau of Aviation, and in order to ensure the safety of the many airports and heliports in Pennsylvania, each facility is inspected by the Bureau prior to licensing. In addition, Bureau staff conduct annual safety inspections at all public airports and public heliports to make sure that they are complying with Pennsylvania aviation requirements.

WeatherMation is something we are hearing more of a clamor for. WeatherMation is the trade name for a computerized satellite-based weather information system which has been in operation in Pennsylvania since early 1989 with the installation of 40 user-friendly computer systems at Pennsylvania airports.

The system provides ready access, either locally at each site or via modem, for the many daily users to assist in pre-flight planning. Five of the units which have the highest usage have been upgraded in the past year to keep pace with technological advances, and I would like to expand the program to many other airports and do these updates as

quickly as we can.

Funded virtually entirely by the Department, this program has been exceptionally well received by the aviation community, and now we are studying the feasibility for providing current weather information directly to the aircraft in flight, utilizing new technologies.

Each year the Bureau provides other services at no cost. We continue to provide updates to our state aeronautical chart and airport directory. We provide high visibility markers for utility wires adjacent to public airports.

Our highway sign program improves directional signing to all public airports. I know that everyone is interested in highway signing, and everyone seems to be an expert at highway signing.

Our aviation staff is always available to provide technical assistance, and we continue to participate in various research programs for improving and marketing our aviation infrastructure.

Now I would like to touch on a few select special initiatives, and each I could talk about at length, but I will be very brief. Several special initiatives are worthy of note. First I would like to talk about our air service study and provide you with copies of the executive summary here.

The Department earlier this month released its assessment of Pennsylvania air service. The Department commissioned this study due to increased concern over the financial stability of commercial carriers, the recognized link between scheduled commercial service and economic development opportunities and the Commonwealth's responsibility to promote a strong commercial airport system.

The study's objectives were to document where air service demand is generated, to develop existing versus potential demand scenarios for each market using data from travel agent services, to identify factors which impact each local market, to outline specific market opportunities for realistic air service and to provide a hands-on air service planning tool for each region.

This is a study that won't sit on the shelf because we have provided a copy to each region that has data specific to that region. Here again, if you would like copies of those technical reports on a region by region basis, I would be more than glad to provide them.

The study provided recommendations regarding specific air service improvements for each market that can realistically be supported, technical data for airlines to verify and support as they evaluate service improvement recommendations, summary documents and a slide presentation useful for communicating study results with various groups

and a self-help tool which will aid local awareness of the community's roll related to air service initiatives. Again, the executive summaries are available to the Committee members and to those in attendance today.

An aviation systems plan: Next year we intend to complete a state-wide airport system plan for Pennsylvania. It has been too long since this had been done in our state. This will be done with extensive participation of airport sponsors and regional planning agencies throughout the state.

We will develop a comprehensive system needs planning document which will provide an improved basis for targeting federal and state resources. This document will include a priority listing of crucial air transportation system needs. Work begins in partnership with the aviation community on December 2nd to consider the work scope.

System plans are frequently FAA funded, but FAA planning dollars are scarce. We consider this project to be very important and will, therefore, start it with state funds and pursue federal funds as we go. I can keep your Committee apprised of progress on a regular basis if you wish.

Turning to airport hazard zoning; Act 164 required zoning within airport hazard areas to limit the height of objects around airports. It requires communities having land within a airport hazard area to include limits on the height of structures based on their proximity to the airport. To

date, over 65 airports have reported that one or more communities in their vicinity have passed or are considering implementing ordinance.

Bureau of Aviation personnel continue to provide technical assistance to encourage compliance, but the compliance rate is low, too low, approximately 30 percent, for various reasons including general reluctance among municipalities to zone and the lack of penalties in the law or incentives for complying or not complying respectively.

We are going to attempt to double compliance by the end of the next fiscal year. Emphasis will be placed on commercial service airports first, initially concentrating on runway approaches. Later the focus will extend to other hazard areas and then to smaller non-airline service airports.

I would like to talk about something I'm very excited about and that's PennDOT-Aviation Council Strategic Action Plan, of which I brought copies of the first draft of this document.

The Bureau of Aviation maintains a very close working relationship with the Aviation Council of Pennsylvania. The Council has two primary goals; to serve as the voice of aviation in Pennsylvania and to serve as a vehicle for sharing information among airport managers.

One thing I would point out to the Committee is

that in several cases we have statutory advisory committees in the Commonwealth. We have a rail freight advisory committed that is created. We don't have such a body for aviation. The Council is not created in statute, and I would just point that out for your information.

PennDOT and the Aviation Council recently completed the joint action agenda that I held up a moment ago. The action plan includes special initiatives in the areas of economic development, aviation safety, public awareness, government relations -- they are interested in talking to you more -- and education. I am personally excited over our upcoming efforts in each area and, in particularly, economic development.

Here, what we plan to do immediately is to publish a directory of properties on or near airports which commerce and other economic development agencies, locally and regionally, can use to assist in targeting commercial or industrial development.

Aviation safety is addressed in several ways. The Department continues to fund and participate in safety seminars in conjunction with the AOPA and the Federal Aviation Administration. With the Aviation Council we have jointly provided and are planning more future seminars at various locations to benefit small airport operators.

The Bureau and the Council work together in

promoting aviation awareness, and in support of this effort a speakers' bureau is planned, recognizing that more has to done to help promote the importance and the understanding of aviation, particularly as it relates to our small airports.

Some of the goals within the strategic action plan have already been met. Many are in process, and all are expected to be achieved between now and 1996, and I have copies available for you.

Environmental seminars: I mentioned earlier that environmental compliance is a key challenge, and perhaps the major challenge, for small airports today.

On May 26th, PennDOT and the Council sponsored an aviation environmental workshop. Presentations covered the environmental assessment process, storm water management, de-icing facilities and preparation of airport specific environmental plans covering hazardous materials and waste management.

The presentations were made by professionals from industry, regulatory agencies, technical consultants, airport operators, etcetera. Conference attendees registered for only \$25, far less expensive than similar conferences which are usually, typically cost prohibitive for personnel from small airports.

The Department has also been providing technical assistance and project funding on a priority basis to help

address underground storage tank requirements. The FAA does not fund these projects, so airports are increasingly looking to PennDOT. Fuel is the lifeline of airports, and as such, this has been an area of increased focus.

-6

Summary: By way of summary I would just like to highlight a few directions and opportunities I believe are important for small Pennsylvania airports.

Number one is sustained funding. Maintaining federal and state funding for airport development truly represents a sound investment in transportation and economic infrastructure. I believe we can further improve the strategic allocation of these funds through the upcoming aviation system planning effort.

Two is expanded technical assistance. Our roll in providing technical assistance will only grow. Assisting airports in complying with environmental requirements like storm water management appears to be an area where we can provide valuable help while avoiding duplicate expenditures by small, financially strapped airports.

Three is to establish closer ties with economic development organizations. Some small airports like Hazelton's, for example, have a well established and results-oriented relationship with their region's economic development entities. Many others do not. I intend to promote these ties statewide through our work and partnership

with the Pennsylvania Aviation Council.

Four is ISTEA, something we have heard of over and over. The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, or ISTEA, of 1991, the federal legislation for transportation, made major changes to the transportation planning process, and we strongly advocate active involvement of airports in their regional planning processes. I don't believe it's happening in many areas, and we need to work very hard at promoting more involvement of airports in that process.

Five is creative funding. It may not be realistic to consider increasing aviation taxes to fund airport improvements. The jet fuel tax, for example, is levied on the airline industry which is reeling in financial trouble.

We do need, however, to see how we can creatively apply other programs and financing instruments, such as low interest PEDA loans, to airports. So far we have been looking at this, but it's been difficult and may require some adjustment to legislation that could be considered.

Number six, participation in the Pennsylvania

Aviation Council, is something I cannot advocate enough for airports and people interested in aviation who are not involved. I believe that here in Western Pennsylvania the representation is not as high as it is in other areas of the state, and it should be.

I'm most excited over the opportunities for partnership we have with the Council, and looking forward -- and I'm very appreciative of it's forward-looking orientation. I'd advise any airport in Pennsylvania, as I said, to get involved with the Council Six or seven new committees have been formed recently with very ambitious and results-oriented agendas.

Seven, and lastly, is customer service. PennDOT and its Bureau of Aviation will continue to explore new ways to be closer to our customers, making sure our efforts and resources are linked to their priorities and needs. We have reduced our time in processing grants, for example, and now we are exploring the feasibility of further enhancements through the use of electronic transfer of funds as is done by the FAA.

Pennsylvania is moving ahead to improve it's aviation and other infrastructure, and this is key to our ability to remain competitive in an evolving global economy.

Through the support of you, the legislature, Pennsylvania remains a leader in closing federal funding shortfalls through alternative financing as shown on that chart. This is demonstrated through our capital budget initiatives, real estate tax reimbursement program and funding of smaller privately-owned airports through our aviation development program.

I want to thank you again for this opportunity to address the Committee and for allowing me to take more time than I was allocated. I will be glad now to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much, Keith. I know you have answered a lot of my questions here, but first I would like to tell you that we do have another member from the Transportation Committee, Representative Larry Roberts, here.

