1	
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
3	HOUSE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
4	
5	IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING ROOM G-50
6	HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
7	
8	
9	TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2008 9:30 A.M.
10	
11	
	PUBLIC HEARING ON
12	AVIATION SALES TAX AND SECURITY ISSUES
13	
14	BEFORE:
15	
16	HONORABLE JOSEPH F. MARKOSEK, CHAIRMAN HONORABLE PAUL COSTA
17	HONORABLE RICHARD GEIST HONORABLE MICHAEL GERBER
18	HONORABLE GARY HALUSKA HONORABLE KATE HARPER
	HONORABLE DICK L. HESS
19	HONORABLE DAVID HICKERNELL HONORABLE MARK K. KELLER
20	HONORABLE MARK LONGIETTI HONORABLE RON MILLER
21	
22	
23	
24	BRENDA S. HAMILTON COURT REPORTING P.O. BOX 165
25	ELM, PENNSYLVANIA 17521 717.627.1368 FAX 717.627.0319
4 J	/11.02/.1300 FAA /1/.02/.U319

	<u> </u>
1	
2	(CONT'D)
3	HONORABLE JOHN P. SABATINA, JR. HONORABLE DANTE SANTONI, JR.
	HONORABLE MARIO M. SCAVELLO
4	HONORABLE JOHN J. SIPTROTH HONORABLE THOMAS J. SOLOBAY
5	HONORABLE KATHARINE M. WATSON HONORABLE JAKE WHEATLEY
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	ALSO PRESENT:
11	REPRESENTATIVE BRYAN LENTZ REPRESENTATIVE JAY MOYER
12	REPRESENTATIVE DAN MOUL FORMER REPRESENTATIVE MARVIN MILLER
13	STACIA RITTER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (D) ERIC BUGAILE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (R)
14	MARK BUTERBAUGH, RESEARCH ANALYST AMANDA WOLFE, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT
15	AMANDA WOLFE, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT
16	DDENDA C HAMTIMON DDD
17	BRENDA S. HAMILTON, RPR REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX		
2	NAME	PAGE	
3	PANEL ON AVIATION SALES TAX:		
4	JAY BERATAN	9	
5	ROBERT ROCKMAKER	13	
6	LAWRENCE J. KRAUTER	23	
7	DAVID FORD	32	
8	BRADLEY D. PENROD	4 0	
9			
10	PANEL ON AIRPORT SECURITY:		
11	ROGER MOOG	4 6	
12	GREG PECORARO	52	
13	GARY HUDSON	57	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	I		

PROCEEDINGS

- -

See we have Representative Siptroth here today who should be noted for a couple of things.

One is we're talking about one of his bills; but, two, is he was a little under the weather for a while and we missed him. So in order to welcome him back, we're going to have him lead us in the pledge of allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. We're going to dispense with the formal taking of roll. There are no votes today. Although the staff I know has -- knows who's here and we're going to have people -- it's a very, very busy day today. A lot of people -- I think a lot of our members will be coming and going so they'll be noted as they -- as they come in.

 $\label{eq:control_control_control} \mbox{For example, we have Representative} \\ \mbox{Watson who just walked in.}$

REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: I was trying to do it quietly.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: So with that, we have two bills that we will be discussing here

- 1 today. The first one is House Bill 2301.
- 2 | Again, the prime sponsor is Representative
- 3 | Siptroth, and I'd ask Representative Siptroth
- 4 | to just, very briefly, John, give us an
- 5 overview of what the bill is intended to do.
- 6 REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Thank you,
- 7 Mr. Chairman. And I am very pleased to
- 8 introduce this piece of legislation. There's
- 9 a companion piece of legislation that has been
- 10 | introduced in the Senate as well.
- This legislation will provide for the
- 12 | exclusion from the Pennsylvania sales tax, the
- 13 | retail of repair or replacement parts,
- 14 exclusively -- exclusively for the use in
- 15 | aircraft or overhaul, rebuild of aircraft.
- 16 | The legislation also provides for the
- 17 | exclusion from sales tax for the sale or lease
- 18 of aircraft.
- Now, this legislation will serve as a
- 20 catalyst to re-energize the aviation industry
- 21 | in Pennsylvania and bring back high-paying
- 22 jobs to the state.
- This legislation will make
- 24 | Pennsylvania more competitive and provide an
- 25 incentive for companies such as Honda Jet and

the retention of Keystone Helicopters that
have been looking at different airports in
Pennsylvania as well; and Keystone, notably,
has been looking to possibly leave the state
if, in fact, they cannot be -- remain
competitive.

Currently there are no contractors in Pennsylvania that provide overhaul and rebuilding of aircraft services. Airports and aircraft owners have to send their planes outside of Pennsylvania, including our own state aircraft.

Currently New Jersey, Connecticut,

New York, Massachusetts, West Virginia provide

exemptions -- such exemptions around the

Commonwealth.

To attract high-paying jobs,

Pennsylvania has missed the boat on the

aviation industry and this legislation will

jumpstart the effort to compete for this

industry.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, John.

To get started, I -- we have a list

of folks that will speak on that particular

```
1
      issue and I think they're pretty much all at
     the front table here. Perhaps we could start
2
     on the -- on my left and just introduce
3
      yourself and let us know who you are and then
4
5
     we'll -- we'll get into the actual testimony.
               MR. GREG PECORARO: Thank you,
6
7
     Mr. Chairman.
8
               My name is Greg Pecoraro, and I'm
9
     with the Aircraft Owners and Pilots
     Association.
10
11
               MR. BRADLEY PENROD: Good morning,
     Mr. Chairman.
12
               My name is Brad Penrod and I'm the
13
14
      chief executive officer with the Allegheny
15
     County Airport Authority.
16
               MR. KELLY FREDERICKS: Good morning,
     Mr. Chairman.
17
18
               My name is Kelly Fredericks. I'm the
     vice chair of the Pennsylvania Aviation
19
20
     Advisory Committee.
21
               MR. DAVID FORD: Good morning, ladies
22
     and gents.
               I'm David Ford. I'm the president of
23
24
     Keystone Helicopters.
```

MR. LAWRENCE KRAUTER: Good morning,

25

1 Mr. Chairman. 2 I am Larry Krauter. I'm the deputy executive director, chief operating officer 3 for the Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority. 4 5 MR. ROBERT ROCKMAKER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and committee. 6 Bob Rockmaker, Aviation Council of 7 Pennsylvania. 8 9 MR. JAY BERATAN: Good morning, Chairman Markosek. 10 I am Jay Beratan, president of the 11 Aviation Council of Pennsylvania. 12 1.3 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Welcome, 14 all of you. Representative -- Chairman Geist 15 would like to make a statement relative to one 16 of our former colleagues who is here and I 17 echo whatever Rick is going to say. 18 REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Thank you. It's a pleasure for me to introduce Marv 19 20 Miller who is the brain trust of all aviation 21 in Pennsylvania. Former member, 22 silver-tongued debater on the floor of the 23 House, and there's nothing that happens in aviation that he doesn't control. 24

25 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you.

1 I don't -- I'm not sure how we should do this. We don't have unlimited time here 2 3 this morning. As I had mentioned, some of the members will be in and out. 4 5 Perhaps one of you would be -- to start off and make a few remarks and we could 6 7 either allow all of you to do that or if you think one would sum it up for all, because we 8 9 may also have some questions of the panel, 10 too. 11 So I'm not sure who wants to 12 volunteer. MR. BERATAN: I'll start. 1.3 14 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay, sir. 15 MR. BERATAN: Good morning again, 16 members of the House Transportation Committee. 17 It's an honor to speak with you this 18 morning as president of the Aviation Council 19 of Pennsylvania. 20 My full-time position is senior vice 21 president and chief administrative officer for

My full-time position is senior vice president and chief administrative officer for DMJM Aviation, a subsidiary of Aecom
Technology Corporation with over 35,000 employees worldwide.

22

23

24

25

DMJM Aviation has a long history of

completing planning, design, program and construction management assignments at airports throughout the world.

