

A permanent ADIZ in the Washington, D.C. area can only add cost, inconvenience and hardship to many types of operations, both flying and non-flying.

Especially considering that the effect any one or multiple small aircraft could have if used in a threatening manner, worst case, is equivalent to a traffic accident on a major highway. More effective means of protecting the capital area have already been proposed by the AOPA, for one, that are more cost and mission effective than these permanent restrictions.

Furthermore, this wastes my hard earned tax dollars. When well thought opportunities to improve security of the national airspace system (as such) at a relatively low cost and low impact to the flying community in general exist, they should be implemented. Some improvements may have prevented or mitigated the impact of the response due to the incursion by a student pilot and his instructor this past summer. Maybe more diligence on the part of FBOs and pilots would have prevented the mayhem caused by that kid who stole the light plane and crashed into a building in 2002. AOPA's Flightwatch program has since addressed this issue.

I agree the Washington D.C. ADIZ was required for a time to assess the airspace security situation after 9/11/2001. That assessment has long since passed and shown a minimal to non-existent threat by general aviation to any of our national assets. Has everyone forgotten about that Cessna crash into the White House during the Clinton years? What was the result? No net effect on security other than to acknowledge a single individual could potentially put an airplane where no one wants it. This, in fact, may well be an example the terrorists themselves cited in their planning for 9/11.

However, there are stark differences between both incidents. Differences in the size and speed of the aircraft are obvious. A small general aviation aircraft cannot cause an even minor disaster nor can it do so without being noticed. It takes a long time for a light plane to traverse even short distances quickly. The intent of the individuals involved was very different as well.

In summary, these ADIZ restrictions should be lifted and replaced with a more efficient and less restrictive arrangement. Better and more cost-effective security measures are available which should be diligently assessed and implemented.

Thank you for your attention to my comments.