We will start with Representative Rick Cessar.

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: No questions. That was a very good report. I appreciate the time and effort you put into this report.

MR. CHASE: Thank you, Representative.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: How about you?

SENATOR LAVALLE: Just one comment, maybe; you allude to the environmental mandate, and one of the concerns I think a lot of us have is that we have a tendency not to be able to get a balance between economic issues and environmental problems as with the attempt to use abandoned mill sites. What do you suggest would relieve some of this, or how do you approach that? I know we have environmental concerns, but sometimes I think we tend to go in a much stronger direction than we need to.

MR. CHASE: I think overall, Senator, our approach

within PennDOT is we are not a conflicting agency with DER. We attempt to work in partnership with them. Now, that may sound trite, but I think we have done some very concrete things to actually move the process along wherever we can.

Within the past couple years, you may be aware,
PennDOT has created a Bureau of Environmental Quality, and if
I have to sum up just in a few words what they do that is
very valuable, it is that the Bureau of Environmental Quality
has streamlined the environmental process from the project
side.

For example, one of the things the Bureau does is it will bring the resource agencies all together in one room so that the project sponsor will not have to go through individual hurdles, but be able to deal with the resource agencies in one setting and all at once.

Beyond that, I think what we need to do in terms of aviation specifically is the following: I think PennDOT has a role in advocacy before the DER, and we're prepared to do that. John Rinehart will probably talk later a little bit about storm water management. This is an emerging concern.

There are things going on nationally that I think we need to be advocates before DER and try to work with them to come up with reasonable approaches.

I think, in addition to the advocacy roll, this technical assistance roll is probably going to take more and

more of our time, but it is an area that should take more of our time because there are many small airports who, for them, this is entirely new ground in terms of complying with environmental regulations. It's indeed a change for them, so I think what you will see is a greatly expanded environmental technical systems effort on our part.

Through the Bureau of Environmental Quality, for example, we have a number of open-ended contracts that work to move projects quickly through the environmental process. The Bureau of Environmental Quality is not just the highway service agency, but I've already talked to the Director, Wayne Kober, and we are looking at ways, through these openended consulting contracts, where we can go out and help small airports, and they won't have to do it on their own.

As I have talked about the financial situation of small airports, I hope I have given you the impression or the idea that they are operating on a shoestring. Many are, so when they have to look at the prospect of an expensive consultant to help them comply with environmental requirements, it's typically prohibitive.

Nevertheless, these environmental laws and environmental regulations are there for a reason, and we are not going to fight them, but we are going to help the airports comply with them.

SENATOR LAVALLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: I just wanted to ask you one thing. Over the last ten years have there been a lot of the small airports closing down?

MR. CHASE: There have been, and that's been particularly the case in southeastern Pennsylvania where the pressures for land use are even greater. In fact, as I contrast the southeastern part of Pennsylvania with this portion of the state, one of the things you have here that is the envy of southeastern Pennsylvania is a very strong reliever system.

You have a number of airports like Beaver County and Allegheny that provide very important relief, as I had mentioned in my remarks, to the scheduled-service facility, which in this case is Greater Pitt, but, yes, we do have airports closing, and the important part of the upcoming aviation system plan is to get some baseline definition of what is our minimum system; almost the equivalent of asking the question of what would happen if Route 80 or traffic Route 15 went out of existence?

We're going to be asking those kinds of questions and doing that kind of analysis for airports. But, that is a trend representative, and it is a trend that we should be concerned about.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Well, I'm glad to hear that because I don't think we can afford to have any more of our

small airports closed down, especially in this day and age and in the future.

MR. CHASE: You're absolutely right.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: I don't know if Larry Roberts has anything to question you on.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Yes, I do. First of all I would like to apologize for being late, but if I were able to fly in, I would have been here on time.

MR. CHASE: I flew in, and I still arrived late.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: I miscalculated all the construction on the highway up I-79. I am a licensed pilot, so I am very much familiar with some of the problems that we have, and I am also aware of the trend that you spoke of.

It concerns me as a private pilot because when you fly around, you like to know where the airports are, and you like to have the convenience and the availability of a place to land, if you have to land, and sometimes just for a little recreation.

I am pleased to have this map. I was late and didn't get all your testimony, but since I have the text, I will read this and am pleased to have this. I'm going to tell you that I'm going to use this map, as a flyer, because it will come in handy.

The FAA, as you know, provides us with sectional charts, those of us who fly. Unfortunately it splits

Pennsylvania so if I fly, I have to use several maps and charts and try to go from one to the other.

My question is; in trying to promote aviation in Pennsylvania, do we have an aviation map just of Pennsylvania, just for flyers?

MR. CHASE: We do.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Do we?

MR. CHASE: We do, and in addition to providing you with multiple copies of the map, I will provide you, Representative, with multiple -- along with this map I will provide you with multiple copies of our aviation map and be glad to have you share that with your constituents and others who are interested.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Good, that will be good to have.

MR. CHASE: It's an excellent map, and what I will do is provide copies of the map and the airport directory. We have an excellent airport directory. My suitcase was too packed this morning, so I couldn't fit everything in there, as you can see here, but the airport directory is an excellent resource, and I will make sure you have each next week.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: I wasn't aware of that. I do have an airport directory for the United States, but I didn't know there was one for -- that was going to be my next

question.

MR. CHASE: I will give you the Pennsylvania airport directory, and maybe we need to do a better job of letting people know it's out there, but that's always a challenge.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Thank you very much.

MR. CHASE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Any other questions?

[No response]

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: I just want to say to you that in your testimony you spoke about legislation possibly being needed to help the small airports, and I would very much like to work with you in putting together the language in that legislation.

MR. CHASE: I appreciate that, Representative, and it is needed. I think, particularly when we look at programs like PEDA, there may be technical type amendments that are going to be very valuable to airports. Right now, for example, they cannot do these hangar projects because I think there is a \$400,000 minimum floor, and we need to get that floor a little lower so that these projects can be affordable for the small airports. I will look forward to working with you and the other members. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much for the excellent testimony, and thank you for coming.

MR. CHASE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: The next person to testify is John Rinehart, and he is the Executive Director of the Reading Regional Airport.

MR. RINEHART: Madam Chairman and members of the Aviation Subcommittee, I am John Rinehart, President of the Aviation Council of Pennsylvania to which Keith referred so kindly in his remarks before. I believe that my testimony will be somewhat briefer than his because my staff is somewhat smaller, and I don't have as many people.

Our members include large and small public and private airports ranging in size from Pittsburgh International to Smoketown, and diverse airports ranging from large full-service organizations to "mom and pop" enterprises struggling to eke out a living in the aviation industry. Our membership includes large multinational corporations with multi-aircraft flight departments capable of intercontinental flight and small businesses with one single-engine aircraft used to travel about the Commonwealth.

We also represent the interests of recreation pilots, those who fly for the shear joy of it. Therefore, my testimony will touch lightly on a wide variety of subjects important to all of our membership.

The Council is privileged to work closely with the Department of Transportation represented so ably here today

by it's Secretary, Keith Chase, and the Bureau of Aviation led by Charles Hostetter. I am pleased to say that our relationship is symbiotic in character. Together we have achieved a great deal over the past few years, and judging from the scope of work Keith laid out, we have a lot of work to do.

Over the course of the past few years the General Assembly has approved the distribution of critically needed financial aid to small airports in Pennsylvania, the development fund to which Keith referred. The Department of Transportation, with the Bureau of Aviation, has worked hard to distribute the money in the shortest time possible. We airport operators are grateful for that quick response.

On behalf of those airports which received funds from ACT 117, 223, 228 and more recent acts, let me say thank you.

You will be pleased to learn that the Westmoreland County Airport Authority used their funds to purchase snow removal equipment, to construct an access road, to rehabilitate a runway and a taxiway, to expand an aircraft parking apron, to build a fuel farm, T-hangars and a parking lot. They used \$650,000 of state money to attract over \$2 million in federal assistance. Good investment.

Lancaster is using their money to purchase land and to improve their terminal building.

The Clearfield-Jefferson Counties Regional Airport Authority leveraged \$235,000 to attract \$2.5 million in federal assistance. With it they extended a taxiway to the full length of the runway, rehabilitated and expanded their terminal aircraft apron, installed a new fuel farm and removed several old underground tanks in accordance with DER regulations.

The Reading Regional Airport Authority received \$1.114 million and used it to dispose of hazardous waste left by a former tenant, to rehabilitate one taxiway and to construct another, to light both taxiways, to rehabilitate two aircraft parking aprons and to refurbish the passenger terminal in accordance with ADA regulations. Reading used their funds to attract an additional \$1.6 million in federal funds.

Other recipients have been equally successful in leveraging their state funds to complete vitally important projects. As impressive as this has been, there is much left to be done.

Most organizations appearing before the General Assembly come hat in hand requesting more money. We will not disappoint you today. Airports across Pennsylvania need the continued support of the General Assembly if we are to retain a vibrant aviation infrastructure.

Federal mandates to install airfield signs, to purchase

land for safety areas at the end of runways, to clean up our environment, to improve the accessibility of our terminals, to acquire rescue equipment and to improve security all require large sums of money. Little is left over to adequately maintain our basic infrastructure of runways, taxiways and aprons.

