



28 May 2003

*Initially transmitted via Email  
Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested*

Docket Management System  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Room Plaza-401  
400 7th Street, South West  
Washington, D.C. 20590

**ATTENTION: DOCKET NUMBER FAA-2002-13923**

Ameriflight, Inc., submits the following comments applicable to the proposed rewrite of 14CFR135 and associated regulations. Specific regulatory references are cited where applicable. In some cases, there is no specific regulation to cite; comments are marked “no Reg Ref”

**1. REGULATION BY HANDBOOK BULLETIN [no Reg Ref]**

Numerous FAA directives (Handbook Bulletins, FAA Inspectors’ Handbooks, Minimum Equipment Lists, Advisory Circulars, etc.), impose restrictions far more stringent than the regulations themselves. Examples include MELs that prohibit daytime VFR flights in FAR 135 single engine airplanes with inoperative gyro horizons, requirements for various features to be included in operators’ manuals that aren’t supported by the regulations, etc. The chief complaints about these increasingly-common documents are:

- (a) They are not subject to the normal rulemaking process — including economic impact analysis and publication for public comment before adoption.
- (b) Specific directives are addressed and enforced like regulations by some local FAA offices, and partially or completely ignored by others.
- (c) These practices result in significantly different requirements being imposed upon operators in various districts and regions, in many cases resulting in discriminatory effects upon operators’ ability to compete.

*The Aviation Rulemaking Committee needs to poll its membership for examples of these directives, compile a list of them, and recommend to the FAA that they either incorporate them into proposed rules — so they can either be validated through the normal rulemaking process or rejected by it — or eliminate them as insufficiently important to warrant rulemaking.*

**2. OPERATIONS SPECIFICATIONS [119.7, 119.49, 135.23(c)]**

The FAA’s Automated Ops Specs (IOPSS, etc.) have grown increasingly voluminous and redundant, to the point that even the issuing FAA offices may not be familiar with what is in the OpsSpecs they send to operators in their district. One example is completely duplicated (often

---

**AMERIFLIGHT, INC.**  
4700 EMPIRE AVENUE  
HANGAR #1  
BURBANK, CA 91505  
(818)980.5005



28 May 2003

Comments related to Docket Number FAA-2002-13923

Page 2

multi-page, for large operators) lists authorizing use of the Approved Aircraft Inspection Program for fleet aircraft (D73), and to authorize use of those aircraft on the certificate (D85). Local offices often have difficulty using the automated OpsSpecs system. Their format is such that, often, only a few lines of text appear on each page.

*In the spirit of the Paperwork Reduction Act, redundant and inapplicable boilerplate content should be removed from individual operators' OpsSpecs. A standard should be set for reasonable OpsSpecs subject matter. The automated system should be simplified. The standard should specifically require that OpsSpecs not reiterate material already required by the regulations or required by the regulations to be in operators' manuals, and not incorporate requirements unsupported by the regulations. This could be accomplished by specific requirements in FAR 135, or by other means.*

### **3. JUMPSEAT RIDERS [135.85]**

FAR 135.85 is interpreted in some parts of the country to prohibit transportation of other operators' pilots on jumpseats of "straight freighter" aircraft that do not comply with all passenger-carrying requirements of FAR 135. Presence of another pilot in the cockpit, who can look for traffic and otherwise monitor the operation, is bound to increase safety. There are other clear benefits to both jumpseaters and operators (such as ability to assist other carriers' pilots commuting to their flight assignments, to negotiate reciprocal jumpseat agreements, etc.).

*The following additional "letter item" should be added to FAR 135.85: "Pilot and Flight Engineer crewmembers of other U.S.-certificated air carriers, provided an approved seat with an approved seat belt is available with access to the flight crew exit." If the FAA deems it necessary, the regulation could require that operators notify jumpseat riders that they will be traveling in aircraft that do not meet the regulatory requirements of FAR 135 (if applicable).*

### **4. MANIFESTS [135.63(c)]**

FAR 135 requires that manifests be made out in duplicate, but does not specify what is to be done with the copy. Furthermore, the rule does not require that passenger names be placed on passenger manifests, nor does it require manifests for single engine airplanes. This information on manifests — if available — could be extremely useful in identifying occupants following an accident.

