

EXPERIMENTAL AIRCRAFT ASSOCIATION

PIO BOX 229, HALES CORNERS, WISCONSIN 53130 OFFICES AND AIR MUSEUM 11311 W. FCREST HOME AVE., FRANKLIN, WI 53132 PHONE: 414 425-4860

> December 11, 1981 AIRMAIL

Mr. Odd H. Johnsen P.O. Box 25f 8001 BODØ MORWAY

Dear Odd:

I would like to take this opportunity to say how pleased I was to be a part of the Microlight meeting. I've attended many meetings relative to microlights or ultralights, as some countries call them, and I find many of the concerns to be quite similar.

In reviewing the minutes I received from FAI, I still see there is some doubt as to the proper description of a microlight. It certainly will vary with people and countries, and be regulated by the laws of the countries.

Here in the United States, our government FAA looks upon the microlight, or the ultralight as we term it, as a single place machine. The definition is different between the United States and the FAI's recommendation. In the United States, if the machine will be two-place, then it well be a licensed airplane falling into our experimental amateur built category, requiring a minimum of a student pilot's certificate; a solo in a powered aircraft and signed off for that particular aircraft by a certified government flight instructor. To carry passengers, one then must have at least a private pilot's certificate. We have already found many of our states, which are called provinces in some countries, requiring state registration and taxes on these ultralight machines. Many states have already determined that the machines are not air vehicles but airplanes. Anything that uses navigationable airspace is an airplane, which will be in conflict with our federal government's interpretation, for the present.

The people involved in ultralights here in the United States have had the opportunity to express their opinions. The date has now been closed for comments and now government officials who have been very positive and helpful, will evaluate all the comments.

Mr. Odd H. Johnson December 11, 1981 Page 2

After categorizing the recommendations, they will come up with the final answer. In reviewing well over 500 letters sent in by the public to FAA, I find great confusion, self-serving interests and a variety of recommendations. If only 10% of the recommendations were accepted by government, it would make the original government proposal look wonderful. There are many who feel that the pilots should be licensed and should be knowledgeable on aviation law. We certainly appreciate the endeavors of manufacturers here in our country. Some of our chapters and organizations who have flight training programs and certificates of merit are showing initiative. This is fine but to many respondents it will not be acceptable as government recognized. The Air Transport Association of America submitted their recommendations, representing thirty-two airlines, which calls for the licensing of the pilot and aircraft certification requirements.

While one worries about what constitutes a microlight or ultralight; wing loading; knetic energy, etc., there are those out there using airspace who have a different view. We just hope that government will not be overly influenced and that organizations of groups, such as our EAA Ultralight Assn. and those in countries elsewhere have the togetherness and the leadership to insure that we are not overregulated.

In discussing the change of name with many people, from ultralight to microlight, I have found no support here in the United States. To them an ultralight is a microlight or vice versa. In fact, the FAI requirements calling for a one to two-place airplane does not fit the United States unlicensed and unregistered requirements. Whether the word is microlight or ultralight, anyone involved in the movement will be able to accept either one, I'm sure.

It is most difficult at meetings such as we had at Paris, to go home and try to change the minds of government and enthusiasts, though we are full of enthusiasm. Unfortunately, most do not have an organization strong enough in their country to be influential on many matters. Fortunately, we here in the states in developing EAA some thirty years ago, have a bit of influence and receive respect for our input, from government and many people.

I would certainly encourage every country to build a reputation for their national organization, that is broad in experience and wisdom; that can work together and not be separated by ones own particular interest. Perhaps the word is "general aviation" which is a very general term. When we break our organizations down into small, ineffective groups such as ultralights, antiquers, vintage and homebuilders, without having a single strong togetherness group, we will continue to be ineffective.

We in EAA have not used that philosophy. We have brought everyone into the group. You may like a microlight this year and soaring the next year. Or, you may hang on to a warbird for a year or two and then go into vintage aircraft. You may be just a historian or a lover

Mr. Odd H. Johnson December 11, 1981 Page 3

of aviation, or want to associate with them. Numbers are very important, and leadership is even more important.

I enjoyed being with all of you. Sometimes it is difficult being a Yank who loves the world, and especially the world of aviation.

EAA, the official representative of the ultralight movement, as well as the amateur built movement in the United States and a member of our National Aero Club, works with all and is a part of FAI. Unity is the word and I would very much recommend that each of you try to develop that with your major national aviation group, NAC. If you do not have one, then you assume that responsibility. We should continue to share our ideas and use the best portion of each country's regulations to influence our own governments. So often, governments are influenced by what others do. Let's get the best out of them...that's the philosophy.

Sincerely,

EXPERIMENTAL AIRCRAFT ASSOCIATION, INC.

Paul H. Poberezny President

m