The Bureau of Aviation distributes approximately \$6 million a year to airports. The source of these funds is from fuel taxes, but somehow or another they don't seem to have kept up with inflation in these bad, or rough, economic times.

This has been just a fraction required to fill needs and is an insufficient amount to maintain the barest necessities such as pavement and lighting. There is precious little, if any, money to build hangars and other service buildings on our airports.

A husband and wife who successfully run their privately-owned airport recently told me that they had risked their entire retirement nest egg to build a few T-hangars to store small aircraft on their airports, as the customers wanted. After three or four years they are now just beginning to see a margin of profit to redeem their nest egg.

"Special" funds are welcome, but airports need the assurance of a steady stream of funding if they are to do a

better job of long-range planning. Hit or miss financial aid programs do little to instill confidence. Airports are afraid to plan ahead. Lending institutions need assurances that they will be repaid.

We would like to encourage the members of the House Aviation Subcommittee to look for some additional funds to boost the annual state aid to airports to continue the development program, if you will.

We recognize that merely throwing money at the problem without accountability is unthinkable. The General Assembly and the citizens of Pennsylvania need to be assured that their funds are being spent wisely. For that reason the Bureau of Aviation needs to be supported in their two efforts.

First is a realistic state system plan of airports which they are now undertaking. This plan must be more than a compilation of the wishes and desires of airport sponsors and pilots based at the airports. The planners must be charged with a requirement to remain within a budget and to make tough decisions to recommend projects which will benefit all of Pennsylvania, but to do that they need some kind of dollars out there and assurance of that.

Second, the Bureau should be supported in their efforts to develop a system for prioritizing requests for funding which come before them. The criteria should include

costs benefit analysis as well as safety and other necessary matters, and they should be as objective as possible.

The Council would encourage the General Assembly to find some way of supporting strategically important airports which are privately-owned and available for public use. Many privately-owned airports serve important roles in the economy of Pennsylvania and need to be retained.

The Council and the Bureau have initiated discussions with the Department of Commerce to establish a loan program for financing revenue producing projects on airports such as hangars, T-hangars, fuel farms and the like. Small airports cannot put together a large enough loan program to attract favorable interest rates. Lending institutions look at building constructions at airports as poor risks in many cases. The Department of Commerce should be encouraged to work with the Bureau in this effort.

Earlier I spoke of the high costs of federal mandates. The greatest of these costs is associated with the quality of our environmental requirements. Airport administrators understand and support efforts to clean up our environment. However, the costs of compliance is already high and climbing yet higher.

Airport operators have spent large sums of money to remove underground tanks and to remediate contaminated soil problems. Many of these tanks have been abandoned by

previous tenants without any financial wherewithal or legal obligation to clean up after themselves.

Now an additional problem is coming before us.

Recent federal and state efforts to establish and enforce regulations regarding storm water runoff have airport administrators quivering in their boots. Many airports in Pennsylvania are participating in a national group which is formed to help the federal Environmental Protection Agency to identify the problems and to find solutions.

Sadly, the deadline for publishing federal regulations has passed without so much as a notice of proposed rule making. The Council has just learned the EPA is expected to publish their proposed regulations within a few days.

The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources is charged with regulating storm water runoff within the state. DER seems no closer than the EPA to the publication of their proposed regulations. The Council hopes that DER will examine the EPA regulations carefully before proceeding with their own.

I wish to assure members of the Committee that it is the intent of our membership to comply with the regulations. We only ask for DER's consideration regarding the unique character of airports. It is our contention that regulations should be environmentally sound and financially

feasible. The Council is seeking a joint audience with the Bureau of Aviation and DER to discuss our concerns.

The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of
Pennsylvania has seen fit to pass legislation requiring local
jurisdictions to govern the height of construction around
airports. Many airports have enjoyed the cooperation of
those surrounding communities to comply with this
legislation, but not all communities are willing to restrict
the landowner's use of his or her property. Enforcement
efforts should be increased and sanctions placed against
those communities that refuse to comply.

While we're on the subject of airport zoning, let me suggest that it might be wise to push zoning requirements beyond simple regulations governing height. Airports have been struggling with noise issues for several years. Many airports are already surrounded by noise-sensitive neighbors and burdened with the cost of relief.

There are some airports which enjoy open space around them. This open space should be preserved or planned for compatible land use. Owners of residential properties do not like to hear that the airport was there first and that they should learn to live with it or move.

Intermodalism, ISTEA, has become one of the leading transportation buzz words of the decade. A statewide planning effort is underway to identify how we can link the

various modes of transportation more advantageously. This effort should be applauded, and those of us in the Council have been participating.

When completed, it is to be looked to for direction regarding the wisest use of funds. An airport without adequate access roads is useless. Airports should exist for a purpose, as well, and Pennsylvania is fortunate to have a Secretary of Transportation who is a strong advocate for intermodal transportation.

Airports are not only part of the transportation network, but they are also part of an economic network.

Several airports in Pennsylvania are surrounded by office and industrial parks. Others are surrounded by vacant land which could be used to the economic advantage of communities.

Industrial parks are compatible with airports.

They create jobs in the community. They help to finance the development of the airport. Combined with airports they generate a significant impact on the economy of Pennsylvania as documented by the study which Keith shared with you. Airports help to create jobs. The Council would encourage greater use of the resource of vacant land which surrounds many of our airports.

Returning to money again, I would like to discuss a procedural matter with you. According to the present procedures, an airport must file a request for funds with the

Bureau of Aviation to draw down on allocated funds. For some reason, beyond the Bureau of Aviation, several weeks pass before airports receive the funds.

This places a financial hardship on those airports and the contractors whom they hire. Somewhere there is a log, and I think only one, which, if loosened, will release the flow of funds in a more acceptable time frame.

We would like to recommend the state follow the example of the federal government and set aside a grant amount in a bank and permit the airports to draw down on their account after documenting compliance with the program to the satisfaction of the Bureau.

Some of you have expressed concern for the high cost of interstate air transport before the Aviation Council. We share your concern, but we cannot seem to gain the attention of the airlines. We would like to see lower fares for short-haul traffic across Pennsylvania. Lower fares would help to draw Pennsylvania together. However, we would be opposed to any effort to re-regulate the airlines. Somehow we just have to work it out.

Madam Chairwoman, the Aviation Council of
Pennsylvania appreciates the interest of your Committee in
our concerns. We pledge our cooperation in a combined effort
to position Pennsylvania to meet our air transportation needs
in the 21st century.

We thank you for this unique opportunity to appear before you and the rest of the members of Committee.

I must say that Keith and I say somewhat the same things because we talk together a lot, but we did not rehearse this presentation.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Rinehart. That was very informative. You were speaking about procedure to fund the Bureau of Aviation at a faster pace. I think we do have -- not a faster pace. I shouldn't have said that.

It's the Bill that we have in the Business and Economic Development Committee to support what you have been suggesting here on getting your funding in a timely fashion. I don't know if it covers airports, though.

No? It doesn't. It's only vehicles. Maybe we ought to include -- it's only trucks for what, trucking?

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: I think that's what it is.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Maybe we ought to include airports in that.

MR. RINEHART: We would be pleased to hear that.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Okay. Well, we are taking care of some of the people, anyway, but there was one other question I wanted to ask you and it just left my mind for right now. I don't know if Rick has something else to ask.

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: Thank you, Madam Chairman,

I do. You mentioned you are opposed to re-regulating the

airlines. Why?

MR. RINEHART: At this particular point I think we have gone a long way down the road to seeing airlines work on a competitive basis. I think what I'm saying here is, in light of what's happening in Hawaii where Senator Inowe has introduced legislation at the federal level to permit the State of Hawaii to regulate funds for intra-island flight within the state, there may be some attention or some efforts to do that in other states. I don't know. I keep hearing that.

I don't think that is the way that we would solve the problem here. I think that somehow or another we have to work with the airlines to convince them that there are lot of people who would go from the eastern end of the state to the western end of the state in the aircraft and save ground transportation if we could work it out and work out the fares. I think it's a marketing tool that we have to do -- we, as users, need to do with the airlines.

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: I think we have a problem here. If you fly from Pittsburgh to Philadelphia, Pittsburgh to Harrisburg, it's outrageous what we are being charged. From here to Harrisburg it's like \$400. From here to Philadelphia it's almost \$600. Deregulation really hasn't helped in that area, has it, for the short flights?

MR. RINEHART: It hasn't, and there are too many

little stories, anecdotal stories, where it's cheaper to fly to the west coast than it is to fly to the western part of the state from the eastern part of the state. I think we need to work on that, and I think we need to work in a cooperative effort with the airlines to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: Don't you think regulation would help the small airports, small airlines?

MR. RINEHART: No, I think not. The issue here now is the small airlines, the regional carriers, the ones that serve the Readings of the -- the other, however many, are served only by commuter carriers. Those are the air carriers that are making money. US Air Express, to my knowledge, is doing quite well financially, thank you. US Air is having some problems.

That's another issue, but they have separated, and right now the competition among the long-haul routes -- along the long-haul routes -- seems to be driving the fares down where there is not an adequate amount of competition, or comparable competition, at the short-haul routes to drive the fares down. That's where I think it needs work to be done.

