

# Aviation Legislation

The Ninety-Nines, Inc.

South Central Section

SPRING 2004

Concerns with: Charitable Flights; Pilot Screening; Photo ID; Sport Aviation; TFRs

Unfortunately, we just have follow-up information on matters already discussed in these reports. We do finally have approval on the FAA's authorization bill. I believe it was still called The Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act; however, getting individual spending up and running is still stalled. Some funds are only this week being released (specific tower operations, etc.) and we have been assured that there are not user fees THIS YEAR. I think by now all of you know my views on User Fees. To me those are dirty words and as with anything that would encourage pilots not to contact ATC, I'm agin it. Let's hope it doesn't happen, but this year's funding questions including some "pilot" programs for other than traditional controllers, user fees are still a live possibility.

Speaking more about safety, a couple of years ago when I first brought up the plans (and execution) of night flying without lights in MOAs, I was told by several people that this couldn't, wouldn't, didn't happen. Well we have to acknowledge that it does happen and a recent plan to combine two MOAs in Louisiana brought the matter to light again. There are now some informal changes to the plans and hopefully they will not revert to the original one. I've repeated this paragraph because I think it's important and the problem is increasing. This is dangerous, Folks.

I still need more information on FIA's Proposal to increase the required number of flight hours from 200 to 500 for pilots conducting fundraising or charitable flights, and to remove a current exemption for flights within 25 miles of an airport. The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking was issued and FAA said that the changes were being proposed because of safety reasons; however, the safety data furnished involves primarily accidents by those already covered by Part 135 -- not Part 91. FAA has evidently not listened to any objections to the proposed rule. A Congressman (one who flies, of course) may try to get some input at the congressional level. The Small Business Administration has spoken against the changes because of their concern for the many small businesses that would potentially be put out of business. The final rule was presented to the Office of Management and Budget, but was withdrawn just before the deadline. Those who "know" about these things have said that this happens when FAA fears that the issue is not going to be approved and withdraws it so that it can be resubmitted later in a slightly different form. We do need to keep a close eye on this issue, it probably will return.

Some states (most notably New Jersey) are still trying to legislate who can fly and where they can fly, with the same old proposals for background checks and such to be paid for by the pilots. These expensive requirements are proposed not only for new pilots, but for new ratings and even bi-annual check rides.

I do get tired of saying again that the proposed new certification requirements for light -sport aircraft. *pilots*, instructors and repairmen still have not been finalized. The proposed regulations are now in the hands of the Office of Management and Budget. I had hoped we could soon start welcoming new Light-Sport Pilots. We have a 99s committee in place to review the new regulations as soon as they are released and made a recommendation to the Board of Directors. It was proposed that the Light-Sport Pilots self-certify as to medical with driver's license only required; however, this is still not a "done deal."

Please remember, it has been decreed by TSA-not anyone in FAA-that violations of TFRs cannot be cured by training or fines, but must include some loss of license time.



Charli Lamb, Adviser