



3-Hour Airline Deplaning Rule to Drive Significant Benefits for all Stakeholders

Could Help Solve the NYC Congestion Conundrum

CONTACT BTC || Kevin Mitchell | 610-341-1850 | mitchell@BusinessTravelCoalition.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Business Travel Coalition (BTC) has recently concluded due diligence, including a month-long survey of business travel industry professionals, to determine if it should support passenger rights legislation contained within S.1451, the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act. BTC endorses this language introduced by Senators Barbara Boxer (D-CA) and Olympia Snowe (R-ME). In particular BTC unequivocally supports the provision that would provide passengers with an option to disembark after three hours of delay, should a captain decide it is reasonable and safe to do so.

Since 1999, BTC has testified four times in Congress in opposition to passenger rights legislation. In lieu of Congressional intervention in the marketplace, anathema to businesses whose interests BTC represents, BTC called for the voluntary airline Customer Service Plans that was announced in September 1999. In testimony in March of that year, however, as well as in follow-on testimony throughout the years, BTC cautioned that if the airlines do not fix service and extended ground delay problems, someone will eventually endeavor to do so for them.

From BTC's [1999 testimony](#): *"Like other industries that have faced the ominous threat of government intervention, airlines should view this legislation as a major warning and move decisively to address Congressional concerns. The industry needs to take immediate steps to head off this and further Congressional action, which will surely follow, if the industry's problems are not corrected in the near term."*

II. BTC SURVEY

As part of its due diligence, BTC conducted an online survey of travel industry professionals and business travelers and follow-up in-person and phone interviews between July 26 and August 31, 2009.

- The survey was distributed to 7,000 randomly selected participants from BTC's electronic community of 35,000.
- Some 674 persons completed the BTC survey including:
 - 198 corporate travel managers,
 - 123 travel management company executives,
 - 25 airline staff,
 - 187 business travelers, and
 - 141 "other," which includes travel professionals from hotel, credit card, consultancy, technology, rental car, payment systems, limo and destination management companies as well as representatives from academia, state and federal government, labor and industry associations.

- Underscoring the concern of global travel departments looking after their nationals traveling through the U.S. aviation system, survey participants represented the following 12 countries: U.S., Canada, Belgium, South Africa, UK, United Arab Emirates, Germany, Thailand, Sweden, Finland and Italy.

Key Survey Results (Summary results, with survey participant comments, can be found at Addendum 1; complete and filtered quantitative results by participant segment can be found at Addendum 2.)

- 91% of survey respondents indicated addressing extended tarmac delays should be a priority for airlines to address.
- 85% of those surveyed conceptually support passenger-rights legislation.
- 82% of survey participants support proposed Senate legislation that would allow passengers to disembark after 3 hours of on aircraft delay, should a captain decide it is reasonable and safe to do so.
- 85% think U.S. airlines have not done enough in the past 10 years – allowing for all their cost constraints – to improve customer service levels.
- 77% say airline customer service – broadly defined – has not improved at all in the past 10 years.
- 80% believe airlines have not made a compelling case against passenger rights legislation.
- 64% indicate they believe that airlines will not endeavor to voluntarily improve customer service levels to an acceptable degree.
- 55% think airlines will not, via an industry-wide commitment, codify passenger-rights commitments and obligations in contracts of carriage.
- 85% stated Business Travel Coalition should weigh in on the efficacy of passenger rights legislation, and support it.

III. ANALYSIS

A. Uneven Progress

After 10 years of Congressional pressure on airlines as well as highly unfavorable press reports of nightmarish delays and conditions for passengers, the response by the airline industry has been uneven, as confirmed in U.S. DOT Inspector General reports to Congress. While some airlines have taken limited positive steps on behalf of their customers, at the industry-level airlines appear either unwilling or unable to fix this extended ground delay problem.