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: Another subject; when you talk about small "mom and pop" operations, what are you talking about?

MR. RINEHART: I mean just that, a family of two in a privately-owned airport.

1 2 3

 REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: How big, what can they accommodate, runway size and all that? Should we really be spending money to try to keep those operations in business? Is it worth our effort?

MR. RINEHART: I'm not sure that, and I may get in trouble on this one, but I'm not sure that every airport is worth state's attention. I wouldn't contend that, and those that are there for other reasons may be supported by their own users.

However, I think the Commonwealth can look at some kind of criteria which is developed out of key statewide systems study which would pinpoint those publicly-owned, as well as privately-owned for public use, airports that are valuable to the state's economy and as well to the state's recreation; not only business economy, but the state's recreation.

A lot of people come to Pennsylvania in their airplane just for recreation. We can fund those pinpoint airports that are valuable and support them. I think that would be -- as to every airport, I'm not so sure.

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: I agree with you, because we talked -- we look in terms of developing an intermodal transportation system, and it is vital that we do have a good intermodal transportation system along with the small airports. I concur with you that not every airport in this

Commonwealth ought to be considered for some type of financing.

MR. RINEHART: I may lose my job as President for saying that, but that's okay.

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: Well, you won't lose your job because I won't say anything and nobody else here will either, but I do thank you for your comments and appreciate them.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much. I just remembered what I wanted to ask you. Are there regulations on the level of noise coming from airports? I know they don't have them at some of the industrial sites. I just found that out. There is no regulation for noise levels. Is there any regulation on noise levels for the airlines, or airports?

MR. RINEHART: Yes, on the airline airports, definitely. The FAA has established a series of regulations which has been more restrictive in terms of noise over the last several years. Stage three, the quietest stage is to go into effect somewhere about the turn of the century, if I'm not mistaken. The airlines are now in the neighborhood of 40 percent to 45 percent compliant, as I recall, on a national basis with that regulation.

That's true. That is happening. As far as the

smaller GA airports with the single-engine aircraft, light twins, I'm not familiar with any regulation. However, in planning for airports, whether they be public or private, there are guidelines to suggest compatible land use around the airports in relationship with noise. That's why I refer to land use planning.

There's a number 65 LDN, whatever that means, but there is a number out there to contour, noise contour, that's generated around the runways which would suggest to the communities that are willing to cooperate with the airport that this would be a place not to build houses.

This would be a place to put something else such as a golf course, and industrial park, a business center or some other kind of thing that would help the economy of the community and also the economy of the airport insofar as the airport would not be required to buy the residential development at a future date.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you. Jerry, do you have anything to add?

SENATOR LAVALLE: I would just be interested in knowing -- you say in your testimony that you want to have an audience with the Bureau and DER about your concerns.

Obviously your concerns are environmentally sound rules and regulations that also match up with being financially feasible. I would be very much interested in knowing what

the results of that meeting may be.

MR. RINEHART: So would I at this point. What we're looking for here is specifically, and let me target the Storm Water Compliance Act -- just that we've passed the deadline. We're trying to find out what's going on here. There has been a lot of conversation back and forth between Washington and Harrisburg in terms of how these are going to be applied to the Commonwealth. Many airports have been visited, or some airports have been visited, by representatives of DER to talk about storm water. That makes us nervous. Are we hanging out there because we have not filed with certain things, certain applications? This is going on.

What we would like to do, and it's what I just saw before I came, or late yesterday when it came in the mail -- the EPA is now looking to publish their regulations regarding storm water. If what I saw is correct, a lot of us who were nervous yesterday need not be worried today because we don't put enough de-icing materials out there to be a cause of concern.

I hope that's the case, and I hope the DER follows along with that. We want to be compliant, we want to be supportive, but there are limits to our financial capabilities.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Larry, would you like to ask

something?

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Yes. Do you know off-hand if any of the airports in Fayette or Greene Counties are members of the Council?

MR. RINEHART: I think so, but I can't specifically say which ones.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Could you get that information for me and let me know if my airports are members?

MR. RINEHART: I certainly will.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: I have another question that perhaps I should have asked to Secretary Chase, but perhaps you could answer it. On the map that we received in the Secretary's package I'm looking at the Connellsville Airport which is specifically identified as a business airport, and others that are identified as general service. What is the difference between -- or who makes this determination and classifies them?

MR. CHASE: The business airport -- when John mentioned some priorities for funding -- we do have some priorities for funding. The aviation system plan will be done even to improve that.

We have three categories representative for the funding; the scheduled-service airports, the business airports and the general service. On the map in front of

you, I think the blue dots show well what I consider to be the backbone of our network, those business airports.

They're called business airports because they can accommodate business class aircraft. The runways have to be 3,500 feet or more, there has to be lighting and there has to be an instrument, precision or non-precision, approach.

I mentioned Tioga County in my testimony. If you look at that on the map, you will see that northern tier area is without a business airport. Because they don't have that, they have lost economic development opportunities.

We have to go to Elmira, New York, or into Williamsport. So, as we direct resources, a couple things we like to do is put emphasis on those business class airports, and then for the next level down, the general service airport, is to fund projects that will move them up into the business category. That's a very important focus of the program.

Out here in Al Speak's planning area you will see in western Pennsylvania we have quite a few that are in the business category that really make up the backbone of the reliever system for the area out here.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: That was a loaded question, by the way. I knew the answer, but I was setting you up for a comment.

MR. CHASE: All right.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: In southwestern

Pennsylvania, you're right, we have a number of business

airports. In fact, we have a good number of airports.

You may or may not have heard of the recent business summit at Nemacolin Woodlands that was held last week by the Speaker of the House and the Democratic leadership. That's within my District. Nemacolin Woodlands sits above Uniontown. In fact, Joe Hardy, the owner of the 84 Lumber Companies, owns Nemacolin Woodlands, and he has a corporate jet and he has his own runway, but it was closed down for repairs, which doesn't show on this map, by the way.

We had an awful lot of -- the business summit was a meeting of business people in Pennsylvania trying to pull together to try to find out what we could do to create a better business climate in Pennsylvania. We had a good turnout, but as I circulated and spoke to a lot of the CEO's from businesses across Pennsylvania, I learned that a lot of them did, in fact, fly in in the corporate jets.

I look at our map and we have Connellsville, which is a about ten miles from Nemacolin Woodlands. None flew in there. Then there is Somerset, another business airport located about 15 miles from Nemacolin Woodlands, and none of them flew into this airport. I was dismayed to learn that they flew into Morgantown, West Virginia, across the state line, which is about 40, 45 miles from Nemacolin Woodlands.

I mention this to you because I would ask that perhaps we work a little closer together to promote our airports. We need to make sure that our airports are sound, and we can invest and make them good airports, but we also need to promote their use.

when I learned that we had all these corporate executives from the state of Pennsylvania flying into a West Virginia airport when I had two close by, I didn't really know how that occurred. I just mention that as a comment. We need to work on that. We need to promote our airports a little better, and the maps that we mentioned may be a way of doing that.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much. The next person is Homer King, who is President of the Aero Club of Pittsburgh.

MR. KING: Representative Laughlin, thank you and your people for inviting me to appear this morning. My appearance is a little different than some of the other speakers, and inasmuch as I read the list here, I see that most of the other people are connected with a managed -- some airport or some airport facility, or something.

I am here as President of the Aero Club of Pittsburgh, and maybe a little historical background on that might be helpful to explain why I was invited to come.

The Aero Club of Pittsburgh is a unique

organization. It is the oldest aero club in the United States, having been formed and founded in 1909. It got around to being incorporated by court decree about 1921, and it is a non-profit organization.

It is particularly unique in that the Aero Club of Pittsburgh does not own an airport. It does not even have a clubhouse. In fact, the Aero Club of Pittsburgh does not even own any airplanes. However, many of the members of the Aero Club own airplanes and fly airplanes, and those are old airplanes and brand new airplanes.

The Aero Club of Pittsburgh has been very, very instrumental in the development of aviation, particularly in western Pennsylvania. The Aero Club of Pittsburgh was instrumental in founding Roger's Field, which was the first airport in western Pennsylvania, located out in Fox Chapel where the Fox Chapel High School now is.

Then the Aero Club was instrumental in getting started with the Allegheny County Airport in 1932. It had something to do with the opening of the Greater Pitt in 1952, and just last year we participated in the opening ceremonies at the Greater Pittsburgh International.

The Aero Club of Pittsburgh, as I said before, has no particular facilities of it's own, but it does have about 475 members, all of who are devoutly interested in the progress and promotion of aviation, and basically general,

although not specifically so, and not limited to that.

Our members include people who just think about airplanes, those people who build little airplanes, build big airplanes and people who fly airplanes and who rent airplanes. We have people who do model airplanes, and we have members who are commercial pilots who fly 747's on international routes. So, we cover a wide spectrum.

There was a gentleman by the name of Clifford Ball, who was the founder of the first air mail system in the United States after Representative Kelly from McKeesport got the Air Mail Act passed. Clifford Ball, operating out of a place called Bettis Field, which is about four or five miles from Allegheny County Airport, founded the Clifford Ball Airlines which carried air mail from Pittsburgh to Youngstown to Cleveland and eventually to Washington and to Philadelphia. This was the first air mail service, civilian air mail service, in United States.