As the president of the Aviation

Council, which is a volunteer position, I,

along with our other officers and board of

directors, help set policy which will assist

in attaining our association's goals and

mission objectives.

The council's mission statement is to represent the Pennsylvania aviation community in matters involving government and private sector interests, to improve aviation in partnership with the Commonwealth and the federal government, and to increase public awareness of aviation in the Commonwealth.

The council is comprised of members with diverse aviation interests including airports, aviation service firms, corporate aircraft and charter operators, firms providing goods and services to the aviation industry and individual aircraft owners and operators.

The counsel has seven purpose elements which are as follows:

1 Promote aviation economic 2 development. Enhance public awareness of aviation. 3 Maintain strong governmental 4 5 relations. Work toward improving aviation 6 7 safety. 8 Develop and advance statewide 9 aviation education. Provide membership services and 10 11 programs. Assist member businesses and 12 individuals with technical assistance and 13 14 information. The council is one of the oldest 15 state aviation associations in the United 16 States. Founded in 1971, the council has 17 18 grown, with a membership that exceeds 260-plus members, and is continuing to grow. 19 20 Let me set the stage for why we are 21 here. 22 Today, we come before you to discuss what we at the Aviation Council of 23 Pennsylvania see as a wonderful opportunity to 24 25 position the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania into a very positive business posture with respect to the aviation and aerospace industries.

We are seeking your support to
eliminate PA Aviation Sales and Use Taxes on
specific categories. The Aviation Council of
Pennsylvania has determined that the present
PA Aviation Sales Taxes on Aircraft Sales,
Parts, Maintenance and Repairs are providing a
great detriment to both the retainage and
growth of the aviation and aerospace industry
in our great Commonwealth.

Our council's executive director,
Robert Rockmaker will now walk you through
this project for clarity and definition.

I appreciate your time today and look forward on behalf of our members and the entire aviation and aerospace community to seeing our great Commonwealth become a leader in this business category.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you.

For the benefit of the stenographer, that was Mr. Jay Beratan. Okay.

Next Mr. Rockmaker. And if you could

-- I mean I would ask all of you to perhaps summarize, give us the bullet points as opposed, you know, to a lengthy reading so that we can get everybody fitted in today.

Thank you.

MR. ROCKMAKER: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, again. And I did some more lining out here already so...

As the director of the council, I oversee the daily functions, as Mr. Beratan just pointed out.

And the project that we're talking about today to eliminate the sales and use taxes on aircraft sales, parts, maintenance and repairs started over three years ago.

This is not something that just started, you know, this year or last year.

It has been a -- a -- a good project for the council to tackle for the aviation industry in the Commonwealth and it's going to reap many, many benefits for airports in the Commonwealth, not only the communities in the Commonwealth, but the businesses that are on airports, as well as, as Representative

Siptroth pointed out, companies that are not here in the Commonwealth but have looked to come to the Commonwealth.

The --the light bulb really went off years ago when we were sitting around at an FBO meeting of the council discussing a variety of agenda items.

I brought this subject up. I turned to the committee members sitting there and everybody in the room that day were all business owners, not managers, but actual business owners, who had bottom line profit and loss responsibility.

I asked them where could they take their aircraft to get a repair done, like a paint job, a major power plant job, a major avionics job. And they all looked at each other and they started to try to figure out to name names of companies and everybody fell short.

We had a real zero base when it came to that category.

The aviation landscape was barren when it came to looking down a list of firms in Pennsylvania that could provide the

services.

1.3

Not only was work drying up, new aviation service firms were knocking on the doors of Pennsylvania's airports looking to locate or relocate into Pennsylvania.

The council's board decided to look at this project very seriously and that's why we're here today.

Larry Krauter, who was president of the council at the time, who is seated directly to my right, identified this as a major, major project that we basically could not fail at. We basically needed to make sure that eventually this project got done.

Or we ran the risk of actually seeing airports in the Commonwealth dry up because they weren't able to identify and create new business on the airports.

As an example, Lehigh Valley

International Airport lost a Boeing 737

aircraft and with that over 12 good-paying

jobs, the maintenance and everything that came

and accompanied that aircraft flew out because

the aircraft had never paid a sales tax when

the aircraft was originally purchased in

1 another state.

The Pennsylvania Department of

Revenue knocked on the door and a \$50 million

Boeing business jet at six percent means the

owner has to pay \$3 million in sales tax, just

like an automobile or any other taxable item

under the revenue code.

REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: That's nothing on that.

MR. ROCKMAKER: The -- the bottom
line was the company decided to pick up the
airplane and literally flew out of
Pennsylvania, those jobs along with that
aircraft, and, of course, the result was a
loss of income to the airport as well.

Prior to me taking over at the council here, I had an assignment when I was the deputy director of Lehigh Valley
International Airport. This goes back several years ago.

We had identified a company, ITT

Corporation, based in New York City. They had seven corporate jets based at La Guardia

Airport and we started to negotiate to bring them to Pennsylvania.

And keep in mind, this is in my prior position. ITT ended up coming into the Lehigh Valley in this case. They built a brand new facility, a multi-million dollar facility, relocated over 80 high-paying jobs into the Lehigh Valley, and they operated for many years there.

The interesting part was that that was in my estimation the phase one. ITT's chairman certainly was very involved in the decision to move their corporate operation out of New York.

Phase two perhaps could have been the purchase of the Bethlehem Steel building, which some of you may know is still vacant to this day.

Now, that's not something -- that's not something that a lot of people know, but I decided to bring it out because I was the person involved in bringing ITT to the Lehigh Valley.

And what am I saying here? Sometimes the airplane or aircraft come first and then the business follows.

I hope you understood and followed

what I -- I just went through there.

The Conklin and de Decker site -study. This important for you. The council
retained the services of the premiere aviation
sales tax specialist in the United States, Nel
Sanders Stubbs.

She prepared a study looking at surrounding states. As we suspected, the study was quite clear. We were at a disadvantage.

Unfortunately, on a regular basis,

Ms. Stubbs reports to clients across the

United States when they're looking to relocate
their aircraft, because of tax implications,
et cetera, on a regular basis, she is steering
all different size of firms, not just Fortune

100s and 200s, but when it comes to people
that own aircraft, she'll steer them out of
Pennsylvania because of the ensuing sales tax
that will follow when they bring the aircraft
into Pennsylvania.

And this happens on a regular basis.

The industry right now is going through another birth of a new category of aircrafts. Some of you may be familiar with

the term VLJ or very light jet and personal light jets.

This category is going to continue to grow, and it's going to require services and a wide selection of suppliers across the United States.

Pennsylvania had been in the final running for service centers for both Eclipse and Embraer Aviation. We have lost these business opportunities to New York and Connecticut respectively. Both of these states do not have sales tax on parts, maintenance, and repairs.

Each of these facilities would have employed between 35 to 100 employees to start, with future expansion.

Today I can share that there are still at least two firms eyeing Pennsylvania for a similar service center. One of them is Honda Jet. As most of you know, and I'm sure Chairman Markosek, and I know Representative Geist is also aware because of his international travels, Honda Jet is one of the premiere total global transportation companies in the world.

Honda is looking at Pennsylvania to bring in a service center. Their decision, I believe, will be coming within six to nine months to break ground some place in Pennsylvania.

On Page 11, I'd like you to follow me if you could please. It's called the unique balance.

This is an example of what takes place when DCED is out providing economic development stimulus packages.

A firm will go out -- a firm is offered a package of incentives to relocate to Pennsylvania from another state. A relocation package could include:

A \$2 million infrastructure grant.

\$500,000 in employee training.

\$500,000 in state income tax.

On the other side of the balance sheet, the relocating business determines that their two aircraft will generate a Pennsylvania sales tax bill of over \$6 million. This is because the business did not pay sales tax in the state that they have the aircraft based and originally purchased in.

You can do the math. You'll see that there's a net loss of \$3 million just moving into the state with the aircraft. So the \$3 million that the -- that the state is going to give to help attract really is -- is a -- not only -- it's not a wash. It's -- it's a net loss.