B. Market Failure

Based upon BTC survey and interview results it is clear that the vast majority of travel industry professionals and organizations, including BTC, has now concluded in this case, i.e. more than 10 years after the infamous Detroit Metro snowstorm debacle, that there is an evident market failure that can only be addressed by government intervention. Congressional legislation appears to be the preferred option over proposed U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) rules in light of airlines' history of legally challenging DOT regulations they are not in support of.

C. Nature of Problem

To focus the debate on root causes, such as bad weather or antiquated ATC technology, is to avoid discussing the real problem which is how airlines respond to irregular operations, which they often cause by over scheduling. Likewise, to blame mishaps on the poor judgment of individual airline employees, as was done in the Rochester, MN case, is to miss the larger, structural leadership failure at the individual airline and industry levels. If airline CEOs were as focused and committed, for example, as they were after 9/11 in securing from Congress, in just days, \$5 billion in direct payments and \$10 billion in federal loan guarantees, the problem would have been solved many years ago.

D. Scope of Problem

According to DOT, 613 flights experienced extended tarmac delays of 3 hours or more during the first 6 months of 2009. Members of Congress, the U.S. DOT Inspector General, consumer groups and travel industry organizations are not seeking a one-size-fits-all solution. These stakeholders understand that it is not desirable or possible to solve for 100% of extended-tarmac-delay problems, and that no two airports or irregular operations are the same. The fact that some airlines, operating in many airports under various conditions, have instituted hour-specific passenger-deplaning guidelines indicates they have become analytically comfortable with a protocol wherein one size fits most extended ground delay problems. That's all that passengers want codified in law so that there are consequences and incentives for improvement in outcomes for incidents like Rochester, MN or NYC.

E. Unintended Consequences

To say there would be unintended consequences from a Congressional law is stating the obvious. There are always benefits and drawbacks from any public policy decision, some anticipated, and some not. The question is whether the problem is worth solving at a governmental level, and on balance, if the solution would likely generate public policy benefits sufficient to effectively solve the problem. Currently, the airline industry policy of denying there is problem is generating its own set of serious unintended consequences, including negative impacts on the health and welfare of passengers, lost productivity for business travelers and diminished airline brand quality.

It seems that no matter where in the world passenger rights standards are proposed, opponents drag out the dire but fatigued "unintended consequences" warning. For example, a spokesman for the *Air Transport Association* recently told the *San Francisco*

Chronicle, "I promise you that if a three-hour rule goes into effect, we'll be having this conversation again and talking about the unintended consequences..." And in Europe, the *International Air Transport Association* and the *European Low Fares Airline Association* claimed that the now-implemented EU passenger rights regulations would limit consumer choice.

The sky, it turns out, did not fall in Europe. An EU-based travel management company CEO interviewed by BTC stated, "The EU regulations on flight cancellations and delays were expected to increase costs without much benefit to passengers. However, it seems not to have had that result. My experience is that vague reasons for cancellations have disappeared, and that the airlines will re-route and provide overnight accommodations when technical reasons prohibit them from flying. Compensation for cancellations is paid without argument."

F. Statistical Insignificance

Airline industry spokespersons characterize the aforementioned 613 flight delays of 3 or more hours as statistically insignificant even though some 100,000 passengers were impacted. The argument that extended ground delays are statistically insignificant is lost on the daughter who had her eighty-five year old father parked in a hot metal tube for five hours in August; this is first and foremost a health and safety issue.

The deadly February 12 crash near Buffalo, NY was also statistically insignificant, but we rightfully investigated, held hearings and will no doubt tirelessly endeavor to learn important lessons and improve upon crash statistics. Passengers and their advocates expect a high level of determination should also be brought to bear on the growing problem of extended ground delays.

This is first and foremost a health and safety issue. We spend hundreds of millions of dollars endeavoring to incrementally improve upon aircraft accident statistics. Why should passengers accept less with respect to the 613 reported incidents during the first six months of 2009 in which passengers spent greater than three hours on grounded planes?

