

292259

A20046806000 LG

FAA-04-16944-30

Rochelle Claypoole

08/04/2004 11:38 AM

To:

cc:

Subject: O'Hare Flight Schedule Reductions

----- Forwarded by Marion Blakey/AWA/FAA on 08/04/2004 10:40 AM -----



Frederick Keady  
<fkeady@attglobal.net

>

08/03/2004 11:49 AM

To: Marion Blakey/AWA/FAA@FAA

cc: middleseat@wsj.com

Subject: O'Hare Flight Schedule Reductions

2004 AUG 12 P 2:53

DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION  
DOJ/DOJ

Dear Administrator Blakey:

I read in the Washington Post this morning that the FAA proposes to reduce the ORD/IAD schedule of Independence Air from 12 flights to 8 flights. That action would not be in the interest of airline passengers.

It was the FAA, along with the city of Chicago, the FTC and the DOJ Antitrust Division that permitted O'Hare to become a Fortress Hub in the first place. Now the FAA, through the use of its regulatory powers, would facilitate further anticompetitive actions by high-cost, low service legacy carriers under the pretext of managing traffic.

I am a former gold level frequent flyer on United, American, British Airways and other major airlines. I had the pleasure to fly Independence Air last week. Independence provided a high level of service at a price I could afford. More such flights are needed at O'Hare, not less, if O'Hare is to be anything but an overpriced, anachronistic monument to the time when air travel was available only to the elite. (I mostly fly out of MDW or MKE now.)

I sent the attached e-mail to the "Middle Seat" column in the Wall Street Journal, excerpts of which were reprinted in a followup article. It is evident from the outpouring of responses to these articles that the political winds are blowing against any further government actions that would help maintain the chokehold of major airlines on the American air travel system.

As long as the air travel system is a hybrid of regulated and unregulated elements, all units of government must take special care to avoid being co-opted in attempts by dominant competitors to maintain high entry barriers and otherwise limit competition by hoarding gates and landing slots, interfering on other carriers licensing and scheduling, and lobbying for tax breaks and government bailouts.

It is a mystery to all of us in the heartland why the Federal government would do anything whatsoever to assist the very two airlines that permitted four of their aircraft to be hijacked and used in the attacks of September 11, 2001. But, no; they have been indemnified and coddled in every possible respect. When customer service issues arise they adopt an attitude of "Poor us!", instead of acting to resolve the issues.

Perhaps it is time to confront the reality that our air travel network may be better off without the

airlines that made so many mistakes and all of their legacy. Their aircraft, pilots, flight attendants, mechanics, agents will become available to the marketplace, and will still be around to provide the kind of service that taxpayers deserve.

All you have to do is let it happen.

Sincerely,

Frederick D. Keady P.E.  
Glenview IL 60025

----- Original Message -----

**Subject:**United Airlines and other legacy carriers have the stink of failure

**Date:**Sat, 03 Jul 2004 15:45:34 -0500

**From:**Frederick Keady <[fkeady@attglobal.net](mailto:fkeady@attglobal.net)>

**To:**[middleseat@wsj.com](mailto:middleseat@wsj.com)

Dear Mr. McCartney,

I just read your June 22nd article after returning from Europe, and couldn't agree more that the big carriers must shape up or ship out.

I'm sure that United, American, Delta, Northwest and Continental all have file cabinets full of consultant reports telling them that they should pay any price to build or acquire "fortress hubs" in order to gain "pricing power" over the business traveler. (The authors of those reports no doubt continut to peddle overpriced hot air to timid corporate functionaries.)

But common sense should have told them that even the most stolid road warriors won't hold still for the kind of exploitation dished out by the legacy carriers.

American Eagle of another example of a clueless regional carrier, but they don't even have the excuse of independent ownership, because they're owned by American. On a recent attempt to fly round-trip on

A20040806000 LG

Rochelle Claypoole

08/04/2004 11:38 AM

To:

cc:

Subject: O'Hare Flight Schedule Reductions

----- Forwarded by Marion Blakey/AWA/FAA on 08/04/2004 10:40 AM -----



Frederick Keady

<fkeady@attglobal.net

>

08/03/2004 11:49 AM

To: Marion Blakey/AWA/FAA@FAA

cc: middleseat@wsj.com

Subject: O'Hare Flight Schedule Reductions

Dear Administrator Blakey:

I read in the Washington Post this morning that the FAA proposes to reduce the ORD/IAD schedule of Independence Air from 12 flights to 8 flights. That action would not be in the interest of airline passengers.