And the chairman sits there in the aircraft one day, you know, sitting with the director of aviation and says, boy, is this really a good opportunity for us? We're bringing our airplanes in and we're going to be really paying a lot in tax just to come into the state.

The Pennsylvania Aviation Advisory

Committee in March 22, 2007 found through a report that the sales and use tax attributable to the aircraft, aircraft engine and parts manufacturing and overhaul dropped from 1.9 million in 0 -- 2000 to only 500,000 in 2005/2006.

Accordingly, the total estimated PA sales tax revenue collected according to the Department of Revenue in '06 was \$800,000. As you can see, this is a major drop.

There's a very clear picture here,
revenue continues to drop. It will never get
to zero, because not everybody is going to not
do any maintenance in Pennsylvania, but there
will be some light maintenance in
Pennsylvania.

But based on that kind of number, it's -- it's dry -- it has dried up. It has dried up.

Also the Fels Institute did a study.

And, again, I'm not going to read this at this point. I think you can see for yourself what the Fels Institute did with their study information.

It's pretty clear, again, we are at a tremendous disadvantage. Pennsylvania has turned into a warehouse for aviation. We turned into a warehouse. And we need to change that.

In the packets that were brought forward today, I believe they were passed out in the folders, there is a map. You should each have a map in there and that also depicts geographically for picture purposes what we're talking about.

```
1
               Very clear. Aircraft can move very
2
     quickly. They can get in and out and that --
     that is what we're facing.
3
               So we're trying to turn it around so
4
5
     that we're not just a warehouse for aircraft
     in Pennsylvania.
6
7
               Thank you very much.
8
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you
9
     very much.
               Perhaps brief comments from any of
10
11
     the other gentlemen?
12
               MR. KRAUTER: I'm sorry. I thought
     you were going to ask some questions,
13
14
     Mr. Chairman.
15
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Well, we can.
16
     can.
17
               MR. KRAUTER: I'm ready to go.
18
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: For questions or
19
     for --
20
               MR. KRAUTER: For -- for an
21
     additional statement.
22
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Just some
23
     brief statements from all of you or some of
24
     you. We are running -- and I apologize.
25
     We -- we're short on time today.
```

MR. KRAUTER: I'll try to abbreviate my comments, Mr. Chairman.

Obviously, all of you are going to be sitting here asking the question: Why is this important for us?

We're asking you to eliminate this tax because we want to retain companies that are being enticed to relocate out of state.

And you're going to hear from one representative of that company shortly.

We want to achieve competitive parity with neighboring states that have developed distinct advantages in attracting aviation-related businesses that we're competing for as a result of a more favorable tax treatment.

And we want to make our airports continue to be financially self-sufficient.

All of you are aware in your various travels that airports are under increasing pressure to become financially self-sufficient.

And, obviously, any assistance we can get to attract and retain aviation businesses at our facilities are going to contribute dramatically to that.

No one is going to disagree that there are some serious airspace problems in the New York area that are representing some -- really opportunities in Pennsylvania.

There are many companies that do
business in the New York City metro area and
New Jersey metro areas that are now shopping
airports in Pennsylvania in order to set up
their corporate flight departments;
maintenance, repair and overhaul types of
businesses; and charter and fractional
ownership businesses because they can base
their employees and their aircraft resources
in Pennsylvania and take a short hop into the
New Jersey or New York metro area with their
customers and come back.

So it's very financially efficient for them to do that. Particularly in light of the airspace problems that they're encountering in the system.

So as a result, we get shopped a lot by a lot of corporations looking to do business, and I can tell you that within the past few months we've been asked to make proposals to Embraer, Honda Jet, American

Eurocopter, and also a Fortune 500 financial firm that you would easily recognize if I were able to mention them. And all for the same 3 purposes.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other issue that I wanted to bring to your attention that was touched on by Mr. Rockmaker is the fact that it's forecast that we'll have 7,600 very light jets flying in the U.S. by 2025.

These jets can retail anywhere from 2 to \$5 million. And Honda Jet, I'll use as an example, is going to retail for about 3.65 million.

Now, obviously when someone wants to come into the state and buy a Honda Jet product and base it in Pennsylvania they're going to be reluctant to pay about \$225,000 of sales and use tax to do that, as you heard in the ITT case.

As I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, we have received serious interest from a major helicopter manufacturer to set up a sales and service center to service the northeastern United States at our airport.

They visited on numerous occasions

and the last visit included the president of the company himself.

And the president of the company told us in no uncertain terms that he was very impressed with the airport facility. He was impressed with the management team at the airport. He was impressed with our financial offer.

But the sales and use tax was sort of the issue of the day with the president. And he had just turned to us and said, look,

Maryland is recruiting us heavily. We would like to come here, but is there anything that you can do on the sales and use tax because that is going to erode our competitive position dramatically and obviously impact the decision that we make to come into Pennsylvania?

And obviously we made the president of the company aware of our efforts and your efforts to address this matter. I'm hopeful that we'll be able to address it quickly enough that we can impact this decision.

Because it's an important decision.

Another part of the problem that the

sales and use tax creates that I mentioned impacts our ability to be financially self-sufficient.

If we do have the opportunity to bring a business into the airport, one of the problems that we face then is downward pressure on our rates and charges because we're effectively going to -- being forced to make up for the sales and use tax impact.

So that company may say, okay, we're going to deal with the sales and use tax but now we're going to turn to you, airport authority, and we're going to say, charge us less hangar rent. As a -- as an example, charge us a lower, you know, fuel flowage fee, other types of things like that.

So effectively they're turning around and putting downward pressure on us and we're at the same time trying to charge market rates that we think are -- are reasonable. So we're kind of being forced to make up for that situation.

And obviously when you're trying to be financially self-sufficient, that is -- that is a problem.

We've made an investment. We at
Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority actually
own and operate the FBO.

And we made an investment to establish a factory sales and service center for Robinson Helicopters. An R44, which is a four-place helicopter, can retail for about \$350,000, just to give you an idea.

We made this decision because there was a big hole in the service area for Robinson Helicopter sales and service. And I think one of the big reasons that there's a big hole in the service area is because no one wants to come in and put a factory-authorized dealer in here and pay the six percent that goes along with all of the work that would be done on these types of -- of equipment.

But our pilots came to us and said, look, we're tired of flying to New York.

We're tired of flying to Maryland to do basic maintenance. Is there anything that you guys can do to try to help us out?

So we've made this investment. It's somewhat of a -- of a business risk in part exacerbated by the sales and use tax.

And it might surprise you on how this kind of comes around again on rates and charges. We have mechanics who are very highly trained, air frame and power plant mechanics.

Do you realize that it costs you more to go get your Lexus worked on in the Lehigh Valley than it costs you to use the services of an air frame and power plant mechanic to work on a jet aircraft?

A hundred bucks at the Lexus dealer.

Eighty bucks at Lehigh Valley Aviation

Services. In part, because we have to be

competitive. We have to lower our -- our shop

rates to offset those sales tax liabilities.

One of our tenants at the airport has estimated that they could add up to seven new aircraft to their management contract if the sales and use tax was eliminated.

They predict that this would add up to 30 new jobs, increase fuel sales, and obviously increase the hangar rental income back to the airport authority.

There is no doubt in my mind that this is a formula that could repeated at many

airports across the Commonwealth if the sales and use tax was eliminated.

As you heard Mr. Rockmaker indicate earlier, one of the leading experts in the country, which is often consulted by these types of businesses, has a clear message that they're broadcasting to aviation. It's stay out of Pennsylvania.

And obviously that's the wrong message. They're saying stay out of Pennsylvania with your high-paying jobs, stay out of Pennsylvania with your investment capital, and stay out of Pennsylvania with your new technology.

And obviously we want to work with the legislators to change that message so the Conklins and de Deckers of the world are saying, hey, have you considered Pennsylvania to base your corporate aircraft or to base your maintenance, repair and overhaul business?

Very important that we turn this around in order to retain the businesses that are here and win new business that's out there.

