

It seems that there are several distinctions which need to be made

First: Fixed wing vs. Helo

Second: Occasional vs. Frequent operations

Third: Under 4 - 6 seats vs. greater number of seats.

Forth: Over water vs. non over water operations

Analysis:

If the Maryland operation is/was frequent operation, then exempting occasional fixed wing operators, with 4 to 6 seats, would reduce the problem to non-existent. If it was more than occasional operation, then the problem would still be fairly small.

Cure:

Fixes for this kind of operation would be TO DEFINE AN AIRCRAFT WEIGHT AND PASSENGER CLASS WHICH WOULD ALLOW THIS PARTICULAR OPERATION AND TO DEVELOP AN ONLINE COURSE FOR SIGHTSEEING PILOTS SIMILAR TO THE MOUNTAIN FLYING COURSE. This approach would impose minimal hardship on flight schools and small FBO's which provide gift rides, photo runs of the persons house, and rides in general.

Larger operations:

Aircraft maintenance is not listed as an underlying cause of the referenced accidents. Thus an increase in the amount of protection provided to the public by changing from FAR 91/100 hour inspections to FAR 135 requirements is not warranted.

I do agree that an increased amount of operator training and or flight proficiency is necessary for larger operations, operations over water, and operations over hostile terrain. This can be as simple as a local FSDO approved training plan and a required briefing for passengers.

In short there should be a different requirement for a fixed wing, single engine, Piper Saratoga/Cessna Sky Wagon size, operating in a benign environment and a Bell Jet Ranger operating in the Grand Canyon