It was the FAA, along with the city of Chicago, the FTC and the DOJ Antitrust Division that permitted O'Hare to become a Fortress Hub in the first place. Now the FAA, through the use of its regulatory powers, would facilitate further anticompetitive actions by high-cost, low service legacy carriers under the pretext of managing traffic.

I am a former gold level frequent flyer on United, American, British Airways and other major airlines. I had the pleasure to fly Independence Air last week. Independence provided a high level of service at a price I could afford. More such flights are needed at O'Hare, not less, if O'Hare is to be anything but an overpriced, anachronistic monument to the time when air travel was available only to the elite. (I mostly fly out of MDW or MKE now.)

I sent the attached e-mail to the "Middle Seat" column in the Wall Street Journal, excerpts of which were reprinted in a followup article. It is evident from the outpouring of responses to these articles that the political winds are blowing against any further government actions that would help maintain the chokehold of major airlines on the American air travel system.

As long as the air travel system is a hybrid of regulated and unregulated elements, all units of government must take special care to avoid being co-opted in attempts by dominant competitors to maintain high entry barriers and otherwise limit competition by hoarding gates and landing slots, interfering on other carriers licensing and scheduling, and lobbying for tax breaks and government bailouts.

It is a mystery to all of us in the heartland why the Federal government would do anything whatsoever to assist the very two airlines that permitted four of their aircraft to be hijacked and used in the attacks of September 11, 2001. But, no; they have been indemnified and coddled in every possible respect. When customer service issues arise they adopt an attitude of "Poor us!", instead of acting to resolve the issues.

Perhaps it is time to confront the reality that our air travel network may be better off without the

American Eagle from Chicago to Evansville IN (for \$635 R/T), I failed to obtain transportation on five of six segments, and ended driving eight hours back to Chicago in a rental car. Now American refuses any accomodation on the unused return coupon. I knew I should have flown Southwest to Louisville, and driven to Evansville!

And what about international travel? The cash cost to provide a transatlantic seat is about \$250. United cheerfully demands \$2500, while American imposes unnecessary connections and endless long lines in order to obtain a fare of about \$1,000. The legacy carriers are milking the international routes to subsidize their inefficiency and overstaffed, overcompensated and underproductive workforces. They do this by exploiting massive regulatory entry barriers in international air transport markets.

Industries that are partly regulated and partly unregulated seem particularly susceptible to anticompetitive behaviors in which government is a willing or unwitting accomplice. Utilities, health care, agriculture broadcasting and public lands all suffer similar pathologies. God save us from the dead hand of Congress.

Frederick Keady  
Glenview Illinois  
847-832-9012

airlines that made so many mistakes and all of their legacy. Their aircraft, pilots, flight attendants, mechanics, agents will become available to the marketplace, and will still be around to provide the kind of service that taxpayers deserve.

All you have to do is let it happen.

Sincerely,

Frederick D. Keady P.E.  
Glenview IL 60025

----- Original Message -----

**Subject:**United Airlines and other legacy carriers have the stink of failure

**Date:**Sat, 03 Jul 2004 15:45:34 -0500

**From:**Frederick Keady <[fkeady@attglobal.net](mailto:fkeady@attglobal.net)>

**To:**[middleseat@wsj.com](mailto:middleseat@wsj.com)

Dear Mr. McCartney,

I just read your June 22nd article after returning from Europe, and couldn't agree more that the big carriers must shape up or ship out.

I'm sure that United, American, Delta, Northwest and Continental all have file cabinets full of consultant reports telling them that they should pay any price to build or acquire "fortress hubs" in order to gain "pricing power" over the business traveler. (The authors of those reports no doubt continue to peddle overpriced hot air to timid corporate functionaries.)

But common sense should have told them that even the most stolid road warriors won't hold still for the kind of exploitation dished out by the legacy carriers.

American Eagle of another example of a clueless regional carrier, but they don't even have the excuse of independent ownership, because they're owned by American. On a recent attempt to fly round-trip on