G. Solution

As one former major airline CEO recently told BTC, "Beyond 3 hours, the airlines need to fix the problem, and if they are forced to do so, they will." Implied in this statement is that if airlines are given sufficient time before implementation of passenger rights legislation, e.g., 6 months, they will likely identify the key operational barriers and work to emplace policies and processes to overcome them before implementation. What's more, according to DOT's 116-page impact analysis of proposed passenger protections (Sept. 2008), airlines stand to benefit from new efficiencies generated by the process-redesign required to solve for the extended ground delay problem. A 3-hour single standard needs to be legislated that will generate benefits for all stakeholders.

IV. SINGLE-STANDARD BENEFITS

A. Passengers

Each year approximately 100,000 passengers, many of whom are infants, elderly or suffering ailments, are confined in unhealthy conditions aboard excessively delayed aircraft. A single standard would provide an important safeguard for the health and welfare of passengers.

B. Corporations

Large organizations that fund business travel activities would benefit from increased business traveler productivity as airlines respond to a single standard with new, more efficient processes and fewer extended onboard delays.

C. Airports

Excessive ground delays and customer service meltdowns result in bad publicity and a failure of an airport authority's core mission to facilitate passengers throughout the aviation system. A single 3-hour standard, with attendant financial penalties, would force airlines to address this problem.

D. Workers

Flight crews aboard excessively delayed aircraft would benefit by avoiding suffering through the same unhealthy conditions as passengers (probably more often) as well as the additional mental stress caused by having to often deal with upset customers in an operating environment without bright-line go, no-go parameters.

E. Airlines

Over the past few years, the airlines, as a collective brand, have damaged their image, weakened the customer value proposition, and no doubt, consequently decreased their pricing power. A single 3-hour standard will help them help themselves.

Helping Solve the NYC Congestion Conundrum

While the 3 NYC airports and the Philadelphia airport can typically amount to some 12% of the Operational Evolution Partnership (OEP) 35 operations, they can cause more than 45% of the delays and 48% of the delay minutes throughout the National Airspace System (NAS) resulting in material financial, lost-productivity and environmental costs for all stakeholders.

The delays are chiefly caused by the over scheduling of flights where the demand exceeds capacity at critical times of the day, using many regional jets (70 passengers and below) instead of fewer larger jets, and an increase in non-air carrier operations, such as private jets.

Solutions for the over-scheduling problem at NYC have either been **(1)** politically unpalatable, such as slot auctions, **(2)** impossible to develop and implement because of antitrust laws, or **(3)** competitively unfeasible because airline “A” would not unilaterally reduce its schedule only to have airline “B” fill in and increase its market share, and in some cases raise airport-costs for airline “A.”

With a rule in excess of 3 hours (preferred by airlines) they could likely ignore the consequences of potential fines in order to maintain market shares at NYC, and elsewhere. Importantly though, according to industry experts, a 3-hour rule could only be workable for NYC airports if airlines drew down their schedules to better match the capacity limitations of the airports. If they did not, political pressure and horrendously bad publicity from so many delays would be a weekly event with attendant calls for further government action. Airlines would have very strong unilateral incentives to right-size their NYC operations during the many months before such legislation were to become effective.

Reduced NYC airline flight schedules may not cost airlines lost revenues, especially if a single flight can replace several small regional jets. Additionally, an improved pricing environment from reduced capacity would be an offset as would significant operational benefits from more efficient system-wide operations across the U.S. Moreover, with airline industry capacity and operations declining now would be an opportune time to test this hypothesis before demand returns in full force.

V. CONCLUSION

A 3-hour deplaning option for passengers should represent the maximum Congress should consider when the Senate and House conference on this legislation. 3 hours is too long for most persons to tolerate sitting in a sealed metal tube; but it is likely within the margin of safety. Anything greater than 3 hours is risky.