1 We have an excellent system of airports. They're geographically important, 2 as we're seeing by all this shopping that's 3 going on for these sales and service centers. 4 5 The recent experience, though, that we've had is that the geography alone is not 6 7 going to carry us. We have got to have relief on the sales and use tax if we're going to 8 9 continue to be successful in attracting these new businesses and, of course, retaining this 10 11 business. 12 This is not a maybe, someday topic This is a must have issue. We must 1.3 for us. 14 have this issue and we must have your help to 15 repeal this tax. 16 I appreciate your attention to my 17 comments, Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Krauter. 19 20 Mr. Ford? 21 MR. FORD: Yeah. Good morning. CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Mr. David Ford of 22 23 Keystone Helicopter. 24 And after your remarks, I think we're

going to go to questions on this particular

25

1 bill because I know the other speakers are also interested in the next bill that we're 2 3 going to speak on, too, if that's okay with everybody here. 4 5 So, Mr. -- Mr. Ford --MR. FORD: Good morning. 6 7 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: -- for brief remarks. Thank you. 8 9 MR. FORD: Thank you very much. I --I think Keystone Helicopter does have a unique 10 This is not anecdotal 11 perspective. information. This is our business. This is 12 what drives us day in and day out. 13 14 Keystone Helicopter was founded in 15 the state of Pennsylvania in 1953 by aviation 16 industry icon, Mr. Peter Wright, and we've 17 been located here every since. 18 In 2005, we were acquired by Sikorsky Aircraft who is a part of the United 19 20 Technologies Group, a \$40 billion Fortune 50 21 company. 22 We currently do a significant amount of helicopter completion and maintenance and 23 24 repair and overhaul activities here at our

heliplex activity which is located near

25

Chester County Airport.

In fact, in the past five years, since the acquisition by Sikorsky, we've grown from a relatively small, \$40 million, family-owned business with less than 200 employees, to a much larger business. We're now in excess of \$150 million annual revenue and we currently employ over 500 employees at our state-of-the-art facility in -- near -- near Coatesville.

As you know, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania imposes the six percent sales tax and that does, in fact, impact our -- our competitive advantage.

If I very conservatively were to estimate that only ten percent of the business that we actively seek, we lose because of this competitive disadvantage.

When you -- when you look at six percent sales tax, that's a significant factor when somebody is looking at a major either overhaul or modification or repair, even purchase of an -- of an aircraft.

Most of our major modifications run in the 1 to \$2 million range and an aircraft,

a complete sale of a helicopter can be in the 10 to \$12 million range.

And we firmly believe that
elimination of this sales tax would
significantly improve our win rate which would
allow us to continue to grow our business,
which would attract new jobs to the state of
Pennsylvania, add additional revenue, because
obviously we pay corporate income tax at the
9.9 percent rate so every dollar of additional
revenue that we bring in we pay taxes and it
goes back.

In fact, we are -- we are currently considering a major expansion to our facility that could potentially add another 250 jobs and would create a construction project in the neighborhood of \$18 million. If you just looked at the additional tax that an \$18 million construction job would bring and the -- the vast majority of that will be contracted through local Pennsylvania companies to do all of that construction work, so if you looked at that, if you look at the 250 new jobs, all of these are -- are individuals that will be spending their

paycheck, buying houses in the local area, using the services, and -- and obviously 3 they're paying their -- their personal income tax, the potential is that we would eclipse 4 5 the \$800,000 of -- of tax revenue that the state brought in 2006 in a very, very short 6 7 time.

Again, as has been mentioned by others, these are good, high-paying jobs. typical aviation professional is -- is earning typically in excess of \$60,000 a year. you're bringing in, you know, very high, good-paying jobs into this area.

So, again, we would simply urge you to -- to consider this bill and consider it quickly, because our decisions are being made right now in terms of whether we're going to expand here or whether we're going to divert that work elsewhere.

And potentially we could be faced with a decision to relocate the entire business at some point in the future, because it becomes increasingly difficult to compete in this environment.

Thanks. I'd be happy to answer any

25

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 questions.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank
you. You've all made your case very well, I
think.

We have some -- just for the information of folks here -- some members who are Transportation Committee wannabes who have joined us, I ask them to join us up here at the front, to show them the courtesies of our -- our committee here.

Any questions from the -- the members here? Any of the members?

I think we all pretty much got the gist of what you're saying. You made a very, very good presentation today.

So seeing no questions, we'll move on to the next piece of legislation. Now, some of you out there at the front, you can either stay there. I know you have interest in both issues and we have some other folks who are moving forward.

The other bill -- while we're getting settled, the other bill is House Bill 2292.

Representative Lentz, who is here today with us, and while we're waiting to get situated,

Representative Lentz, would you like to make a brief comment on your bill, please.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Thank you. I apologize to the members and witnesses for being late. I was at a Local Government Committee.

And based on the testimony I've been reading here, I wish I'd stayed at the Local Government Committee.

I'm interested to see that

Representative Siptroth's bill appears to be

slightly more popular than my bill. But I -
I have met with some of the representatives

and had some conversation before the hearing

today and I -- I thank Chairman Markosek for

holding these hearings.

I think it is an important issue and
I think there is -- there is an obvious
difference to all of us between securing
ground vehicles and securing airplanes.

In the Army we used to call it airplanes have the ability of vertical insertion which is a great advantage of vehicles if you're trying to carry out some bad deed.

1 And as security gets tighter and 2 tighter at our major airports, that's -- that 3 can potentially have the impact of -- of pushing -- making the smaller airports, the 4 5 general aviation airports, targets for that type of activity. 6 7 I -- I personally don't see this as 8 being a burdensome requirement, but I know 9 we're going to hear some testimony to that effect. 10 11 But I'm also interested to see has this been tried in other states and to what 12 effect and to what success. 13 14 But I thank the Chairman for having 15 the hearing and giving me the opportunity to 16 participate. CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Sure. 17 Thank you, 18 Representative Lentz. 19 I'd like to call on Mr. Brad Penrod 20 first who's Allegheny County Airport 21 Authority's new executive director. I just 22 met him myself today. 23 Welcome, Brad. And you may proceed. 24 We chatted briefly about your comments

relative to this bill and --

25

1 MR. BRADLEY PENROD: Very good.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to the committee members.

My name is -- my name is Brad Penrod, executive director and CEO of the Allegheny County Airport Authority.

As the operators of the Allegheny

County Airport and the Pittsburgh

International Airport, the Authority is

acutely aware of the operating security issues

facing airports and the aviation industry

today.

At the Allegheny County Airport, one of the largest general aviation airports in the Commonwealth, in cooperation with our tenants and industry groups, we have implemented a number of best practice related — best practices related to security without the need for legislative guidance from the state or federal levels.

The proposed language for security plans at public airports in the Commonwealth is a concern to many airports. Initially, my primary concern is to identify the exact issue the proposed language wants to address.

Well, I agree that airport operators are encouraged to coordinate with their tenants and local Law Enforcement Officers and industry groups, and promote security awareness with their tenants, a one-size plan does not fit, is not realistic, and would, in fact, restrict general aviation and its growth in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Given that many public use airports in the Commonwealth are already security -- have already in place airport security plans approved by the Transportation Security Administration, a separate security plan, as proposed in the current language, would be an additional burden and cost on airport operators and tenants with no apparent benefit.

Federal Sensitive Security

Information requirements would need -- would

need to be cleared by federally regulated

airports before they could be disseminated to

state and county officials, further

compromising airport security.

Other concerns would be with the -- my understanding, at the current time the

Bureau of Aviation does not have the staffing resources to be tasked with reviewing airport security plans.

Additional, it is not certain or clear if the department would conduct security assessments or if the task would be outsourced to the Pennsylvania State Police.

If outsourced, the concern becomes who would do the regulatory inspection and enforcements.

Specialized training specific for enforcement personnel would need to include operation of motor vehicles on airports and the time and cost of this training would need to be realized in a component of the overall implementation.

Additionally, the legislation references coordination with the local Emergency Management Agencies. The EMA, Emergency Management Agency, may or may not be the applicable resource to draw from.

Law Enforcement Agencies may be better suited for reviews, depending on the specific county individual needs, and, again, a one-size plan does not fit the airport

system.

