

The Florida Senate
BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Transportation Committee

BILL: SB 1864
 INTRODUCER: Senator Baker
 SUBJECT: Aircraft Safety/Wildlife Hazards
 DATE: March 20, 2009 REVISED: 3/25/09

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Eichin	Meyer	TR	Fav/1 amendment
2.			CA	
3.			JU	
4.			GA	
5.				
6.				

Please see Section VIII. for Additional Information:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| A. COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | Statement of Substantial Changes |
| B. AMENDMENTS..... | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Technical amendments were recommended |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Amendments were recommended |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Significant amendments were recommended |

I. Summary:

The bill creates the “Airline Safety and Wildlife Protection Act of Florida” providing a legislative finding that the ability of airport operators to manage wildlife hazards in a manner consistent with federal and state law is necessary to prevent jeopardy to human life or aircraft safety. Further, the bill declares the legislative intent that an airport should not be subject to penalties, restrictions, liabilities, or sanctions when taking authorized actions to manage wildlife and that the authorization should not be superseded by the actions of other state and local agencies.

The bill provides an airport authority or any other entity owning or operating an airport may not be subject to any administrative, civil, or criminal penalty, restriction, liability, or other sanction stemming from authorized actions taken for the purpose of protecting human life or aircraft safety from wildlife hazards.

This bill substantially creates s. 379.2293, F.S.

II. Present Situation:

Between 1988 and 2005, wildlife strikes (collisions between aircraft and wildlife) have killed more than 219 people and destroyed over 200 aircraft worldwide.¹ Although the splash landing of USAirways Flight 1549 into the Hudson River in New York on January 15, 2009 has recently publicized the phenomenon, wildlife strikes have been problematic to aircraft since Orville Wright struck a bird with his airplane in September 1905. Data collected in the FAA National Wildlife Strike Database indicates the problem is getting worse with the number of strikes annually reported tripled from 1990 (1,739) to 2000 (5,979). Three factors are believed to contribute to this increasing threat.

- Many populations of wildlife species commonly involved in strikes have increased markedly in the last few decades and adapted to living in urban environments, including airports. Thirteen of the 14 bird species in North America with mean body masses greater than 8 pounds have shown significant population increases over the past three decades. The white-tailed deer population increased from a low of about 350,000 in 1900 to over 17 million in the past decade.
- Concurrent with population increases of many large bird species, air traffic has increased substantially since 1980. Passenger enplanements in the United States (U.S.) increased from about 310 million in 1980 to a record 749 million in 2007 (3.3 percent per year), and commercial air traffic increased from about 18 million aircraft movements in 1980 to over 28 million in 2007 (1.8 percent per year).² Commercial air traffic in the U.S. is predicted to continue growing at a rate of about 2 percent per year to over 36 million movements by 2020.
- Commercial air carriers are replacing their older three- or four-engine aircraft fleets with more efficient and quieter, two-engine aircraft. In 1969, 75 percent of U.S. commercial passenger aircraft had three or four engines. In 2005, only about 10 percent have three or four engines. The reduction in engine redundancy increases the probability of life-threatening situations resulting from aircraft collisions with wildlife, especially with flocks of birds. Further, research indicates birds are less able to detect and avoid modern jet aircraft with quieter engines than older aircraft with noisier engines.

As a result of these factors, experts within the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and U.S. Air Force expect the risk, frequency, and potential severity of wildlife-aircraft collisions to grow over the next decade.

The majority of wildlife strikes occur within the immediate airport environment: 74 percent of all strikes occur at or below 500 feet above ground level (AGL).³ Wildlife is attracted to an airport environment because desirable food, water, or habitat is present. The nature and magnitude of wildlife strikes at an individual airport depends on many factors, including air traffic type and volume, local and migratory wildlife populations, and local wildlife habitat conditions.

