DOCKET NO. FAA-2009-1093 FAA FLIGHTCREW MEMBER REOUIREMENTS -DUTY AND REST

Presentation of the Cargo Airline Association September 3, 2014

CASE HISTORY

- 12/22/11 FAA issues Final Rule that excluded all-cargo operations (all-cargo operations continue under existing duty and rest requirement rules)
- Independent Pilots Association (UPS) appeals FAA decision to Federal Court
- FAA discovers errors in original Regulatory recalculate costs and benefits Impact Analysis and hires Volpe Center to

ASE HISTORY (Continued)

- 12/12/12 FAA issues Initial Supplemental operations and calls for industry comments. Regulatory Impact Analysis recalculating costs and benefits of applying new Part 117 to all-cargo
- Supplemental Regulatory Impact Analysis found 110:1 (Base Case) and 18:1 (High Case) costs to far exceed benefits, with negative ratios of
- FAA concludes that "The Initial Supplemental RIA results in data that provides greater justification revisions to the final rule. . .is warranted." rule. . . As a result, the FAA has determined that no tor the exclusion of cargo operations from the final

Position of the Cargo Airline Association

- A cost/benefit analysis is totally appropriate, not benefits of the flight, duty and rest rule. foreclosed from. . . considering the costs and finding "FAA does not believe that is is statutorily precluded by statute, and is in compliance with the terms of Executive Order 13563. The FAA agreed
- The FAA's Supplemental RIA more accurately reflects the costs and benefits of applying Part 117 to cargo operations
- The Volpe Center recalculation reveals an increase \$550 million and a decrease in benefits from \$20.35 million to \$5 million (base case) and from \$32.55 in costs over the original RIA from \$306 million to million to \$31 million (high case)

The new cost/benefit calculations were of any fatigue in the benefits analysis. costs and did not address the issue of the cause maximally conservative, understated actual

Costs

crew training. The largest understated cost category is for totally ignoring the substantial costs of dispatchers and upper management, FAA estimated a cost of only \$1.1 million for fatigue training under the new rule. The

Benefits

The agency concluded that there would have been a 75% probability of accident avoidance if Part 117 solely on one FedEx flight in 2002 wherein the were in effect. NTSB found fatigue to be a contributing factor. The benefits found by the FAA were based

by the flight crew and has shown that the crew that regulation had been in place. See CAA would have been in compliance with Part 117, if First, FedEx has reviewed the actual rest received comments, pp. 11-12. This conclusion flies in the face of the facts.

reasonable (even if not well managed) & a PAPI." Initial Supplemental RIA, pp. 110addressed this case, since rest periods were accident occurred on visual approach over a black hole with a color-blind pilot trying to use Second, the FAA itself concluded that, .. unsure exactly how NPRM would have

 Given these facts, the 2002 crash cannot be used to construct a benefits number

Lesson Learned -- The issue of fatigue in the such as lifestyle choices must also be be blamed on crew scheduling; other factors might have been fatigued. All fatigue cannot considered. cause or contributing factor in accident. The cockpit is not settled if fatigue is found as a key question that must be asked is WHY a crew

Conclusion

The FAA's finding in the Initial Supplemental with the record in this proceeding. appropriate. Indeed, any other result would be arbitrary and capricious and not consistent analysis, cargo operations should be excluded revisions to the Final Rule are necessary or from the new Part 117 is correct and no RIA that, based upon a revised cost/benefit

Contact Information

- Stephen A. Alterman, President, Cargo Airline Association - salterman@cargoair.org.
- Yvette A. Rose, Senior Vice President, Cargo Airline Association - yrose@cargoair.org.
- Phone contact (202) 293-1030