1.3

Should the proposed language be implemented, we would need to ask if the legislation would expose the Commonwealth to the liability associated with an accident involving an aircraft in which the pilot did not remove one of the locks as required by the legislation.

A gust lock, which is a form of control movement, movement restriction, common to general aviation aircraft, have been cited on more than one occasion to have been the cause of aircraft accidents due to the pilot's failure to remove the locks prior to flight.

Additionally, an example of it, the pilot -- or the propeller/chain lock, if required by the Commonwealth, would the Commonwealth be liable for any propeller damage or structural fatigue to the aircraft engine and the associated costs if that propeller lock would not -- would not be removed?

The Commonwealth should be encouraged to endorse the Aircraft Owners and Pilots
Association's Airport Watch Program and best

practices that are in place today.

2 Aircraft Owners and Pilot

Association, AOPA; and the TSA, Transportation Security Association; airport industry groups and airports across the United States work on a regular basis to address a well-coordinated and thought-out security solution that is applicable to the entire industry.

Because aviation is a national and even international system in nature, the security of the same should be a nationwide standard.

A legislative solution on a state level to a problem that does not exist will be a deterrent to general aviation in the Commonwealth.

Given the significant number of public use airports in the Commonwealth, not to mention the many private airfields, the resources needed to inspect and enforce the proposed security plans would be a significant strain on existing resources and would require an expensure -- an expenditure of variable (sic) funds.

The responsibility of enforcement of

the proposed language is not clearly identified.

Further, the systems and controls
that are identified in the proposed language
would be burdensome and costly to maintain and
are currently without a funding source.

The proposed language identifies that airports would be responsible for complying with the act. The additional inspection of aircraft locks, a task and burden on airport operators, would require additional staff and time and resources.

Additionally, if the locks are interior to the aircraft, there would not be a physical way to inspect that lock.

A concern also is to penalize airport operators of the loss of department funding -- would be to establish legislation that is set to fail upon implementation and airport improvements across the Commonwealth are required to ensure safe operating conditions and improve facilities would not be funded.

The proposed language is not clear as to who would be liable for any criminal penalty that may be imposed for noncompliance.

1 Certainly the airport operator and 2 sponsor -- or sponsor should not be as -- as 3 they do not operate and maintain the aircraft. Additionally, in many cases an 4 5 aircraft operator -- an aircraft is owned by a group, a club, a corporation, or a person and 6 7 may not necessarily be the same person that would be operating the aircraft. 8 9 For the reasons outlined above, and for the betterment of aviation in the 10 11 Commonwealth, I strongly suggest that the 12 security plan and the two-lock rule currently 13 proposed not be supported. 14 Thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you 16 very much. 17 Mr. Roger Moog --18 MR. MOOG: Thank you. 19 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: -- from the 20 Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission. 21 MR. MOOG: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, 22 and good morning to the committee. 23 I represent the Delaware Valley 24 Regional Planning Commission. We do Aviation

System Planning in the Delaware Valley and

25

metropolitan area, twelve counties in and around Philadelphia, Bucks, Montgomery, Chester, Delaware County and Philadelphia County in Pennsylvania since 1982.

In the wake of 9/11/01 communities in our region in Pennsylvania indicated some anxiety about their general aviation airports. We're not talking about Philly International or any commercial service airports but general aviation.

That those airports might be used as staging areas for terrorist activity or the site of terrorist activity and thereby jeopardize the communities that they -- the suburban communities that they belong into.

As a result, DVRPC did a study of security risks and countermeasure recommendations at 22 total airports in the region, including New Jersey and Delaware and one airport in Maryland.

In Pennsylvania we looked at 13 small airports. Each airport was surveyed physically and people at that airport were interviewed.

The airport risks were rated and

analyzed against one another. We were not compared to risk of terrorism by other transportation modes, like a truck or a car or another surface transportation.

I'm going to give you briefly the conclusions of that study. It was determined that the risk of terrorism type -- type events relating to small airports had to do with four major variables.

One was runway length, which, of course, is also proportionally to the size of the aircraft that can use the airport.

Second was critical public infrastructure nearby, thereby considered to be attractive targets by the security analysts that did the study.

If operations levels at the airport was busier, then it was assumed it could be a higher risk airport.

And, finally, if there was agricultural activities at the airport, which I found to be interesting, but the security analysts thought that that was an important variable as well.

For the 22 airports in the study, 13

were in Pennsylvania, three were determined to be high risks, seven were voted -- were determined to be medium risks, and three in the study -- and they're all in the Philadelphia area -- were determined to be low risk.

Then the study developed countermeasure recommendations to control or minimize that risk in the future. And as you would expect, the lowest risk airports had the fewest countermeasure recommendations and they were simply awareness campaigns at the airport, a single point of contact for -- for unusual activity that might be noted, and securing all aircraft keys. And I presume that the owners of those aircraft would secure those keys.

As you look at the airports that got more risky, additional strategies were added.

The principal one was secure the aircraft itself; random security patrols; relationships -- formalized relationships with local police; employee I.D.; limited access to the field itself, the operating area; and, finally, for the -- for the biggest of the

G.A. airports, that the cargo and passengers should be verified by the airport operator and -- and -- and verified as being in the appropriate aircraft.

None of these countermeasure strategies that were proposed in our study was high capital intensive in nature. We weren't asking the airport to do major construction to improve security like they do at commercial service but were really procedural in nature as far as raising awareness and preventing careless situations.

You'll be hearing, I know, from a number of representatives of PA Pilots and Airport Owners that have some problems with the -- with the securing aircraft by a two-lock rule, as has been proposed in the legislation.

But I -- since my region is partially in New Jersey and New Jersey currently has that two-lock rule for its general aviation airports, I made some contacts at New Jersey DOT and they have indicated to me that there has been no resistance by pilots or airport owners to this rule.

However, I think that the rule as proposed needs to be more specifically interpreted and -- with regard to a liability issue for aircraft -- airport owners, because they cannot necessarily control the aircraft owners on their airport. Also the potential for lost state grant aid for noncompliance again because the airport owners do not necessarily control the aircraft operators' or owners' behavior.

And, lastly, I would say that -- that given the fact that the payload of larger business type aircraft is larger than smaller recreational-type aircraft that is housed at many of these smaller airports, perhaps the two-lock rule might be tailored to larger aircraft versus smaller aircraft in some way.

The last comment I would make is that in the -- in the case of the New Jersey experience, the aviation people in New Jersey commented to me that the inspection for conformity to the two-lock rule has -- is done on a regular basis by state employees that are out there inspecting the airports anyway so they've experienced no increase in

```
1
     bureaucratic cost to administer this rule.
               That concludes my comments.
2
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you
3
     very much. Very interesting comments.
4
5
              Next Mr. Kelly Fredericks. Is he up?
     Not here? Okay.
6
7
              MR. ROCKMAKER: He's here,
8
     Representative. But you're not going to
9
     testify?
10
              MR. FREDERICKS: Not yet.
11
              MR. ROCKMAKER: Right now he said
     he's not going to testify.
12
13
              CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Oh, okay. Sir,
14
     you are?
15
              MR. GREG PECORARO: Greg Pecoraro
16
     from AOPA.
17
              CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Would you like
18
     to --
19
              MR. PECORARO: Yes, thank you very
20
     much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21
              CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: -- proceed
22
     briefly?
23
              MR. PECORARO: Yes. Good morning.
24
               Thank you for allowing us to testify
25
     on behalf of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots
```

Association, the world's largest aviation association representing more than 415,000 members, including more than 13,600 in Pennsylvania, and we're here to express our opposition to House Bill 2292.

First, we'd like to make sure you understand that general aviation aircraft are not considered a significant threat by the Transportation Security Administration.

The typical GA aircraft weighs less fully loaded than a Honda Civic weighs empty. The first attempt to bring down the World Trade Center and the successful attack -- attack later on the federal building in Oklahoma City, both used trucks.

Yet it is the aircraft and their pilots that is targeted in the proposed legislation.

Make no mistake. AOPA believes that securing one's aircraft using at least one method is a good idea. But mandating it is not necessary.

An aircraft is a high-value item.