A passenger’s chance of fatal blood clots increases at 4 hours on the tarmac (UN WHO WRIGHT report 2007). These events are usually accompanied by some amount of dehydration and lack of available, potable hydration. An EPA water report in 2008 stated that 17% of all airplane water tested had true coliform in it and recommended that elderly passengers, children or anyone whose underlying health condition is compromised (which DOT says is 20% of all passengers) not drink the water. A 3-hour maximum with a 30-minute extension provides passengers with the best possible scenario for avoiding exposure to these risks.

In addition:

- 1 in 7 Americans are diagnosed diabetics, with 3.89 per hundred classified as undiagnosed diabetics. Being deprived of glucose or medications beyond 3 hours is life threatening for many with diabetes.
- 30% of all Americans have some degree of claustrophobia, which would be mitigated by having the knowledge that they won't be "trapped" indefinitely.

- Elderly, disabled persons, children and anyone with compromised health will have the assurance they will be able to get their needs met in 3.5 hours.

...

Addendum 1 (Summary results, with survey participant comments.)

<p>1. Have U.S. airlines done enough in the past 10 years – allowing for all their cost constraints – to improve customer service levels?</p> <p>Representative Comments</p> <p>“Most airlines have tried to improve communication pertaining to airport operations (delays, cancellations, stand-by status, etc.)”</p> <p>“Airlines are in a challenging position in this economic climate. The real challenge is ensuring consistency which is difficult when human beings are involved in the process. I believe efforts are being made to do the right things but the focus is on profitability (as it should be) which may sometimes seem in direct conflict with customer service.”</p> <p>“The airlines are not solely to blame. In fact the federal government (FAA) should shoulder the majority of blame for not maintaining the infrastructure under which the airlines must operate, e.g., antiquated ATC computers, slot control, etc.”</p> <p>“Time and again I receive complaints especially from my international travelers on the indifference of those who are supposed to take care of them.”</p>	<p>Yes No Unsure</p>	<p>4.3% 84.9% 10.8%</p>
<p>2. Specifically, should addressing extended tarmac delays be a priority for airlines to address?</p> <p>Representative Comments</p> <p>“Safety should be the main priority, however making passengers sit on a plane on a tarmac for several hours is also something that needs to be addressed and could be considered a safety issue if passengers miss medications or cannot use the restrooms, etc.”</p> <p>“This should be a priority; however, I believe it’s a shared responsibility and that the proper infrastructure must exist in order for them to do it properly. Services must be available and it cannot be cost prohibitive when customer related issues need to be addressed.”</p> <p>“But how? It’s in the airlines best interest to keep delayed passengers on the tarmac. How could they orchestrate bringing planes back to the gates without creating more mayhem when other passengers are waiting to enplane. Deplaning on the tarmac? Please, let’s be serious. Foul weather is beyond the carrier’s control, but I agree it is outrageous to keep them on the</p>	<p>Yes No Unsure</p>	<p>90.8% 8.2% 1.0%</p>

tarmac for more than 3 hours.”		
3. Has airline customer service – broadly defined – improved in the past 10 years?	Not at all Somewhat Very much	77.0% 21.9% 1.1%
<u>Representative Comments</u>		
<p>“OK, so who is smoking something here? The airlines have pulled back their service and the result has been universally less satisfactory among the peer group [industries] and decidedly against universal measurements.”</p> <p>“Despite some bright spots, it is more cattle car, less caring, e.g., don't ask for volunteers on overbooking, just don't board the non-seat assigned. On-time was getting bad and worse until recession. There have been no efforts to get to realistic schedules.”</p> <p>“Unless we have a free market economic environment, it will be difficult for airlines to justify investment in customer service. The business case for improved service is weakened by the forced route/network structure, which encourages airlines to invest heavily in schedule and network, leaving little remaining to invest in soft items like service training and staffing.”</p> <p>“Customer service has evaporated as the airlines add fees and cut capacity. Most of my travelers dread to fly these days.”</p> <p>“I believe it has kept up with the pace of customer service improvements in other industries to the best of its ability.”</p> <p>“We are paying more and receiving less service. Food for purchase, paying for checked baggage, self registering at kiosks for flights yet still need an agent to tag the bag....confusion all around.”</p> <p>“There have been some improvements (I would point to some cabin amenity improvements, industry wide baggage handling and on-time performance) as well as non-in-flight improvements like electronic check-in and other services, but on a broad basis, this has barely kept the industry neutral.”</p> <p>“Prices have gone down enormously. Accordingly it is difficult to maintain service levels where they were 10 years ago.”</p>		
4. Have airlines made a compelling case against passenger rights legislation?	Yes No Unsure	4.8% 80.0% 15.2%
<u>Representative Comments</u>		

