

The primary objection to this proposed rule is just common sense: It is very hard to imagine that hijacking is much, if any, of a threat to a 2 or 4 passenger, privately owned and operated aircraft. The image of that airplane being hijacked comes closer to "ludicrous" than "worrisome". That said, there are two specific objections:

First, the additional costs of this regulation are burdensome, and represent far too high a cost (for little, if any, public benefit) for the majority of the General Aviation fleet owners, who are "casual" owners of their aircraft.

Second, while this rule might make sense for airplanes regulated under Part 121, it makes little or no sense for airplanes operated under Part 91. These General Aviation flights are often under the command of students or low-time pilots, and the likelihood of them or their passengers accidentally triggering a false alarm (which then cannot be reset) is high.

The proposed rule will add an unreasonable burden to both the airplane owners AND to whatever security/response team is assigned to track and respond.