

1. The SVAR should be left as a temporary rule with a review cycle of every 90 days until it can be removed. Making this a final rule does nothing to further enhance security risk reduction and will make it more difficult in the future to remove, should changing understanding of terrorist risk management or evolving economic situations at these airports indicate such removal is prudent.
2. The SVAR does not appear to allow reasonable, normal activities at these airports, such as pattern flying, or transient activities for people visiting the College Park Aviation Museum.
3. The SVAR does not clearly indicate if the base operator list can be modified (i.e., future planes and pilots can be added/deleted over time). This will be vital to the ability of the airports for viable economic management.
4. Security provisions do not address responsibility for detection of and reporting of violations to this SVAR, and local actions to be taken by the various parties during and after such a violation.
5. It does not appear to me that any of the provisions outlined do anything to reduce real security risks, but impose undue burdens on these three airports, their users, and their economic communities. The likelihood of a person or persons wishing to use a general aviation aircraft as part of a terrorist act coming from one of these three very public fields must be minimal compared to the ease of which such an action could be prepared and launched from a farm field or private strip using a stolen aircraft.