Just historically, before that time, after World War I, the United States government thought that the United States Army should fly the air mail, and they tried that for several years with disastrous results -- killed, I think, 15 or 18 pilots, and wiped out half of the available airplanes that they had which were Jenny D-4s at that time.

With that historical background of what the Aero Club of Pittsburgh has to offer, we are interested,

specifically and very basically, in general aviation because we think it is a good thing. We think that in order to have general aviation and promote its benefits, small airports are very, very important.

Costs has something to do with this; a lot to do with it. Most people are familiar with the municipally-owned and municipally-operated airports. I'm going to limit my remarks basically to this area west of the Laurel ridge; from there over to the Ohio line although we do go to other airports all over the state.

Everybody knows of Greater Pitt International and Allegheny County, Latrobe, Westmoreland County, Butler County and Rostraver. These are all controlled airports, but there are a number of other airports around that we think are very important that are uncontrolled.

Right in our immediate area we have, of course,
Pittsburgh-Monroeville. We have a place called Bouquet.
Over north of the city, up above of New Kensington, is a
place called West Penn, and we have Mount Pleasant-Scotdale.
We think it's important that these airports be maintained and kept, but for some reason while funds seem to be available for municipally-owned and municipally-operated airports, the funds are not so available for privately-owned and publicly-operated airports.

I am familiar with the Pennsylvania Aviation Law

and the regulations pertaining thereto. In fact, I had something to do with the formation of those some ten, 15 years ago when I was Chairman of the Pennsylvania Bar Association Aeronautical Committee. For some reason these privately-owned publicly-operated airports do not seem to be able to get the funds that they need to do this.

Is it really important? I think it was mentioned earlier that it is not believed that all privately-owned publicly-operated airports should survive, and I think that this is true. However, I think a close look has to be taken at these airports to decide which ones should survive.

For instance, if you were in the Monroeville area and you wanted to go to Greater Pitt, and if you want to catch a flight out of Greater Pitt, say, at 5:00, you had best leave Monroeville about 1:00 in the afternoon unless, of course, you take a helicopter, if you can find one. A helicopter would do that. Or, if you could get a friend who has an airplane at Pittsburgh-Monroeville Airport, he can fly you there in about 15, 20 minutes, maybe a little bit less.

I fly out of Pittsburgh-Monroeville. I have my airplane out there. Many times people come in; business people come into that area because it's much easier, quicker and, I believe, cheaper to do that than it is to go to Greater Pitt and take that drive from Greater Pitt.

One of the unfortunate things about our brand new

airport here in Pittsburgh is that there are times when it is impossible to get there, and so this is -- your Committee deals with transportation, and this is something that I think should be addressed.

The cost of operation of the airports varies. To get a tie-down space or hangar space, if you can find any, over at Allegheny County is very, very expensive as compared to what you would pay at one of the other privately-owned and publicly-operated airports. Tie-down space at Allegheny will run anywhere from \$125 to \$200 per month.

A hangar, if you can find one, is two or three times that at Allegheny County. The county does not own the hangars. They rent the space, and then you build your hangar, put your own in there. At the smaller airports you can get a much better arrangement.

In my prepared remarks I had a few statistics which might be interesting to show. There's been a general decline in recent years in general aviation. I'll just give you a few of these numbers, and these are FAA figures that were released a little bit earlier this year.

They say that the IFR traffic levels at the FAA route traffic control centers is down 10.4 percent from 1992. They say that the hours flown in piston-powered aircraft is down 10.7 percent. The number of student pilot certificates processed in the first quarter of 1993 were down 16.6

percent, and also private pilot licenses and people with instrument ratings were down 9.5 percent and 17.5 percent, respectively.

The cost of getting a private pilot's license, at least around this area, will run between \$3,000 and \$5,000 if you do this at a municipally-operated airport, but if you want to join a flying club, and there are a number of them that operate out of privately-owned publicly-operated airports, that cost can drop to just about half, or maybe two-thirds, of that.

The fuel arrangements and the cost of the fuel at the municipally-operated airports around this area is generally over the \$2 range for 100 octane AvGas low-lead, but at most of the privately-owned publicly-operated airports, that cost is about \$1.81 to \$1.86. I don't know exactly why that is except that it's the cost of operating the airport.

I think it is important, since cost is such a factor anymore, that the privately-owned public-operated airports be assisted and an effort should be made to keep them in existence. The smaller airports can also be used as reliever airports although they might not fit into the business category as it's now known.

Just a few little items that I think might be helpful and that I think your Committee could address itself

to is the constant encroachment of building developments around airports. It's very strange that developers will come in and build right next to an airport, and then they will complain about the noise, and the airport has been there for 40, 50 years.

Representative Laughlin asked a question of one of the prior witnesses about whether there was any noise abatement or any noise program at airports. There is, of course, with the big commercial airports and commercial airliners. However, most privately-owned publicly-operated airports have their own regulations about things like that.

This is done as a matter of courtesy, as well as a matter of safety, to the people who do live around there.

The landing patterns at almost all of these airports is usually directed away from the homes and buildings that are underneath.

At Butler Airport, for example, there is no regulation, but they have a recommendation. I don't know how they would ever really enforce it, but everybody pays attention to it. When you take of on 26 you do not make a turn over the school. You always turn out the other way.

At Monroeville, when you're taking off on 23, you always make a right turn out, not a left because a left puts you right over Monroeville. Similarly, when you are coming in and landing, you have a right-hand pattern on 23 and a

left-hand pattern on 5 to stay away from the town.

Most of the privately-owned publicly-operated airports do this out of respect for the people who live around there as well as, should something happen like an engine stop, which doesn't happen very often, but should it happen, you're not forced to land in somebody's living room, which can spoil everybody's whole day.

The Pennsylvania airplane law and the regulations talk about the erection of antenna and towers, and of course this is very important, but for some reason there does not seem to be a great amount of coordination between the people who want to do this and the enforcement of these laws.

It's a strange thing that when somebody wants to erect a tower somewhere near, or in the proximity of, an airport, they must get FAA approval, but there seems to be a lack of communication between the FAA people and some of the other people who are in the area.

I had an experience, I guess it must be about ten years ago, where a tower was going to be erected within two and one-half miles of an airport, and for some reason nobody found out about this until the tower started to go up. The tower was going to be 2,800 and some feet which put it 800 feet above the landing pattern of two airports which were within a four-mile radius. One was within a four-mile radius and the other was within about six miles, I think.

It was a very, very definite danger, and I couldn't find out how the FAA had approved this. Well, they had gone to the local town and gotten some kind -- a rubber stamp approval. How this was done, I don't know, but they had it. We went to court on it, and I was successful in getting the people building the tower to reduce it by 1,000 feet to at least get it down below the landing pattern.

This is something that was very expensive to everybody, including the people who wanted to build the tower. Something should have been in existence to keep this from happening. I don't know whether this is within the problems of your Committee or not, but there should be some kind of greater coordination between the zoning at airports and the construction and maintenance of the airports.

I know we are running a little short on time. I thank you. If I can answer any questions, I will be very happy to.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much, Mr. King. You mentioned that the Aero Club does not own an airport, does not have a clubhouse, does not own any airplanes, but the Aero Club, through Tom Michael, when he heard that I was the Subcommittee Chairman on Aviation, was the one that brought me to your luncheon, and it resulted in this hearing.

MR. KING: I remember it well, and I am very happy that you remembered us.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you.

Rick, is there anything you want to ask Mr. King?

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: Absolutely. Thank you for being here, Mr. King. The only thing I would like to say is that you mentioned that Roger's Field in Fox Chapel was the first airport in Allegheny County.

MR. KING: I believe so.

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: Well, I'm here to tell you, sir...

MR. KING: That's wrong?

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: No, it's absolutely correctly, absolutely correct. That is in my legislative district, so that is a point of renown, and you pointed that out to me today. For you being here, I am extremely happy, and thank you very much for that information, but I did know that.

MR. KING: Well, very good. I will say that that is the one time when the Aero Club of Pittsburgh did have a clubhouse. There was an old farm house there, and they used that as a clubhouse. If you ever have an opportunity to see the original charter of the Aero Club, it has all these restrictions in there. There shall be no alcoholic beverages and all of these no-no's down there -- no smiling in the outer lobby and all of this.

Of course, you have to understand that back at that

time, at the time the Aero Club got its non-profit charter, this was done through the Court of Common Pleas, not like it's done today, through Harrisburg.

Also remember that this was during the days of Prohibition, and so if you didn't put all those kinds of things in your charter, that you were going to abstain from strong alcoholic drink and no ogling of women as they walked down the street, and all of this -- if you didn't put all of that in your application for the charter, you didn't get it. That's why it's there.

This was before my time, but it's my understanding that all those restrictions were honored more in the breach than in the observance. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: We do have Rosemary Palmer, who is the Director of the Erie International Airport, to give her testimony at this time.

MS. PALMER: Thank you for the opportunity to share with you Erie International Airport's legislative concerns. We greatly appreciate legislative efforts over the last several years to fund airport capital projects.

Erie has been the beneficiary of a recent capital program grant which will be used to match federal dollars and also passenger facility charges to do such things as airfield rehabilitation, Americans With Disabilities Act compliance, noise mitigation, terminal improvements and

environmental assessment for the runway extension and safety improvements.

