

62117

OFFICE OF THE
CHIEF COUNSEL
RULES DOCKET

Date: 7/15/99 11:06 PM
Sender: "John Townsley" <johnjt@northcascades.net>
To: 9-NPRM-CMTS
cc: Wade Gorton" <senator_gorton@gorton.senate.gov>; "George Nethercutt"
<grnwa05@hr.house.gov>
Priority: Normal
Subject: Docket No. FAA-I 999-5836 -35

1999 AUG 19 P 3:05

I own and operate a 1964 Cessna 172G. I use the aircraft to travel from my home in rural Okanogan County, Washington to metropolitan areas located through out the Pacific Northwest. I travel for both business and pleasure.

I am a forester, and often have meetings in Fortland, Missoula, and Spokane where I address issues important to my community.

I am very concerned that additional Federal regulations proposed to be imposed on repair stations for General Aviation aircraft will substantially and unnecessarily increase the cost of operating my aircraft. Since Okanogan County has no public transportation of any kind (no bus service, no commercial airline service, and no passenger train service) I have highly dependent upon my personal aircraft for business travel.

It is already quite expensive to operate my aircraft. While I support the need for high standards for repair stations, I am skeptical that the recurrent training requirements, requirements for additional record keeping, and other new proposals will force the few authorized repair stations in the County to close or substantially increase costs. I believe the FAA should recognize there are substantially different issues between commercial airline repair stations and GA repair stations. Small GA aircraft are for the most part older, have technology that has had few changes over the past three decades, and are much simpler than commercial jets. It does not make sense that repair stations which work on my Cessna 172 would have to have the same recurrent training as a station that works on Boeing 747's.

Sincerely,

jt

=====
John Townsley
johnjt@northcascades.net
P.O. Box 586; Okanogan, WA 98840
=====