¹“Wildlife Hazard Management at Airports: A Manual for Airport Personnel”, FAA and USDA

² Federal Aviation Administration 2008

³“Wildlife Strikes To Civil Aircraft In The United States 1990–2007”, FAA and USDA

Accordingly, airport sponsors and managers have a legal responsibility under federal regulations (Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations, part 139 [14 CFR, part 139]) to ensure airports maintain a safe operating environment. Airports are required to “undertake immediate action to alleviate wildlife hazards when they are detected.”⁴

Airports use various methods to mitigate wildlife hazards including minimizing on-airport wildlife attractants and preventing wildlife access to the airport through fencing, mowing at certain heights to minimize attractants, planting certain types of grasses or plants that do not attract wildlife, or other means, and, as a last resort, depredation (lethal means).⁵⁶ However, wildlife protection and management is guided by myriad overlapping and potentially conflicting federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances. Attempts to minimize, mitigate, or otherwise control wildlife strikes at or near airports regularly contend with the missions of any number of regulatory governmental bodies including the FAA, the USDA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). In Florida, airport managers must comply with rules and regulations of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC), water management districts (WMD), the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), and various local ordinances.

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

The bill creates the “Airline Safety and Wildlife Protection Act of Florida” in new s. 379.2293, F.S., to address airport activities undertaken within the scope of a permit or other authorization for depredation or harassment of wildlife.

The bill provides a legislative finding that the ability to manage wildlife hazards in a manner consistent with federal and state law is necessary for airports to prevent jeopardy to human life or aircraft safety. Further, the bill declares the legislative intent that an airport should not be subject to penalties, restrictions, liabilities, or sanctions when taking authorized actions to manage wildlife and that the authorization should not be superseded by the actions of other state and local agencies.

The bill provides notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, an airport authority or any other entity owning or operating an airport is not subject to any administrative, civil, or criminal penalty, restriction, liability, or other sanction with respect to any authorized action taken for the purpose of protecting human life or aircraft safety from wildlife hazards. The bill applies to an airport as defined in s. 330.27(2), F.S. This statute defines “airport” as “an area of land or water used for, or intended to be used for, landing and takeoff of aircraft, including appurtenant areas, buildings, facilities, or rights-of-way necessary to facilitate such use or intended use.”

⁴ 14 CFR, part 139.337

⁵ Airport Cooperative Research Program Synthesis No. 3 “General Aviation Safety and Security Practices: A Synthesis of Airport Practice”

⁶ Airports Council International – North America, “Wildlife Hazard Management – What Airports Are Doing to Reduce the Risk.”

The bill defines, for purposes of this section, “authorized action taken for the purpose of protecting human life or aircraft safety from wildlife hazards” as an action authorized by or within the scope of any of the following:

- The airport’s wildlife hazard management plan, as approved by the FAA.⁷
- A depredation permit issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.⁸
- A standing order of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Rule 68A-9.010(4)⁹ or rule 68A-27.002,¹⁰ F.A.C., or a permit authorizing the harassment of wildlife issue by the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

Under the bill, if any action authorized above conflicts or appears to conflict with a development permit, land-development regulation, local comprehensive plan, or other environmental or land-use law, rule, restriction, or requirement, the authorization described above shall take precedence. In addition to an airport authority or the owner or operator of an airport, the bill’s immunities also apply to officers, employees, contractors, or employees of a contractor, or a member of the airport’s governing body. However, this immunity only applies to the extent the actions of the officer, employee, contractor, contractor’s employee, or member are authorized by or within the scope of one or more of the legal authorities described above.

This act shall take effect upon becoming law.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

⁷ 14 C.F.R. 337

⁸ 50 CFR 21.41. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service issues depredation permits “to allow the taking of migratory birds which are causing serious damage to public or private property, pose a health or safety hazard, or are damaging agricultural crops or wildlife. http://www.fws.gov/pacific/migratorybirds/depredation_permits.htm (March 9, 2009).

⁹ Rule 68A-9.010(4), F.A.C., addresses the taking of nuisance wildlife on airport property.

¹⁰ Rule 68-A-27.002, F.S., provides for the harassment of endangered, threatened, and species of special concern on airport property.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

C. Government Sector Impact:

Airport authorities could potentially see a reduction in litigation expenses associated with civil actions and enforcement proceedings.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Additional Information:

A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:

(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

None.

B. Amendments:

Barcode 567678 by Transportation.

This amendment clarifies the meaning of “airport” as used in the act to be the same as defined in s. 330.27(2), F.S., *i.e.*:

...an area of land or water used for, or intended to be used for, landing and takeoff of aircraft, including appurtenant areas, buildings, facilities, or rights-of-way necessary to facilitate such use or intended use.