We note the Transportation Commission's recent inclusion of airport projects in the 12-year planning process. We also salute the Bureau of Aviation for the statewide air service study that was released two weeks ago. We are grateful particularly for the Bureau of Aviation's pavement rehabilitation program and how it responds to changing airport needs.

I'm sure I speak for all state airports in acknowledging increasing legislative support for aviation as an economic development tool within the Commonwealth.

Companies cite access to commercial service airport behind only skilled labor and highways as the most important factor in site location and retention decisions. Most companies want to locate within 30 minutes of any airport and 45 minutes of a commercial service airport.

Airports in Pennsylvania's rural communities are sometimes, quite literally, the lifeblood of the community, preserving adequate medical evacuation and blood supplies. Those airports also preserve access to interstate commerce for small communities.

There are three things that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania can do to foster and support the aviation industry that is so vital to its economic health. More funds

must be appropriated to maintain and improve the infrastructure and computerize the Bureau of Aviation's services. Department of Environmental Resource Storm Water Permits should be encouraged to use the EPA model permit for airports, and communities should be encouraged to enact airport hazard zoning and compatible land use plans.

Airports are no less important to the Commonwealth's future than education and highways. The Bureau of Aviation's economic impact study provides ample data to support that fact, yet aviation has been traditionally self-funded with ticket and cargo taxes on the federal level, and fuel and registration taxes on the state level. Restricting aviation funding to levels that the industry itself can support completely ignores the value of the industry to all Pennsylvania citizens.

The present \$6 million annual funding level ought to be more than doubled. Erie International Airport's needs for the next seven years top \$40 million. That includes a 1,000-foot runway extension needed to assure flight reliability, which will require bridging or relocating one road and bridging the substandard runway safety area on another.

It also includes rehabilitation of the terminal that was dedicated the year before Pittsburgh's old terminal was dedicated, and the third big ticket item is completion of

the noise mitigation plan. All the plans have the support of our municipal planning organization.

While we hope to receive federal funds for some of the work, it will not be enough. Assuming best case that the Federal Aviation Administration funded 90 percent of all projects, \$4 million remains.

When you know that the proposed 1994 Erie
International Airport operating budget of \$1.5 million shows
a mere \$24,000 excess revenue over expenses, even while
eliminating two positions and without wage and benefit
increases for the remaining airport personnel, and when you
know that our passenger facility charges that we collect are
committed to completed and ongoing projects until 1997, you
understand how dire the circumstances are.

How can we raise the capital improvement funds? We have the highest rates in all categories for concession and landing fee and rental rates that the traffic will bear. They are also in the high range of fees at comparable airports. We are not the highest in all cases, but we are in the high range. We have levied PFC's on our customers. Our local governments are strapped.

Erie International Airport's tale graphically points out the need for more aviation infrastructure funding. Erie is, no doubt, the worst case among the six largest commercial service airports in the state. That is probably

because Erie is the sixth largest commercial service airport in the state -- that marginal break-even line that airports have.

The situation I described is not unique to Erie International. The same struggles and inappropriate, but necessary, trade-offs are shared by many airports and communities.

The good news about airport infrastructure is that rehabilitation is cyclical. Runways are rehabilitated every 15 years. Terminals may last 20, and master plans last ten years. If we can ever catch up with the backlog of projects, future ones could be spread out better over multiple years eliminating funding peaks and valleys.

Many airport delay projects for as long as possible hoping their funding priority will increase. Sometimes that means that the eventual project costs more because more work was required than would have been if the project had been done when it should have begun. It is poor management of our limited resources, but what choice is there?

In Erie's case we will soon close the only taxiway to one runway because the taxiway has literally disintegrated within the last two months. We knew two years ago that the taxiway should be rehabilitated, but rehabilitating the runway, which was in approximately the same condition, came first. Our luck has simply run out.

We have requested emergency FAA funding and we hope we receive FAA funding for next year, but in the meantime, operations will suffer.

Perhaps you know that some airports are closed because the struggle became too much. Other airports are patched together with chewing gum and bailing wire, both of which, no doubt, meet all safety regulations, and while I am not one to be unduly alarmed when a single airport is decommissioned, the trend starkly shows the inability of smaller airports to survive without outside help.

The time has come to consider grants without matching share requirements for airports that can demonstrate need and having exhausted all other alternatives. The time has also come to expand the definition of capital improvements.

Not only is the funding level inadequate, but the distribution formula sometimes obstructs usage of the funds for the most pressing projects. Since the formula serves the goal of assuring that smaller airports obtain some funds, the formula can only be changed with the infusion of more funds, and the Bureau of Aviation's dedicated employees can no longer effective work without full computerization of their offices.

When I realize what they are still manually doing because personal computers are not provided, I cringe. No

wonder they struggle to process paperwork in a timely fashion. No wonder airports have to wait weeks for reimbursement payments, increasing the costs of projects and straining relationships with suppliers.

The Federal Aviation Administration has implemented a computer draw down process. I was delighted to hear that Keith is working on that, and I know that he has worked on that, the computerization, for some time. I don't know what the problem is within the Bureau of Aviation itself.

A second way the Commonwealth could help airports is by encouraging airport hazard zoning and compatible land use planning, but it is important that the legislative solutions recognize that many airports are not located within the jurisdiction that owns them.

That means that those with zoning power may not have the will to use it on behalf of another jurisdiction. It is wrong to penalize airports that cannot control what surrounding jurisdictions do. On the other hand, perhaps airports themselves could be granted power to enact hazard zoning and compatible land use if the affected jurisdictions refused to do so.

A third way the Commonwealth could be of help to airports is to use its powers to encourage the Department of Environmental Resources to adopt the recently announced Environmental Protection Agency group permit as its model for

airport storm water discharge permits.

Airports typically respect and protect the environment. Many of us have long since adopted best management practices and other measures to prevent environmental harm. However, we are greatly concerned about unfunded legislative mandates, and no one has funded the storm water plan and monitoring that would be required.

Aviation groups spent two years educating the EPA about how airports work and what the effects of various substances used on airport were. The information was based on data collection.

We suggest that DER should adopt the EPA airport permit standards rather than developing its own. We also hope that airports which cannot afford the consultant's fee to draft the permit-required plans will be provided with the help necessary to meet the requirements.

Along these lines I can point to one difference that was made. The general permit which has been issued, which the DER adopted word for word from the EPA in November of 1992, had a monitoring requirement for airports with 50,000 operations.

The aviation groups went to EPA as they were working on their specific industry permits and said that operations is not the proper way of breaking out who should and who shouldn't. If you have 50,000 general aviation

operations, none of which are using de-icing fluids, then you don't have a problem. If you have 50,000 commercial service ones, all of which are using significant, then you do. You should make the determination based on how much substance is being used.

The EPA adopted that in their permits, which is supposed to be published as a notice of proposed rule making this week. That is one example of how the industry was able to educate EPA about how to do it in a way that was responsible and responsive.

I am sure that you are familiar with media account of the challenges facing the aviation industry. If smaller airports are to provide the infrastructure and services required for the economic health of Pennsylvania, we need legislative help.

We pledge our help to you. I'm sure that any airport director would be more than happy to assist you in formulating any plans that you would like to consider.

We also express our appreciation for this opportunity and for what you have done for us already.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much. The unfunded legislative mandates that you spoke about are coming up, even with the municipalities, across the state. I just read not too long ago where President Clinton is going to be

addressing that, and hopefully, whenever we have a mandate coming from the federal government, they are going to fund that.

We have been fighting over that for many years, and I even sent letters to the federal government along with DER because DER is making municipalities do certain studies and not funding them. I hope we're going to be able to address that with the federal government, too. I appreciate your testimony.

Larry, is there anything that you would like to say?

SENATOR ROBERTS: No.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: All right. Thank you very much.

The next person to testify is Dan Donatella who is Chairman of the Board of Beaver County Airport. I'm very familiar with the Beaver County Airport since I live in Beaver County, and I'm sure he's going to have some information that is going to very helpful to all of us.

MR. DONATELLA: Thank you very much, Madam

Chairman. I want to say, before I comment on my testimony
today, that I am extremely pleased that this Committee found
it necessary to come to our area to give us an opportunity to
be heard.

I think you ought to be commended for that because

I can't recall, frankly, in recent times when we had the House Transportation Committee on airports come down to this area, so I am extremely appreciative of that and giving us an opportunity to testify.

Following the text that I presented, I am going to be as brief as I can. First of all, I do want to say I completely agree with the testimony given this morning by the Deputy Secretary, Keith Chase. I think the man is right on the mark with his comments.

I am extremely pleased to have this opportunity to testify this morning before this Committee regarding the small airports and their needs.

It is common knowledge that aviation is one of the most significant and important factors that effects our economy locally, statewide and nationally. Small airports are a critical element in Pennsylvania's transportation network that links our Commonwealth with the rest of the nation and the world. Small airports and their facilities have become vital to America's businesses and corporations.

Contrary to belief, a recent survey indicates that commercial airlines and hub-airports service a very small percentage of corporations and businesses compared to the smaller general aviation airports. The fact is that most Fortune 500 corporations do not fly commercial airlines to do business, but rather own their aircraft, which they find is

essential to their business because of the flexibility business aircraft ownership affords.