<p>“No. Their arguments are full of the usual doublespeak and cross talk. The airlines provide a basic transportation service. The customer is entitled to a fair return from his side of the contract.”</p> <p>“They promised to fix it and failed repeatedly.”</p> <p>“All other travel services have defined customer rights - so should airlines.”</p> <p>“Airlines have convincingly articulated the unintended consequences of such legislation, which in all likelihood would lead to further travel disruptions.”</p> <p>“They have made some efforts, but nothing compelling other than their economic inconvenience.”</p> <p>“Unfortunately, their lobbyists in Washington have done their job well.”</p> <p>“There are persuasive arguments against codifying this. However, the pending legislation provides loopholes that the airlines could use to justify further delays, so I'm not sure why they're opposing it.”</p>		
<p>5. Do you conceptually support passenger rights legislation?</p> <p><u>Representative Comments</u></p> <p>“The airlines have universally failed to self-police. Therefore, they must be forced to adopt rights. The EU rules are comprehensive and most airlines (who fly to Europe which is the majority of U.S. carriers) are now in compliance.”</p> <p>“This is long overdue.”</p> <p>“Yes. I don't fly as much as I used to because of the lack of customer rights and customer service on airlines.”</p> <p>“Not at all. In a free market economy, consumers should be able to send the message to carriers whose treatment of them is less than caring.”</p> <p>“I support passenger rights...absolutely. And they should be in effect. Just not certain it should come from a legislative mandate. Would prefer for Congress to not be involved.”</p> <p>“Airlines should have been taking better care of their customers. The drive for legislation is due to the lack of focus and commitment by the airlines to improve their service levels.”</p>	<p>Yes No Unsure</p>	<p>84.9% 8.6% 6.5%</p>

<p>"I hate that the airlines have not found a way to police this themselves."</p>		
<p>6. Do you support proposed Senate legislation that would allow passengers to disembark after 3 hours on the tarmac, should a captain decide it is reasonable and safe to do so?</p>	<p>Yes No Unsure</p>	<p>82.2% 11.1% 6.7%</p>
<p><u>Representative Comments</u></p>		
<p>"There is another part of this. The airline must not board an aircraft if they know ahead of time that there is a significant delay possible just to get the passengers off the terminal gate. Too often the airlines do this to subdue the passengers."</p>		
<p>"I think that 3 hours is too long."</p>		
<p>"Someone has to think of the passengers, their health, anxiety level, ability to make other plans, etc."</p>		
<p>"3 hours is a long time to keep passengers in their seats without them going anywhere. What about those with small children and those with medical problems. While on the tarmac, there is no assistance for those people."</p>		
<p>"This is the wrong answer. Legislation should provide that an airplane will not leave the gate if there is an anticipated delay of over an hour. We know which airports are affected the most and additional reserve gates should be provided."</p>		
<p>"Since the airlines are not willing to make a "reasonable" decision, I feel the government is the last resort. I would prefer to see the airlines offer a solution."</p>		
<p>"I would go further and force the captain to either arrange safe transportation back to the gate or return the aircraft to the gate."</p>		
<p>"Frankly, I think it should be two hours maximum. That is my threshold for being confined on an airplane going nowhere."</p>		
<p>It shouldn't need to be a piece of legislation... its common sense... but if it has to be a bill, so be it."</p>		
<p>"Three hours is a long time especially on a regional jet. I would suggest two hours."</p>		
<p>"Absolutely. And three hours is even excessive!"</p>		
<p>"Yes I support Senate legislation and no, I don't necessarily</p>		

