



**GENERAL AVIATION PROVISIONS IN CURRENT LAW AND  
HOUSE AND SENATE FAA REAUTHORIZATION BILLS**

<b>Current Law - Vision (100 – Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act) and FAA Policy</b>	<b>H.R. 658 – 4 year bill</b>	<b>S. 223 – 2 year bill</b>	<b>GAAC Position</b>
<p><b>Funding</b>  <b>AIP: \$14.2 billion over four years</b>, increasing by \$100 million each year from \$3.4 billion in FY 2004 to \$3.7 billion in FY 2007.</p> <p>Current cost share – Vision 100 changed the cost share to 95/5, increasing the federal share of project costs that may be covered by discretionary AIP grants to small airports.</p>	<p><b>Funding</b>  <b>AIP: \$12.2 billion (avg \$3.05 billion/year)</b>  <b>90/10 cost share, unless in distressed community, then 95/5</b></p>	<p><b>Funding</b>  <b>AIP: \$8.1 billion (avg \$4.05 billion/year)</b>  <b>95/5 cost share</b></p>	<p>GAAC supports a four-year reauthorization bill that provides at least \$8.1 billion for the AIP program and maintains the 95/5 cost share as proposed by the Senate in S. 223.</p>
<p><b>Through-the-fence</b>            In Advisory Circular 150/6190-7 (8-28-06), FAA officially defines Through the Fence (TTF) as:</p> <p>“ Through-the-fence operations are those activities permitted by an airport sponsor through an agreement that permits access to</p>	<p><b>Through-the-fence</b>            The bill stipulates that the sponsor of a general aviation airport should not be considered in violation of a federal grant assurance solely because the sponsor has an existing TTF agreement.</p> <p>The committee report argues that airports should have the flexibility to</p>	<p><b>Through-the-fence</b>            Language not included</p>	<p>GAAC supports the language included in H.R. 658 to ensure that airport sponsors are not determined to be in violation of federal grant assurances, and therefore subject to withdrawal of AIP funding, due to an existing TTF agreement.</p>

<p>the public landing area by independent entities or operations offering an aeronautical activity or to owners of aircraft based on land adjacent to, but not part of, the airport property. The obligation to make an airport available for the use and benefit of the public does not impose any requirement for the airport sponsor to permit ground access by aircraft from adjacent property.”</p> <p>In order to receive AIP funding, the airport sponsor is required to execute a contract with the FAA. This contract includes 39 grant assurances – a series of performance metrics – that the airport sponsor agrees to abide by in operating the airport. On March 18, 2011, the FAA published an Interim Policy that amends one of the grant assurances to prohibit <b>new</b> residential through the fence access to a federally-funded airport.</p>	<p>enter into through-the-fence agreements if they want to and can remain in compliance with their grant assurances.</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p><b>Military Airport Program</b>  The Military Airport Program (MAP) is a grant set aside from the Airport Improvement Program. FAA awards grant funds to the civil sponsor on a military airfield for the development of aviation facilities for the public. This program also assists new sponsors in converting former military airfields to public use to add system capacity and reduce congestion at existing airports experiencing significant delays. MAP also provides financial assistance to the civilian sponsors who are converting, or have already converted, military airfields to civilian or joint military/civilian use.</p> <p>To aid in this process, MAP grants may be used for projects not generally funded by the AIP, such as building or rehabilitating surface parking lots, fuel farms, hangars, utility systems, access roads, and cargo buildings.</p> <p>A total of 15 airports may participate in the program at any one time, including <b>one</b> general aviation airport.</p>	<p><b>Military Airport Program</b>  Allows up to <b>three</b> general aviation airports to participate in the Military Airport Program.</p>	<p><b>Military Airport Program</b>  A total of 15 airports may participate in the program at any one time, including <b>one</b> general aviation airport</p>	<p>GAAC supports inclusion of the House of Representatives language in the final FAA Authorization bill to allow up to three GA airports to participate in the Military Airport Program.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p><b>NextGen</b> Requires consultation with GA representatives in development of NextGen plan.</p> <p>Development of Plan- Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall develop a plan to expedite the equipage of general aviation and commercial aircraft with NextGen technologies.</p>	<p><b>NextGen</b> The Administrator shall take into account the unique role of general aviation and involve GA in working groups.</p>	<p>GAAC supports Congressional efforts to ensure that general aviation is considered and GA representatives are involved in the development of the NextGen plan.</p>
<p><b>FAA Operations</b> \$31.3 billion over four years for FAA operations, increasing from \$7.6 billion in FY 2004 to \$8.1 billion in FY 2007.</p>	<p><b>FAA Operations</b> \$36.9 billion for the main FAA Operations account, including \$9.4 billion in FY 2011, and \$9.2 billion in each of FY 2012 through FY 2014. The measure amends and streamlines the operations account funds by striking authorized expenditures for infrastructure systems for general aviation and vertical flight industry; helicopter approach procedures using current technologies; revision of existing terminal and en route procedures and instrument flight rules; and Center for Management Development of FAA.</p>	<p><b>FAA Operations</b> Same language, but increases funding level.</p>	<p><i>Do any GAAC members use FAA Operations funds? Should we be opposing efforts to eliminate GA infrastructure systems as an authorized expenditure of FAA Operations funds?</i></p>