Even a simple, 30-year-old aircraft can be

worth \$40,000 or more. Owners take reasonable

precautions to protect that investment.

A recent survey of AOPA members shows that 91 percent secure their aircraft from theft or unauthorized use. At the same time, these members are adamantly opposed to government mandates requiring them to do so.

Historically, in the years since 9/11 only about nine general aviation aircraft a year are stolen, and the number of GA aircraft stolen is down sharply since the general aviation community has taken steps to enhance security. Only three aircraft were stolen in 2007, this out of a nationwide fleet of over 220,000 registered GA aircraft.

Security is a priority for the federal government and the entire aviation community. Security at general aviation, which is non-airline, non-military, airports is a complex issue.

While operations at airports with airline service are similar enough for the government to impose one-size-fits-all security requirements, general aviation airports are too varied for any single solution to work.

1 The federal government uses a

2 | multi-layered approach to aviation security.

3 | It's much more than fences, gates, and locks.

4 It begins when a person first decides to learn

5 to fly. You have to prove your nationality,

6 and if you're not a U.S. citizen, you have to

7 undergo a background check. And everyone who

8 holds a U.S. Pilot certificate, whether they

9 are a foreign national or a U.S. citizen, is

10 | checked constantly and regularly checked

11 | against all available terrorist watch lists.

For general aviation airports, the U.S. Transportation Security Administration has provided guidelines scalable to fit the needs of everything from the smallest grass

16 airstrips to executive airports serving

17 | business jets.

airport employees.

A key component of those guidelines is the Airport Watch program developed by AOPA in close collaboration with the TSA. It is essentially a neighborhood watch program for pilots -- airports that draws on the eyes and ears of America's 600,000 pilots as well as

In fact, Airport Watch's message to

25

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

one of the posters here for the program which you can see encourages people to do that and says, have you secured your aircraft? Because we do take the issue of securing aircraft very seriously, and these are posted at aircrafts -- at airports all across America as well as these signs that AOPA has worked to make sure get posted. This is for the Airport Watch program, it lists an 800 -- a toll-free number that is staffed by TSA personnel, available 24/7 for people to call in. And, of course, we always encourage people in the case of an immediate emergency to call 911.

Aviation security is the business of everyone who flies. But it is the jurisdiction of the federal government, who has consistently worked at this -- since -- in the years since 9/11 and has also imposed, as we do, a patchwork of regulations that would differ across the country, such as we would have if Pennsylvania were to take this step.

Pennsylvania's proposed two-lock rule with its criminal penalties makes no more sense that jailing a mom with arms full of

groceries who forgets to lock her car on the way into the house.

We encourage you to reconsider this legislation. Thank you for your time and consideration.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Gary Hudson, briefly, and then we'll throw it open to questions. Thank you.

MR. GARY HUDSON: Okay. Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

I'm here today because I'm very much in favor of this two-lock rule for the simple fact that I'm the airport manager at Chester County Airport and I look at my airport as being in the traffic for terrorists' possible activity.

Right now we have about 148 total aircraft. Of those 148, 31 are business jets. We have a 5400-foot runway. We have about 54,000 operations a year.

The airport is also in very close proximity to what I consider to be three security-sensitive areas. We're only ten nautical miles from the Limerick nuclear power plant, only 15 miles from the Peach Bottom

nuclear power plant, and we're about 45 miles northwest of Philadelphia, which, as you know, is a very largely populated area.

We also have a lot of influential people that come in and out of the airport and that are also based at the airport. And for that reason, a lot of these people want to feel safe, not only for themselves but for their investment.

things that need to be done to try and tweak this -- this particular plan. It does have some flaws in it, which Roger and I were concerned about, but I also feel that it is something -- it's something that should not be put off on the back burner. It's something that should really be thoroughly looked at and -- and really thought of.

Because my philosophy has always been that terrorists are constantly looking for new ways to try and cause destruction to -- to persons and property.

In closing, I'm the type person where I honestly believe that you don't wait for the dam to break before you fix it.

1 Thank you very much. 2 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you 3 very much, Mr. Hudson. 4 Representative Watson. 5 REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 7 My mike may or may not be working. 8 I'll try and speak up. 9 I have questions first. Any of you gentlemen could answer. 10 Let me begin by giving just kind of a 11 resume for me. I've been on the 12 Transportation Committee since I came in 2001. 13 14 I am the author of legislation you may or may 15 not like, which is Flying While Impaired. 16 Because, quite frankly, rather than terrorists 17 being in the Philadelphia area, what we had to 18 fear out of the sky were several pilots who --I can't imagine -- but were able to manage to 19 20 get the aircraft up and fly drunk. 21 And because they couldn't be 22 prosecuted by the state criminally, we took care of that. 23 24 I would also share with you that I

have, as I'm afraid probably some of you do in

25

```
1
      this room, a very close association,
2
     particularly, for 9/11 in the sense that my
3
      son was on an aircraft that had just left New
      York that morning and we couldn't find him for
4
5
      four hours. And we weren't sure if it
     wasn't -- we didn't have his -- he's an adult.
6
7
      You know how they don't tell you everything.
8
     We didn't have his exact -- you know, what
9
     plane he was flying on and so forth.
10
               So there is nobody who worries about
11
      terrorism -- my son still lives in New York
12
     City, in spite of his mother's begging. So
     there's nobody who doesn't care about all
13
14
      that.
15
               Okay. All that said, I'm also not, I
16
      quess, affluent enough that no one in my
17
      family owns an aircraft. I have received
18
      information.
19
               Sir, if I were to own an aircraft and
20
     ask to come to your airport to house my
21
     aircraft, a little far from Bucks County, but
      let's assume I move to Chester.
22
23
               MR. HUDSON: Uh-huh.
               REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: Do I not have
24
```

to -- I mean is it just automatically, if I 25

```
1
     pay you the rent, I get to do what I want or
2
     do you not have rules for me to be a part of
3
      it, to be a -- a tenant, or what you will, at
     your aircraft -- at your airport?
4
5
               MR. HUDSON: Yeah.
                                   There are certain
      rules that are in place. For instance, if you
6
7
     want to become a tenant in my airport and you
     want to build a hangar, well, obviously you
8
9
     have to meet the financial obligations.
10
               Right now in terms of security, we
11
     really don't have anything in place in terms
12
     of --
               REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: But you could
13
14
     do that, sir, and impose those rules?
15
               MR. HUDSON: Oh, absolutely.
16
               REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: Okay.
17
               MR. HUDSON: Absolutely.
18
               REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: Because I am
      familiar with Doylestown Airport.
19
20
               MR. HUDSON: Uh-huh.
21
               REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: I live in
22
     Warrington, Bucks County, and I went to all of
23
     them and that's what they assured me, that
24
     these things were being done.
25
               I also, having come out of county
```

government, have connections and in Bucks we have the advantage that in the five county area some of our people are key in the Homeland Security issue.

I talked to all of them, and I'm sorry, Representative Lentz, you picked the wrong seat coming in because -- but they all assured me and said, what is this? This doesn't -- you know, this is not on the radar screen.

And these are the folks that get the grants that do the things in the five county area. And when I called them -- one I knew well enough to call at home over the weekend -- and they just said to me -- so I didn't understand where this came from.

I heard from people I never heard from before. There are a lot of affluent people in my area who own aircraft. I was amazed. And they all very much opposed, opposed because -- and, again, I think I understand, in the sense I felt I was right to have criminal penalties for flying while impaired, but they got really upset about the idea and so someone forgets to lock and

somebody comes through that day I am now facing criminal charges.

And then a discussion -- and I had wonderful letters from a gentleman, I guess, and ladies in your association who certainly -- you obviously must have given bullet points because they used some of the same material.

But I realize -- I just have concern
that it seems to be a solution in search of a
problem and I try to do every bit of due
diligence in talking to Pennridge Airport,
that's right in my district; Doylestown
Airport, which is not; Homeland Security. I
went everywhere I could, and, quite frankly, I
didn't get any support, regardless of New
Jersey or whatever.