Businesses and corporations acquire these aircraft because of the thousands of small general aviation airports available to them throughout the Commonwealth and the nation which are capable of handling this type of aircraft, which saves considerable time for the executive and affords the ability to reach many more local business.

Although hub-airports are certainly vital to our national transportation system, the fact is these hub-airports cannot adequately service corporate America. That is why the small general aviation airports are in continuous need of improvements to keep pace with ever increasing demands that are placed upon them.

The Commonwealth has developed an extensive network of public-use airports over the years, of which more than two-thirds are designated general aviation airports. By comparison, and including Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, the Commonwealth has only -- I mentioned 17 here. I think the Deputy Secretary said this morning that it is 15 commercial-use airports. The Commonwealth has approximately also 350 private-use airports.

Pennsylvania, like most of the northeast, suffered severe economic devastation during the past decade. To help rebuild Pennsylvania, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the

 Bureau of Aviation must continue to help fund projects and improvements for the small general aviation airports.

Over 85 percent of the Commonwealth's major employers depend on commercial air service to conduct their business. It is now known and recognized that small general aviation airports help to attract new industries and business to the Commonwealth and local areas, which provide for thousands of jobs.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Bureau of Aviation, through its Aviation Development Grants Program, has played a vital and major role to help economic recovery in both the Commonwealth and the various local counties by providing significant financial aid to small general aviation airports.

Local municipalities and counties, without the financial aid received through the Bureau of Aviation, simply could not sustain major airport improvements/projects essential to meet the increased demands by the ever growing number of users.

Most important, the Bureau of Aviation has recognized a need by the small general aviation airports to fund very critical airport improvement projects that are not eligible under the Federal Aviation Administration criteria.

It is my belief that without the Aviation

Development Grant Program administered by the Bureau of

Aviation, a great number of small general aviation airports would suffer an even more adverse economic impact because the local municipalities and/or the counties do not have the funding available to make these essential and critical airport improvements.

Most small general aviation airports already require subsidies from local governments just to maintain the airport management and operations, let alone fund major airport improvements. The fact is, very few small general aviation airports break even or even turn a profit.

Presently there are a number of small general aviation airports throughout the Commonwealth that can't even afford to accept or apply for a grant through the Bureau of Aviation simply because they cannot manage the 25 percent match as required by the terms of the grant.

These small general aviation airports are falling through the cracks because after operations costs supported by local tax dollars, no money remains to seek or apply for airport improvement grants. Because of their inability to support airport improvements that would help render the airport operation solvent, attract new growth and business, the airport and facilities remain in a spiral of adverse economic depression.

I suggest to this Committee that small general aviation airports in the Commonwealth be categorized and a

strategy be formulated to determine a method or formula to financially assist those small general aviation airports that lie in designated economic depressed areas, beyond the 75/25 percent, as required by the Aviation Development Grant Program. Without some special financial assistance many of these airports will remain economically depressed with no hopes of growth or development.

Over the past few years, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Bureau of Aviation, since the implementation of the Aviation Development Grants Program, has significantly helped the small general aviation airports. Prior to that time, the Bureau of Aviation most generally only helped in providing the five percent state match for grants to small airports through the Federal Aviation Administration.

The Bureau of Aviation, in my opinion, has streamlined its operation and recognized the needs of small general aviation airports to a certain extent.

I am here today to give testimony before the

Committee that the Aviation Development Grants Program is

working and is working very well. On behalf of, and in the

interest of, the small general aviation airports, I urge this

Committee to ensure the continuation of the Aviation

Development Grants Program because of the inability of local

municipalities and counties to fund airport improvement

projects so vital and essential to the economic growth of the

local area and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I commend the Honorable Susan Laughlin and the members of the House Transportation Committee for conducting this public hearing and affording us an opportunity to testify.

I also wanted to thank the Deputy Secretary for Aviation, Mr. Keith Chase, for his fine cooperation and his interest and concerns for the development and growth of small general aviation airports within our Commonwealth.

I again thank you for coming here and giving us an opportunity to speak, but I do feel very strongly about something being done to take care of, probably, some of the airports that Mr. King talked about that simply don't have the money to come for a grant.

For example, if you apply for a \$100,000 grant, it means that you have to come up with \$25,000. Well, that kind of money is just now out there, frankly speaking. Most airports apply first of all through the Federal Aviation Administration's program, obviously because that is a 90/10 proposition with the FAA paying 90 percent of the grant, five percent through the Bureau and a remaining five percent with the county.

One thing that is significant that is good about the Bureau of Aviation's program is the fact that many of their projects qualify for funding that FAA will not assist

you with. So, what happens, when an airport has a grant that they cannot obtain through the Federal Aviation Administration, is that they do turn to state government because there, at least, 75 percent is certainly better than the local municipalities paying the full amount.

It is a tremendous help on those projects that airports need that FAA will not fund. Without that -- that's the funding I'm speaking of -- without that kind of funding from Keith Chase and his department, you could go on and on about the number of programs that simply would not occur on the local level.

When you talk about economic development, and all the people that know, they form these strategies and they define the economically depressed areas. I think this Committee may consider some special help for those airports that lie in those economically depressed counties or areas and that need help beyond the 75/25, even if it is just for funding a couple of their projects -- to give them that special consideration if they would qualify in an economically depressed area.

In conclusion, again I'm very pleased, Madam
Chairman, with the program and certainly the fine cooperation
of Mr. Chase's office. I think they have come a long way,
and I think the program that he outlined this morning will go
a long way to help not only the small airports, but all

airports in general in the Commonwealth. I thank you.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Donatella. I know you have done a great job as the Director of the Beaver County Airport, and I commend you for that.

I know that Beaver County is a distressed area, and we have helped with other agencies because we are a distressed community, but we will have to look into the aviation aspect of it. I don't know, but maybe we can reduce the match money for the local airports. That's a possibility.

Thank you very much, and Larry, is there anything that you would like to say?

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: No, but I enjoyed your presentation. No questions.

MR. DONATELLA: Thank you very much. Any other question?

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much for coming.

We have one more person, and that is Jim Dunbar.

He is Vice President of the Aero Club of Pittsburgh.

MR. DUNBAR: I thank you very much for the privilege of contributing to this Committee.

I would like to briefly read to you some statistics that were formulated by the Economic Impact of Civil Aviation on the U. S. Economy, and this was for the year 1992. It was done by the Partnership for Improved Air Travel, which is

basically a think-tank in Washington, D.C.

What they did is do this with regard to general aviation. I must tell the Committee that there is no commercial aviation involved in this. There is no manufacturing of jobs in these statistics.

Basically, general aviation constitutes 7.9 percent of, basically 8 percent, of aviation as we know it here in the United States today. The total economic impact in the nation is \$42 billion annually, keeping in mind no manufacturing, no commercial.

In addition, there are total jobs of 537,000. Now, let's break that down to Pennsylvania. The annual economic activity in just the state of Pennsylvania, one year, and again, that is with no commercial and no manufacturing, is \$1 billion and 43 million.

The annual earnings -- and right away everybody thinks of a corporation, but this is not true. This goes to salaries to pilots, co-pilots, certainly line boys who pump the gas, certainly mechanics and secretaries. It can be anybody who is connected with general aviation. The annual earnings are \$343,100,000 per year. Now, the jobs are 13,930, basically 14,000 jobs, just connected with general aviation.

The reason I bring these statistics in is that I would like to discuss basically two things. One is a little

airport out beyond Bridgeville called Campbell's, and you would know it as Pittsburgh Metro Airport. It is an airport that is owned by an individual and his family, Charlie Campbell. However, it is a public airport, and one of the features of this airport, for some time, was that they had a franchise with Piper Aircraft to take and sell Piper aircraft and to obviously work on the aircraft from a mechanical standpoint, pump gas, so on and so forth. The airport has thrived as long as Piper was in business.

Now Piper is out of business, as are basically Beechcraft and Cessna. Cessna Aircraft today builds only jets at \$5 million plus. Beechcraft has its own jet, however they have several turbo-prop aircraft which will basically run \$3 to \$4 million.

We're not talking about the little aircraft that sustained these airports. And, why has this occurred? It's called product liability.

Now let me tell you about a Beechcraft Bonanza. I've had two Beechcraft Bonanzas. Basically, when that first came out in production, they sold somewhere between \$6,000 and \$8,000. Today, to buy a new Beechcraft Bonanza, it's going to run you somewhere between \$150,000 to \$200,000. However, here's the hooker; of the \$150,000, \$75,000 goes for product liability insurance. They could manufacture that much cheaper, but they have to include that in.

Why am I bringing that up? It's for the simple reason that without the ability to sell aircraft and make a profit, a fee or a commission, or whatever you want to call it, to help sustain the operation -- this is not occurring now.

What is happening is that little airport,

Campbell's, as is magnified all over the Commonwealth, then
has a problem. What they are depending upon is sales and/or
whatever little amount of mechanical activity occurs. We
have a detriment that way, so slowly we're losing jobs by
virtue of the fact that there are no new aircraft for sale.