<p>believe the captain should make that decision. The captain has ultimate responsibility for the safety of passengers and aircraft but trapping passengers against their will in a highly confined airplane cabin without adequate food or water for an extended period of time is unacceptable.”</p> <p>“I think it should be less [time] I do not feel anyone should have to sit in a plane for three hours.”</p> <p>“3 hours is still unacceptable. If the tarmac delay is 1-2 hours, passengers should be allowed to disembark. In this day and age with the level of technology we possess, that anyone should have to sit in a crowded plane for more than an hour or two is unjustifiable.”</p> <p>“I think 3 hours is too long. It should be no longer than 2 hours.”</p>		
<p>7. Do you believe that airlines will endeavor to voluntarily improve customer service levels, to an acceptable degree?</p> <p><u>Representative Comments</u></p> <p>“Dream on.”</p> <p>“No, they have had plenty of time to do so and have not.”</p> <p>“Only to extent that competition forces them to. But this is doubtful given the fact that passengers have almost always chosen to spend less and get less rather than pay more and get more. As much as passengers whine about service, they are not willing to pay for it, and therefore, it’s unlikely any rational airline would dedicate any efforts towards it.”</p> <p>“Airlines will only give lip service to real customer service unless they are forced to address major issues.”</p> <p>“We need to set an industry standard that they need to follow.”</p> <p>“Culture is far too toxic. SWA's culture supports it. International carriers that are still subsidized enough by their governments to not underpay/abuse their personnel will retain high service.”</p> <p>“If they have no other choice than by mandated legislation...that is the only thing that will get their attention.”</p> <p>“Only when they reduce capacity enough to drive profits and/or the economy bounces back robustly. As long as the carriers chase market share instead of profits, customer service will take a back seat. The consumer gets a cheap ticket but little else.”</p>	<p>Yes No Unsure</p>	<p>17.4% 64.1% 18.5%</p>

“Certain airlines already deliver a customer service level that exceeds those anticipated in the legislation. However, the majority of airlines have repeatedly demonstrated that they are not customer focused and will not improve on a voluntary basis.”

“If they wanted to, they would have done so by now.”

“If there's customer demand for better service, and willingness of the passengers to pay for the extra service, they will.”

8. Do you believe that airlines, via an industry-wide commitment, will codify passenger rights commitments and obligations in contracts of carriage?

Yes	13.6%
No	55.4%
Unsure	31.0%

Representative Comments

“This is never a possibility even remotely. The only possibility is that airlines will use this as a tactic to delay the eventual adoption of passenger rights.”

“They claimed they were doing this years ago and it never happened.”

“Only if the government forces them to.”

“Only as a last ditch attempt to avoid legislation which ensures such rights.”

“No, but they should be forced to.”

“Only in response to legislation.”

“It is not appropriate to mandate certain treatment of guests under the same obligations as fare regulations. The hospitality industry does not apply the same standard; neither should the airline industry.”

“Again, not until they have no choice. They were supposed to do this years ago...and they still tell lies at the gate about delays, reasons for them, and real expectations.”

“Only if they are forced to by the government. If this happens they should go all the way and re-regulate the industry, at least on price. Consumers can't have it both ways. You want \$49 tickets, you get pilots and training like the recent unfortunate tragedy in Buffalo.”

“At the stage, Congress needs to step in and protect passengers. The airlines have had sufficient time to correct this problem.”

