



AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION
421 Aviation Way • Frederick, Maryland 21701-4798
Telephone (301) 695-2020 • FAX (301) 695-2375

Phil Boyer
President

December 14, 2005

Mr. William DeCota
Aviation Director
Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
225 Park Ave South, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10003-1604

Dear Bill:

On behalf of the 407,000 members of the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association (AOPA), including more than 25,000 in the states of New York and New Jersey, I want to take this opportunity to share our preliminary views regarding the proposed flight fee increases for Teterboro Airport (Airport Manager's Bulletin #05-03).

In a broader context, and as we have discussed, Teterboro is not only the sole GA airport operated by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANY/NJ), it has also become the most significant and visible gateway to the New York metropolitan area for all of general aviation. In this regard, AOPA will continue cooperating with the PANY/NJ as we work toward our mutual goal: to keep Teterboro Airport operating safely, efficiently and affordably for the millions of Americans who depend upon it.

Ironically, Teterboro has become recognized as one of the nation's most prominent general aviation airports, while flights operated by AOPA's "core constituency" of primarily private and recreational pilots flying aircraft weighing less than 6,000 pounds, constitute but a small fraction of the airport's total activity. According to the FAA's Form 5010 data, while there are some 49 single-engine and six multi-engine non-jet aircraft based at Teterboro, these local planes accounted for only 308 – less than 1.5% – of the airport's more than 216,000 operations for the 12 months ending December 31, 2004.

This is perhaps what we find most troubling about your proposed 50% increase in flight fees for *all* aircraft weighing less than 12,500 pounds at Teterboro. Not only does AOPA vigorously oppose any scheme designed to artificially reduce demand for the airport, but also we believe the smallest segment of Teterboro users should not be penalized by paying an even larger percentage increase as the larger jets – which clearly impose a much greater operational and facility burden on the airport.

Mr. William DeCota
Page 2

For example, under your proposed flight-fee increases, a typical single-engine piston aircraft weighing less than 2,500 pounds (such as a Cessna 172 Skyhawk) would pay nearly \$9 per thousand pounds landed weight – about 150% more than a Boeing 737 and nearly 300% more than a typical corporate jet.

Given this incongruity, we respectfully urge you to reconsider your proposed pricing structure by retaining the current fees for aircraft weighing less than 6,000 pounds. These light general aviation aircraft impose a *de minimus* additional marginal impact on the airport infrastructure. Yet, these aircraft are almost exclusively owned and operated by private individuals, paying the increased fees out of their own pockets, as opposed to the predominantly corporate-owners of larger planes who invariably pass on the increases as a cost of doing business.

Most importantly, retaining the current fees for aircraft under 6,000 pounds will send a strong signal nationwide that the PANY/NJ continues to welcome private pilots – the backbone of aviation – to Teterboro.

While we fully support and share the views of the Federal Aviation Administration that your efforts to artificially limit operations at TEB run afoul of federal law, and equally importantly, do a disservice to the millions of citizens who rely upon the airport, we want to continue working with you and all airport stakeholders to keep Teterboro safe, efficient and affordable. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed flight fees.

Sincerely,

Phil Boyer

cc: Lanny Rider