Now let me tell you what the problem is. Sometime ago, and that was the year 1991, I had an opportunity -- I'm in the real estate business, have a Broker's license here in Pennsylvania. I had an opportunity to get involved with some people in Orlando who wanted to purchase the factory at Lockhaven.

There was a gentleman out of Morgantown, West Virginia, who at the time had a small line of aircraft being produced, and we're only talking about, maybe, one or two a month, but the idea was to get involved and bring in Augusta Helicopters and get them involved in this factory.

Now, you say why up there? There is a pool of talent of people that have great expertise in manufacturing aircraft. The problem was most lenders would not lend --

because of the product liability fear, will not lend to an aviation-related product. If they had gone into something else, they probably could have sold that factory up there.

Now, as you know, Piper went bankrupt, and the factory was sold at foreclosure to a gentleman in Philadelphia. He bought it with the idea that he would be able to turn it around. It's never been turned around.

When you go after these lenders -- when you boil it down, there are certain lenders who will only entertain something, but when we went to them, and including Chase Manhattan -- I might tell you this. I was then involved with the Governor's Committee in Harrisburg and the Department of Commerce of the Commonwealth. At that point in time, even though we had gone and we were trying to get some kind of way to avert this product liability, it wasn't possible.

Chase turned it down. They were fearful that if -let's give an example -- as Piper, if they made \$4 million a
year and they lost the case, and the judgments came against
them for \$8 million, they had a real problem. Do that a
couple of times, and that's one of the reasons Piper is out
of business. Without this infusion of new aircraft, we've
got a serious problem here in this country.

I would think this Committee would want to go to the legislature and examine the possibilities of restricting that, much as your car manufacturers, as you know, will give

you three years and 30,000 miles of unconditional workmanship, but once you go beyond that -- and that's the way liability should act.

Example: You can take a 25-year old aircraft.

It's been worked on for many, many years with a number of different mechanics, some of them licensed by the FAA, a lot of them not licensed. Many, many parts come into that aircraft that are not licensed or certified by the FAA. They are car parts, basically, but they go on that airplane.

Twenty-five years later something happens, but they come back on the manufacturer, Piper, Beechcraft and Cessna, and get these big awards.

This is what the problem is, and without influx of new aircraft -- now there are certain, what they call, kit aircraft. An individual can buy a kit aircraft and put it together himself. There's no liability there because he spends 2,500 to 5,000 hours just putting that airplane together out of a kit. There is a little bit of sales that way.

There are some foreign manufacturers, but aside from the jets and the expensive turbo-prop, you don't have that influx of small aircraft. As a result, a guy or an outfit like Campbell's at Pittsburgh Metro, without those commissions and without the new aircraft coming in, are having a real problem existing.

I know this Committee is concerned with safety and with many aspects of the airports and aviation, but keep in mind that we're starting to slowly strangle the aviation industry without these small aircraft. The big aircraft, yes, but who can afford them? The small aircraft, that is a problem.

As far as I'm concerned, I've been a pilot for years, have done real estate deals, and there is no way to go except in some cases -- if I had to go from here, Pittsburgh, to Palm Beach, Florida, I could do that commercially. However, what happens if I have to go to Myrtle Beach, then over to Sarasota and come back to Boca Raton? I can do that with a small aircraft in one day. Never, commercially.

We need small aircraft. We need to get rid of that product liability and get these aircraft manufactured again, or it is slowly being strangled.

Now I would like to point this out. There is an outfit in Montreal, Canada, called Bombmidier. Bombmidier by itself is not famous. They do have a line of jets and they own the company completely that is call Ken Air, and they produce the Challenger jet. They have also purchased another company which you are probably all familiar with, and that is called Lear Jet. Bombmidier owns Lear Jet 100 percent.

They did away with a factory in Arizona. They have consolidated it all into Wichita, Kansas, but they have

another entity, and apparently in one of the Provinces in Canada, Alberta, I believe, they have gone to the legislature there and restricted product liability so that when an aircraft is manufactured there, for a limited time there is liability. However, beyond a certain period of time, there is no liability, and I think you are going to see more manufacturing going on there.

I would like you to go back to the Legislature of Pennsylvania and suggest that they get in touch with these people at Bombmidier and find out how they are doing it and restrict the liability here in this Commonwealth. I think that is perhaps the biggest detriment at the present time facing the general aviation activities, and that is this product liability and the restriction of small aircraft coming into the market place.

I thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much for your testimony. I did want to ask you one question.

MR. DUNBAR: Sure.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: You mentioned that Piper and a couple other manufacturers have closed down because of product liability; that was the reason for them closing?

MR. DUNBAR: Basically, yes, and I might tell you this; there was a fellow by the name of Stewart Milar who bought Piper a few years back. He was going to go back into

the production of the Piper Cub, and so on and so forth.

He got into trouble financially, and he has had several suitors. I understand that now he is out of it, but in every case it was the product liability that stopped the sale of Piper Aircraft, including outside entities outside the United States.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: There is no other company that manufacturers small airplanes?

MR. DUNBAR: As I said, Beechcraft does have the Bonanza yet.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: I mean in the United States.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, Beechcraft with the Bonanza. I believe Cessna still has a small line going, but instead of the 12 or 15 that they used to have, they only have like one, and the jet, and of course they had a turbo-prop, but they got rid of that too. The same with Beechcraft, but it does have the smaller Bonanza, I believe, on the one single line instead of the 12 or 15 they were used to.

Incidentally, Piper had some very fine lines, but they're out of all of them with the exception of a turbo-prop, which I understand they are still manufacturing in Vero Beach. In every case where the suitors came to purchase, it was the product liability that stopped the sale of Piper Aircraft.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Mr. Dunbar, do you have

any idea what the status of the federal legislation on product liability is?

MR. DUNBAR: I can't answer that other than I know it's in the hopper. You're talking about federal now, right?

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Right.

MR. DUNBAR: It's in there somewhere, but nothing has ever come out of it. I think this is, perhaps, the most serious thing in the United States today with regard to general aviation.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: I thought they were making progress on the product liability deal. I thought maybe you would know.

MR. DUNBAR: No, I can't answer other than I know it's in committee or some place. It's never come out, as far as I know, but it should. You know, the one thing it has done is -- with the investment tax credit going off and that luxury tax going on, plus product liability, it's really decimated not only the aviation industry, but the boat industry, and so on and so forth. This is a big problem.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Perhaps we can consider a resolution to the United States Congress asking them to move on the Federal...

MR. DUNBAR: No question, it should be done, and I think that this Committee could initiate, go through our Legislature and into the Congress because it's needed

vitally.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you.

MR. KING: Just to elaborate a little bit on what Jim was saying; Moony Aircraft, out of Texas, has a very fine single-engine, high-performance aircraft, and they, last year I believe, made between 200 and 300 of them.

Piper, in their general line, has not been making single-engine aircraft except for the Malibu, which is a high-performance aircraft, pressurized, high-altitude airplane. Although, last year Piper did make what they call the Cadet, which is a Piper Warrior, which is -- I think now they have put a 150-horsepower engine in it, but it used to be 110, but most of these were sold overseas. They made 300 or 400 of those.

Piper is still making single-engine airplanes if you wanted to order an Archer or one those single-engines, but they will make them on special order.

Cessna has not made any single-engine airplanes for about ten years; that is, they don't make any of their 150's, 152's, 172's, all single-engine stuff, although they're still making the twin-engines. Basically Cessna, of course, has gone to the jet field.

What Jim has said has a lot of truth in it. The product liability aspect has had a lot to do with this, but

of course, the general economy has a lot to do with it too.

If you're just going to build one or two airplanes, the cost of the liability insurance on the product liability aspect is very, very high. If you're going to build 500 airplanes, of course, you spread that over -- of course it's less. It's not exactly just the product liability aspect. The general economy has something to do with it as well.

I just thought that might be little bit helpful.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Thank you. Is there anyone
else who would like to say something before we close?

[No response]

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: Okay. I think this was a very productive hearing. We've gathered a lot of information here from Keith Chase and from the other people who gave testimony, and I'm sure and hopeful that we're going to be able to put something in legislation through your help, and if there's any other suggestions that any of you can come up with that can formulate legislation to help you, we're going to be there for you.

I understand that this is probably the first time we had a legislative body come before the Aero Club and the different people associated with aviation. I think this is a first with the state, anyway. I want to thank you again for coming.

I don't know if Larry Roberts would like to say

something. Larry?

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Yes, I would just comment to those who provided testimony that it was very interesting, very informative and somewhat enlightening as well. I appreciate the effort that you have made to come here today and give us the information that you did.

I don't know if you noticed that I was underlining a lot. It was nice to have the text here. It made it easy for me to take some notes.

We'll certainly make use of the information you brought to us today, and I think that by working with Representative Laughlin you may be able to make some progress in the directions that you suggested we move in.

Thank you for being here today.

CHAIRMAN LAUGHLIN: We do have some testimony here if anyone wants to take a copy for themselves. It is available to you.

Again, thank you very much for coming, and this hearing is closed.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p.m., the hearing was concluded.)

1 2

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>

I hereby certify, as the stenographic reporter, that the foregoing proceedings were reported stenographically by me, and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under my direction; and that this transcript is a true and accurate record to the best of my ability.

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

By: Salbara Scrimizzi Spin