However, they have failed.”		
<p>9. If you think passenger rights legislation is a bad idea, what are your objections?</p> <p><u>Representative Comments</u></p> <p>“It is a definite that such a law will create unintended consequences that more than outweigh any benefits. If airlines don't provide reasonable service, or deal with customer complaints, then fly someone else. Do we need a law compelling restaurants to seat you at your reservation time? Or for doctors to see you within 15 minutes of your appointment? There are real reasons why airlines sometimes encounter very long taxi delays, not because they are stupid or malicious or don't wish to shorten them, but generally because of bad weather and ATC constraints.”</p> <p>“Too many factors involved. The captain in conjunction with the airlines' management will know the entire justifications to decide whether to continue standing by on the tarmac or return to a gate and allow the passengers to disembark. The government is in no position to monitor the same situation.”</p> <p>“I don't like government involvement...rather see the marketplace fix it.”</p> <p>“I think it is better for the airlines to be self-policing than get the government involved. If, however the airline industry can't or won't do it, then the government may need to step in. The problem with the government getting involved is that it becomes another instance of "too many chiefs and not enough Indians.”</p> <p>“Too subjective. Airlines can't control all of the issues. It will take a concerted collaborative effort between the airlines and DOT. More rules is not the answer. These rules could create lawsuits that would unnecessarily burden the carriers.”</p> <p>“Airlines for the most part do not drive delays -- antiquated ATC and weather cause delays. Logistically, it is impossible always to get out of line and back to a gate. A mandatory three-hour rule is a punitive effort and not a constructive one and it will force more delays of customers and more cancellations.”</p> <p>“My only real objection is that it should not be from an action of the federal government. I don't think they need to legislate rights for airline passengers or for any industry unless safety is involved. Less government...”</p> <p>“I do think it is a bad idea, but at this time, I don't see any other</p>		

<p>option for travelers.”</p> <p>“Government should not intervene in private enterprise. The airline industry should regulate itself to a higher standard; I do not want any Congress intervening with business. Beginning of the end...”</p> <p>“Generally, I think the government should stay out of everything, but this issue may be the exception as it seems to continue, even with the press it has gotten.”</p> <p>“I do not think it is a bad idea, I just think it will take a very long time for airlines to agree, as this would cause them to rethink and redefine the way they run their business. Sitting on tarmacs for extended periods of time can cause stress and health related issues to passengers; I am sure the airlines do not want that liability.”</p> <p>“I think any legislation is a bad idea, but the airlines have proven again and again they will not clean up their own back yard!”</p>		
<p>10. Do you believe Business Travel Coalition should weigh in on the efficacy of such legislation?</p> <p><u>Representative Comments</u></p> <p>“As a pressure group the BTC must support its constituents in the right thing.”</p> <p>“But with careful amendments.”</p> <p>“At this point, we have no other choice.”</p> <p>“Yes I do believe that BTC should weigh in, but after you get the results and then do your normal in-depth analysis to make the best decision for the industry and consumers.”</p> <p>“Business Travel Coalition should act responsibly in lessening the role of government and pushing for more action on the part of the consumer to choose customer-friendly carriers.”</p> <p>“Kevin, I think you ought to do what you think is in the best interests of the industry overall. I don't think passenger rights legislation will solve the problems, I think it will add to them.”</p> <p>“I think BTC should do anything they can to urge, assist and monitor the airlines in providing their own unified passenger rights documents.”</p>	<p>Yes, object Yes, support No</p>	<p>11.2% 84.9% 3.9%</p>

“BTC should present the balanced pros and cons and show that they have thought about it.”

“The passenger rights issue is just a small part of the systemic problems facing the industry....but we must start somewhere to restore dignity and economic sense to the airline industry.”

“But make certain the legislation is done correctly.”

“BTC continues to do an outstanding job in focusing on important issues. Passenger rights legislation needs action and acceptance.”

“Yes, we should absolutely weigh in -- but whether to object or support depends on what / how the legislation is written & implemented.”

“BTC should give objective advice.”

“Yes, but take a sensible approach. In the recent MN case, why would they keep people overnight on the plane if they knew that takeoff was not imminent?”