And, more importantly, they all told me they had the rules and they have the rules in place and they were aware of this, because this goes back about three years, if I'm correct --

MR. MOOG: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: -- Mr. Moog?

MR. MOOG: Yes.

1 REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: Okay. That 2 they all had implementation at their airports 3 to provide for security and that it was being abided by. And, quite frankly, they were in 4 5 better -- a better place to enforce their own security rules because they were right there. 6 7 So this wasn't tasking someone else who had 8 another job to come in and also do this. 9 And so I guess, Mr. Chairman, and 10 with all due respect to Representative Lentz, 11 who comes from where I grew up so we have an 12 affection for Delaware County, but I guess to use a line from that movie Big, I don't get 13 14 it. I just don't get it. 15 Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, 17 Representative. 18 We'll let Representative Lentz ask a 19 question or respond or whatever. 20 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: I will say 21 that was a -- a -- that was an excellent --22 that was an excellent question. 23 REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: Thanks. Ι 24 did ask the gentleman. 25 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: But no. Well,

- 1 I've heard the testimony and I appreciate the
- 2 | input. People in general, as we all know, are
- 3 resistant to regulation and oversight.
- 4 However, I am not persuaded by the analogy to
- 5 automobiles, because, as I said, there's a
- 6 clear difference.
- 7 We have dealt with -- because of
- 8 | things like the Oklahoma bombing and the first
- 9 | bombing of the World Trade Center, we have
- 10 dealt with the access of trucks and cars to
- 11 sensitive areas. Those are called the
- 12 | barricades. You can't get near the White
- 13 | House anymore. You can't park a vehicle in
- 14 front of a federal building anymore
- That's been dealt with on the ground
- 16 | in reaction to that threat. We have -- we
- 17 | have not completely dealt with the aerial
- 18 threat and -- and, as was pointed out in -- by
- 19 Mr. Hudson, it doesn't take a big -- a broad
- 20 | imagination to think of things that you could
- 21 do as a terrorist or for any other type of
- 22 | criminal if you get in an airplane.
- 23 And it doesn't matter whether it's as
- 24 | big as a Honda or -- or -- or smaller. The
- 25 | fact is that they can insert aerially into

places that are otherwise secure from the ground. You can't get to them driving. You can't get to them walking. But you can get to them coming from the air.

And it seems to me that to ask people to lock airplanes up is -- is not an overly burdensome thing to do. And we haven't even mentioned the federal law and local law. We have an obligation in the State Assembly through everything we can do to prevent that type of activity.

And, you know, with regard to liability, I would say that in -- in my -- from my perspective you're more likely to be liable as an airport because you did require a locking system on airplanes -- if one of those airplanes is used in an attack, you're more likely to be sued for having failed to take that action than you are to be sued as a result of requiring it.

So I -- I agree that it should be tweaked and maybe we shouldn't link it to funding, but to have a summary offense to do, as Jersey apparently is successfully doing, to do everything we can to assure things that are

```
1
     sent -- that can be turned into missiles or
     used for various other bad activities are
2
3
     secured, to me is -- is a very minimal ask of
     the aviation community.
4
5
               But I appreciate the opportunity to
     be here today and -- and participate,
6
7
     Mr. Chairman.
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you,
8
9
     Representative Lentz.
               And do we have any other -- any other
10
11
     questions? I -- I have -- okay. Let me just
     ask -- I'll ask mine first.
12
               REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Oh, yeah.
13
14
      Sure. I thought you were summarizing.
15
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Just briefly, for
16
     some of us that are, I quess, amateurs to --
17
               REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Representative
18
     Lentz is on his way to get his picture taken
     with Hillary so he's excused.
19
20
               REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Thanks for the
21
     championship football team. Otherwise, I'd
22
     stay.
23
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Hilar was on your
     high school football team?
24
25
               Yes, just a -- I have a guess of it,
```

- 1 but let me ask mine first and then
- 2 Representative Siptroth and then
- 3 Representative Wannabe Moyer.
- 4 Just very briefly, the two-lock
- 5 | system, you know, reading through the -- the
- 6 bill and the analysis, they give you a number
- 7 of options for the two lock or the two types
- 8 of locks. None of them -- I mean just reading
- 9 off the top of my head here -- and I'll be the
- 10 | first to tell you I'm a novice at this.
- But none of them seem all that
- 12 unreasonable. So I guess I -- you know, if
- 13 | there's a question here, I'm trying to see the
- 14 | -- you know, the opposition, what -- is it the
- 15 | liability part of it that, you know, if we can
- 16 deal with that, would make a difference? Or
- 17 Brad?
- 18 MR. PENROD: I think you're -- if I
- 19 | could, just to touch on -- on the two locks, I
- 20 think some of it is the inspection
- 21 requirements and responsibilities. Who would
- 22 | actually do that?
- 23 | If an aircraft is noted to only have
- 24 one lock, who would be responsible to place
- 25 | the second lock? Who would be responsible if

```
1
      you didn't place that second lock?
               So I think it starts to become -- the
2
3
      details -- the devil in the details truly
     becomes the point in this case. Is it the
4
5
     hangar door lock? Is it the aircraft lock?
               In the case of Allegheny County
6
7
     Airport, we'd implemented almost immediately
8
     after 9/11 the I.D. -- photo I.D. badge
9
     program that I think is -- is probably one of
      the best -- best practices in the country
10
11
     with -- without any legislation to do that.
12
               And so it really comes down, I think,
     on the details of the two locks because
13
14
      there's so many different types of aircraft,
15
      there would be as many different types of
16
      locks, and the knowledge of those locks and
17
     how they work and who keeps the spares for
18
     those, just becomes a very unmanageable spare
19
     parts function almost.
20
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay.
21
     Representative Siptroth, then Representative
     Moyer.
22
23
               REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH:
                                          Thank you,
     Mr. Chairman.
24
```

This question is directed to AOPA.

Would -- would your organization object if this were aimed and targeted for Category 3 aircraft versus 1s and 2s?

Does that makes a better fit for -- for this particular piece of legislation?

MR. PECORARO: Well, certainly
without -- without endorsing a two-lock rule
for anybody, I would suggest that, you know,
aircraft of that nature probably are less
likely to be using the airports that we're
most concerned about and are more likely to be
using the airports that, in fact, in
Pennsylvania, you have so many of them, are
already access controlled.

In other words, you have a large number of access controlled airports in Pennsylvania and those aircraft, I think, generally are locked anyway.

So I think that while a criminal offense, criminal penalties are probably an over-reaction in any case, I think you would find that most aircraft that would fit that category probably do benefit from protection from -- from two locks somehow.

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: One other

question. One of the -- of the penalties is
grants to public airports. A number of
individuals that have aircraft have private
airports of their own and so the only -- the
only penalty would be the summary offense
itself.

And I think there's some concern

And I think there's some concern there that it's a double penalty if it's a public airport versus a private airport.

That's another concern of mine.

MR. PECORARO: Well, you raise a good point, Mr. Siptroth, and that is, you know, who is going to be going on private property and inspecting aircraft at privately owned airstrips to see if they're double locking the aircraft? Which, you know, is -- is certainly, I would think, problematic for anybody.

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: And in some instances with the double lock it's still possible to get an aircraft airborne.

MR. PECORARO: Well --

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: And depending on the type of lock that's used, and then you have the instability of the aircraft

once it's in the air and it could cause additional problems to the public, more public harm than what would be expected if there was a terrorist activity.

MR. PECORARO: Well, as anybody who has ever had their home burgled can tell you that with elaborate security systems, you know, any -- any security system or lock can be defeated.

The issue here -- and I think this is a very important issue -- is that you have to know how to fly the plane to get it up and do anything with it.

And as I've said, the pilot

population is constantly monitored. People

who have the ability to fly these planes are

being checked against the terrorists' watch

list as well as lots of other levels of

security with the TSA and the FAA and Homeland

Security you've instituted.