*FAR 135.63(c) should be amended to (a) include a requirement that a copy of the manifest should be left in a location at the departure station where it could be recovered with reasonable effort by someone looking for it (even if it was only under a rock. Extensive, costly requirements for operators to provide specific*



28 May 2003

Comments related to Docket Number FAA-2002-13923

Page 3

*manifest-leaving locations should NOT be required); (b) that passenger manifests include the passengers' names; and (c) that these manifests be required for single engine airplanes.*

#### **5. SIMULATORS [no Reg Ref].**

Although the FAA continues to emphasize its commitment to, and belief in, the benefits of simulators, current initial and continuing requalification requirements are so burdensome that it is impracticable for operators to use simple generic simulators (that the FAA calls "training devices") such as the ATC-810, AST-310, Frasca 242, etc., although these relatively unsophisticated units can be very effective for initial and recurrent FAR 135 training (and for certain items on checkrides).

*Include a provision in FAR 135 that would to use of simple non-motion non-visual simulators for specified increments of initial and recurrent training and checking; more specific language would need to be developed by the committee, but could include area departures, enroute navigation, area arrivals, straight-in precision and nonprecision approaches to missed approaches, etc. These simulators' suitability and operating condition would be checked and approved at the local district office level, not by the national simulator team.*

#### **6. PILOT EXPERIENCE [135.243(c)]**

The U.S. faces an increasing shortage of experienced pilots. In particular, single-pilot FAR 135 cargo operators have difficulty recruiting entry-level pilots that meet current §135.243 requirements. Previously-reliable supplies of pilots entering the civilian workforce from flight schools and the military are drying up. Periodic surges of hiring by major airlines and regionals exacerbate the shortage.

*For FAR 135 cargo-only operations, allow the following levels experience for IFR pilots in command, rather than those in §135.243(c):*

- Single engine airplane not approved for flight in known icing — 600 hours pilot flight time, 300 hours cross country; otherwise as per current rule*
- Single engine airplane approved for flight in known icing or piston-powered multiengine airplane — 800 hours pilot flight time, 400 hours cross country, otherwise as per current rule*
- Turbine-powered multiengine airplane — 1000 hours pilot flight time; otherwise as per current rule*
- Turbojet-powered multiengine airplane — as per current rule.*
- At least half of required pilot flight time must be in same category of aircraft.*



28 May 2003

Comments related to Docket Number FAA-2002-13923

Page 4

#### **7. FERRY PERMITS [21.197(c)(2), 135.419]**

Many FAR 135 cargo operators use “nine-or-less” §135.411(a)(1)/135.419 AAIP programs — which [per §21.197(c)(2)] do not allow self-issued ferry permits. Need frequently exists to reposition “ferryable” aircraft for maintenance after FAA office hours; inability to do so places a heavy and unjustifiable economic burden on those operators due to unavailability of aircraft for succeeding days’ flights. Current FAA union work rules do not allow Regional Ops Centers to phone inspectors for the purpose — so ferry permits are not reasonably available from the FAA after office hours.

*FAR 135 should incorporate a specific provision, or FAR 21 should be appropriately amended, so FAR 135 cargo operators using a AAIP would be authorized to issue their own ferry permits, and to FAX or otherwise electronically transmit them to the location of the aircraft to be ferried. Suitable, reasonable safety and control procedures would be required in their manuals.*

#### **8. MAXIMUM PAYLOAD WEIGHT FOR FAR 135 FREIGHTERS [119.3]**

The “old” FAR 135.2 (which specified a maximum payload of 7500 lb. for “large aircraft” operated under FAR 135) was based on the DC-3 airplane. Since those days, aircraft with considerably enhanced safety features and somewhat larger size have become available to FAR 135 cargo operators. In this context, the current 7500 lb. payload limitation is obsolete. Several FAR 135 operators can currently operate these types of airplanes at their originally-certificated maximum weights carrying extra fuel, but cannot legally carry that same weight as payload due to the 7500 lb. restriction. They routinely demonstrate an “equivalent level of safety” to FAR 121 operators, and should be allowed to carry the airplanes’ full available payload without the significant initial investment in FAR 121 certification (costly both industry and the FAA), and subsequent ongoing costs and complexity. The current level of market demand for cost-effective cargo service in these airplanes indicates clear public interest.

*Rewrite the current rule to either (a) harmonize it with the “large airplane” definition in 49CFR298 — 18,000 lb. cargo payload [proposed by FAA in a meeting last year], or (b) incorporate some other mutually agreeable increased value such as 12,500 or 14,000 lb., for established operators.*

#### **9. TRANSPONDER CHECKS [91.413(c)(1)]**

Operators that use “nine-or-less” §135.411(a)(1)/135.419 programs are required by FAR 91.413(c)(1) to have a properly certificated repair station that is equipped to do the work, accomplish the transponder test.