“Support with reasonable time limits on the tarmac...and do everything you can to ensure a sane outcome that protects passengers from the worst aberrations for which an airline is responsible, while minimizing additional costs for the beleaguered airline industry. Personally I think the legislation should be confined to the rights of passengers when an irregular operation occurs, be it caused by weather, mechanical problems, or whatever. Above all, though, it is imperative that unintended consequences of such legislation are prevented, e.g., safety is not compromised by an airline doing something unsafe when it shouldn't in order to mitigate its liability under the legislation.”

Addendum 2 (Complete and filtered quantitative results by participant segment.)

# of Participants	➡	674	198	123	25	187	141
% By Segment	➡	100%	29.4%	18.2%	3.7%	27.8%	20.9%
Questions Asked ↓		All	Corp. Travel Buyers	TMC Execs	Airline Staff	Travelers	Others (e.g., hotel execs)
Have U.S. airlines done enough in the past 10 years – allowing for all their cost constraints – to improve customer service levels?	Yes	4.3%	3.6%	0.0%	14.3%	5.8%	5.3%
	No	84.9%	80.0%	97.1%	57.1%	84.6%	86.8%
	Unsure	10.8%	16.4%	2.9%	28.6%	9.6%	7.9%
Specifically, should addressing extended tarmac delays be a priority for airlines to address?	Yes	90.8%	89.1%	91.2%	85.7%	94.1%	89.2%
	No	8.2%	9.1%	8.8%	14.3%	5.9%	8.1%
	Unsure	1.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%
Has airline customer service – broadly defined – improved in the past 10 years?	Not at all	77.0%	69.8%	79.4%	57.1%	82.7%	81.1%
	Somewhat	21.9%	30.2%	20.6%	28.6%	17.3%	16.2%
	Very much	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	2.7%
Have airlines made a compelling case against passenger rights legislation?	Yes	4.8%	0.0%	3.0%	14.3%	5.8%	10.3%
	No	80.0%	80.0%	81.8%	71.4%	80.8%	79.5%
	Unsure	15.2%	20.0%	15.2%	14.3%	13.4%	10.2%
Do you conceptually support passenger rights	Yes	84.9%	92.7%	85.3%	42.9%	88.7%	76.3%
	No	8.6%	0.0%	8.8%	42.9%	7.5%	15.8%
	Unsure	6.5%	7.3%	5.9%	14.2%	3.8%	7.9%

legislation?								
Do you support proposed Senate legislation that would allow passengers to disembark after 3 hours on the tarmac, should a captain decide it is reasonable and safe to do so?	Yes	82.2%	90.6%	79.4%	71.4%	80.4%	77.2%	
	No	11.1%	3.8%	14.7%	0.0%	13.7%	17.1%	
	Unsure	6.7%	5.6%	5.9%	28.6%	5.9%	5.7%	
Do you believe that airlines will endeavor to voluntarily improve customer service levels, to an acceptable degree?	Yes	17.4%	14.5%	21.2%	42.9%	11.8%	21.1%	
	No	64.1%	60.0%	72.7%	57.1%	68.6%	57.9%	
	Unsure	18.5%	25.5%	6.1%	0.0%	19.6%	21.0%	
Do you believe that airlines, via an industry-wide commitment, will codify passenger rights commitments and obligations in contracts of carriage?	Yes	13.6%	9.2%	12.1%	71.4%	13.7%	10.5%	
	No	55.4%	50.9%	66.7%	28.6%	56.9%	55.3%	
	Unsure	31.0%	40.9%	21.2%	0.0%	29.4%	34.2%	
Do you believe Business Travel Coalition should weigh in on the efficacy of such legislation?	Yes, object	11.2%	3.9%	18.7%	33.3%	7.7%	16.2%	
	Yes, support	84.8%	94.1%	81.3%	50.0%	88.5%	75.7%	
	No	4.0%	2.0%	0.0%	16.7%	3.8%	8.1%	