And it's our view that -- that, as the Representative said, this really is a solution in search of a problem because there just have not been any instances and -- and we don't -- you know, we don't expect that this

```
1
      is likely to be a problem.
2
               REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Thank you
3
      very much.
               Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4
5
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you.
               Our analyst points out that the
6
7
      language of the bill says that this is for
     public airports. So private airports
8
9
     apparently aren't covered under the language
      of the bill.
10
11
               Representative Moyer.
12
               REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Yes.
13
     Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm one of those
14
     wannabes. I -- I did put in for the
15
      committee, but I didn't make the cut.
               But the reason I'm here is --
16
17
               REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Then you
18
     better watch what you're saying then.
19
               REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Right.
                                               The
20
      reason --
21
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: You got my vote.
22
               REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Hey, thank
23
      you. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24
               The reason I'm here this morning is
25
     because I -- I placed my name on this bill,
```

because -- as a co-sponsor because I looked at it as a -- as a national security issue.

However, since I did that, I received some emails and some phone calls, one from a friend that's a pilot saying, Jay, this is nothing but a nuisance piece of legislation.

And I -- I have a question for the gentleman from Chester County. Did I understand you to say that you don't require any security for your aircraft? In other words, if I'm a pilot and I -- I contract with you in terms of parking my aircraft at your airport, you -- you don't require any security measures on my behalf at all?

MR. HUDSON: I believe the question that was originally asked me was if a new tenant comes on my airport what do we do. And as of right now, if you want to become a tenant and you want to build a hangar, things of that nature, we don't have anything in place in terms of doing a security background check.

If you come to the airport and you want to learn how to fly, that's a little different. Okay?

```
1
               But I also want you to understand
2
      that we do have security measures in place at
     my airport.
3
               REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Right.
4
5
               MR. HUDSON: I think for the size of
      the airport we have and for the type of
6
7
      equipment that we have flying at our airport,
      I think we have a -- a good system in place.
8
9
               But, once again, terrorists are
      always looking at new and inventive ways.
10
11
               REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Well, what I'm
      saying is if I had -- if I had my aircraft
12
13
     parked at your hangar, isn't there a checklist
14
     of things that you say to me as a pilot/owner
15
     of the aircraft, please lock your aircraft up.
16
      Don't you have signs to that effect? Isn't
17
      there some sort of security?
18
               MR. HUDSON: We -- we -- yes, we do.
     We have a -- actually a security
19
20
      representative who represents AOPA --
21
               REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Right.
22
               MR. HUDSON: -- who -- they would
23
     do -- post these particular type of signs
24
      around the airport.
25
               Other than that, that's basically it
```

right now.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: And the other question, final question I have is for Mr. Moog.

I listened to your testimony and I read your testimony and it wasn't clear to me whether you are for or against it. Are you sort of taking the middle line here? Are you -- are you for this -- this -- this proposed legislation? Are you against it?

MR. MOOG: Well, I think that the legislation -- I am for it in concept. I think it's got to be modified to address some of the issues that have been raised here today.

And I'm not an airport operator/owner or a pilot. I'm a system planner that has some sense of fiduciary responsibility for the airport system in the Philadelphia area as an asset to our community. And it seems to me -- and I've -- I've also dealt with a number of -- of concerns of community members about potential security risks.

And it seems to me that a little formalization of security thinking and

```
1
      regulation in that area is something that's
     good for the aviation community in the sense
2
3
      of public relations with the neighbors that
      they have to deal with to do anything
4
5
      substantive at that airport.
               REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you,
6
7
     Mr. Chairman.
               CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you.
8
9
               Just to mention that we have another
      former member who entered the room, our former
10
     member Gene Hill.
11
12
               Gene, welcome.
13
               Representative Chairman Geist.
14
               REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Thank you.
15
     don't think he looks like a terrorist at all,
16
     no matter what anybody says on that beard.
17
               But to the aircraft owners, just one
18
     question.
19
               MR. PECORARO: Yes, sir.
20
               REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Is that -- is
21
      that number right of three airplanes stolen --
22
               MR. PECORARO: Yes, sir.
               REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: -- in 2007?
23
24
               MR. PECORARO: That is -- yes, sir.
25
      In 2007, that's correct.
```

1 REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Is somebody 2 going to establish a need for writing this law 3 then? MR. PECORARO: Well, I mean I 4 5 don't -- I would suggest that I don't think that there is a need for this law because --6 7 REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Well, we're looking to your industry. 8 9 MR. PECORARO: Right. I'm sorry? I'm sorry. Perhaps I don't understand your 10 11 question. 12 REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Well, do we really need what we talked about here today 13 14 for three airplanes for the whole country? 15 MR. PECORARO: Oh. No, sir. I don't believe we do. I believe that the -- as TSA 16 17 has said, that the solution to this problem is 18 increased emphasis on Airport Watch programs. 19 And, in fact, two years ago in 20 Pennsylvania, when this issue was discussed previously, we worked with -- with a number of 21 22 legislators here and with PennDOT to do a 23 Pennsylvania-specific outreach to pilots in 24 Pennsylvania to emphasize the Airport Watch 25 program, to make sure that they were

participating, to make sure their airports were participating. We are glad to do that. Again, we've already had the discussion with the Bureau of Aviation about this here in Pennsylvania and they said they would be glad to work with us on that and we would suggest that that perhaps would probably be the most cost effective, sensible route for the state to take, but partnered with us as we partner with TSA on this.

REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Maybe -- maybe one of the things -- and Joe had mentioned it also -- is that -- make it a secondary offense much like we do the seat belt law in Pennsylvania.

You know, we just write way too much law. So I want to make sure that -- that there's really a need before we move something like this out of committee.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you.

Representative Moul.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Thank you. I'm a transportation or aviation wannabe.

Speaking as a 20-year plus pilot,

aircraft owner, and member of AOPA, I can tell you that all the pilots at the airport I'm based at are pretty much vehemently against this.

They are all pro an awareness program. They are all pro helping airports be aware.

But the one thing that this

legislation leaves out, which would be private

airports, is probably where, if somebody is

going to go steal an airplane to use it for a

missile, that's where they're going to go to

steal it.

Because at a public airport, such as Thomasville, it's a 5,000-foot runway, it's open to the public, privately owned, you know, there's always people walking around there and we all know each other. We know a strange face when we see it.

But to mandate putting a double lock system on an aircraft, trust me when I tell you this. It will kill somebody someday.

Because there will be a pilot someday saying, well, I didn't want to put this prop lock on my plane, which is basically a chain covered

with vinyl with a lock on it, and if it's put on properly, at least from my cockpit, I would not be able to see it.

Just a -- a little situation that happened to me personally. After checking my oil in my first airplane one day -- and I only made this mistake once -- I forgot to lock the latches on my canopy cover for my engine.

And I was taxiing out -- thank God -- a gust of wind came along and blew that side up. I was just about to take off with that unlocked.

Now, chances are it wouldn't have brought me out of the sky, but it could have come back through the windshield and taken me out. Then I would have come out of the sky.

And that was an honest mistake. Can you imagine what would happen if you left the chain hanging on your prop or a lock on your el rods?

Trust me when I tell you, if you're smart enough to fly the airplane, you're smart enough to pick a lock on a door, you're smart enough to get through the second lock, whether it's a throttle lock or any other type of

1 lock.

1.3

And personally -- nothing against

Representative Lentz. I think he's a

wonderful man, but this is silly legislation.

That -- and we should not be doing anything

with it.

I'm also a little tired of government trying to protect me from myself. And if a terrorist wants to get in my airplane and take off, even locked in my hangar with the doors locked, it's not going to stop him. He's going to get in and do it.

And this will actually hurt somebody someday, and I don't want to see that happen. There's my two cents.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you.

And we're right on time. So I want to thank all the folks that traveled here to be here to testify. Very, very interesting. Very good testimony.

I will mention for the Committee

members that our next meeting is next

Wednesday, March 19th at 8:30 a.m. here. It's

a hearing relative to the study we had done

```
1
      relative to privatizing state transportation
2
      assets.
 3
               And -- and with that, seeing no more
      questions, the meeting is adjourned.
 4
      you.
 5
               (The proceedings were concluded at
 6
7
      10:57 a.m.)
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same.

Brenda S. Hamilton, RPR Reporter - Notary Public