*Provide in FAR 135 that nine-or-less operators be authorized to write a §91.413 test procedure and inspection guide, with suitable controls, into their AAIP. Persons performing the work would need to have the proper equipment and be*



28 May 2003

Comments related to Docket Number FAA-2002-13923

Page 5

*properly trained (possibly on a recurrent basis) by a certificated repair station to perform the 91.413 test, but the requirement for a repair station to perform the work would be eliminated.*

#### **10. CARGO FERRY FLIGHTS [no Reg Ref]**

Currently, the term “ferry flight” automatically excludes carriage of revenue passengers or cargo. If reasonable controls were applied, certain flights carrying revenue cargo (but no passengers) could be conducted (for the purpose of completing a trip sequence) with no adverse safety consequences.

*Ferry flights a single engine retractable gear Piper Lance whose landing gear is safely down and locked (but will not retract), restricted against flight in icing or speeds in excess of  $V_{LE}$ ; or with flaps that won't latch “down” but are secure in the “up” position, operated from runways of sufficient length — and similar circumstances as recommended by the committee — should be allowed in cargo-only operations under FAR 135. This could be addressed by specific regulatory relief in FAR 135, or alternatively through additional MEL relief applicable to cargo-only operations.*

#### **11. ADDITIONAL MEL RELIEF FOR CARGO-ONLY FLIGHTS [no Reg Ref]**

Minimum Equipment Lists have become increasingly strict in recent years, growing much more restrictive than applicable regulations. Considerable additional relief could reasonably be granted, particularly in view of reduced public safety risks, on cargo flights.

*Make provision in FAR 135 for “cargo-only flights” relief items in MMELs. Potential subjects include one (of two) cylinder head, oil, or exhaust gas temp gage on piston twins, prop tachometers when it is feasible to match engine RPM by ear with the other engine on piston or turboprop twins, gyro horizons and DGs for daytime VFR flights, etc. An additional “alphabet category” could also be considered: Passenger carrying prohibited, and only sufficient flight allowed to reach a maintenance base, possibly limited to a maximum of three flight legs and 24 clock hours. A committee working group should explore these and other areas of potential relief. It could be implemented either via MELs, or by specific FAR 135 provisions.*

#### **12. FAR 135 CARGO-ONLY TSA-FAA INTERFACE ISSUES [no Reg Ref]**

Many security requirements currently imposed on scheduled operators, and other proposed security requirements, are impractical, would be ineffective, or are frankly impossible in FAR 135 cargo-only operations in smaller aircraft and at smaller airports. Beyond a certain level, increasing security requirements will simply price smaller communities out of the market and deny their residents access to services provided by these aircraft — much like what occurred when the



28 May 2003

Comments related to Docket Number FAA-2002-13923

Page 6

“single level of safety” and FAR 121 mandates for passenger commuter operators doomed the economic viability unsubsidized operations in 19-passenger and smaller airplanes.

*While this may be outside the immediate scope of the FAR 135 rewrite project, it is an issue that certainly needs to be addressed. This will probably require a joint working group, mentored by the FAA, involving TSA and industry personnel — to acquaint TSA with realities and practicalities of small aircraft, small airport, often single-pilot cargo operations — for example, at airports so rustic that lack of a fence to keep wildlife off the runway is part of the security problem — but risks are commensurately small.*

**13. SEPARATE FAR 135 “CARGO OPERATIONS” SUBPART [no Reg Ref]**

Presuming various concerns above are addressed, it appears appropriate to consolidate regulatory issues specifically pertinent to cargo operations under FAR 135 into a separate subpart — rather than having them scattered throughout FAR 135 and other regulations, as is currently the case.

*Include another subpart in the revised FAR 135 addressing issues exclusively applicable to cargo-only operations.*

**14. HEADQUARTERS FAR 135 BRANCH [no Reg Ref]**

Lack of a “central FAA voice” on FAR 135 issues, poor standardization, different requirements from different districts, and nonuniform interpretation of regulations and other guidance are complaints heard repeatedly from FAR 135 operators.

*A separate Branch at FAA Headquarters dedicated specifically to FAR 135 matters appears to be the most appropriate means of addressing this issue.*

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John W. Hazlet, Jr.", written over a large, stylized flourish.

John W. Hazlet, Jr.  
Vice President - Maintenance  
Director of Operations

JH/ys