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I. INTRODUCTION

"We don't ration steaks, or Lincoln Continentals or Picasso drawings. If you want them, you have to get them the old fashioned way — you have to pay for them." — Alfred Kahn.¹

AIR TRAFFIC HAS increased considerably since the Airline Deregulation Act of 1979.² Although problems of allocating airport resources existed before economic deregulation,³ the increase in traffic after deregulation has made the problem more acute.⁴ The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Department of Transportation (DOT), and the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) before its demise,⁵ have responded in a variety of ways.

² See Staff Report, Office of Economic Analysis, Civil Aeronautics Board, Competition and the Airlines: An Evaluation of Deregulation 33, Fig. 1.3 (1982) [hereinafter cited as CAB Staff Report]. M. Brenner, J. Leet & E. Schoot, Airline Deregulation 18, Table 4 (1985) indicated that between 1978 and 1983, truck revenue-passenger miles increased by 7.1%. Locals increased 91.5%, intrastate increased 123.7%, Alaska/Hawaii by 47.1%, and other carriers increased by 20.9%. Id.
⁵ The CAB ceased to exist as an independent entity in January, 1985, and its
They established quotas on the number of Instrument Flight Rule reservations per hour for specified high-density airports, allowed slot exchanges, permitted experimental slot sales (and then withdrew that permission), and provided antitrust exemptions for airport scheduling committees and agreements. DOT/FAA also has allocated slots administratively when scheduling committees have deadlocked.
Effective April 1, 1986, an FAA final rule (the "Buy-Sell" Rule) permits airline carriers and commuter operators to sell slots for any consideration at four of the Nation's high-density airports. Specifically, this new Buy-Sell Rule provides separate slot pools for air carriers, commuters, and other operators. Air carriers holding slots on December 16, 1985, are "grandfathered," and may buy, sell, trade, or lease those slots beginning April 1, 1986. International slots are treated specially and their transfer is restricted. Slots not used at least 65% of the time must be returned to the FAA and, along with other newly available slots, distributed by lottery. General

to safe altitudes of flight and rules for the prevention of collision between aircraft and land or water vehicles, and between aircraft and airborne objects.


16 Id. at 52,187:

The Department of State [DOS] commented that bilateral agreements would probably not be violated if foreign carriers were given a fair and equal opportunity to compete with domestic carriers for available slots. DOS was concerned, however, that the larger scale of activity of domestic carriers at the high density airports might give them at least an initial unfair advantage. DOS recommended that the buy/sell approach be confined at first to domestic operations to gain experience and to make any needed adjustments before adapting the rule to include international operations.
Aviation slots are not affected. Finally, slots may be recalled by the FAA for "operational reasons" and are not considered "proprietary rights," despite the permission to buy and sell.

Although a wide spectrum of interests supported the Buy-Sell Rule at the FAA's public hearings, opponents voiced four basic objections. These parties argued that the Rule would (1) give an undeserved "windfall" to incumbents; (2) increase air fares; (3) cause slots used for service to small communities to be outbid by carriers seeking the slots for long distance use and more lucrative routes; and (4) create anticompetitive incentives for large carriers to outbid smaller carriers for slots.

Armed with an FTC Economic Staff Report and an economic analysis prepared by the Department of Justice (DOJ), the FAA responded in summary as follows: (1) The economic scarcity value of the slots exists regardless
of Buy-Sell and, therefore, any "windfall" was created at the time the slots were originally awarded and not by Buy-Sell. 26 (2) Airfares would not increase since, as economic studies have shown, 27 existing fares already reflect the scarcity value of the slots. In fact, airfares would decrease due to more efficient slot use and a substantial reduction in delays now costing carriers and their customers millions of dollars per day. 28 (3) Service to small communities is protected by the Essential Air Service Program 29

26 FAR Amendment 93-49, supra note 12. As the FTC REPORT OF THE AIRPORT TASK FORCE, supra note 4, explains:

[T]he prices which would be paid for slots if a market existed would only be a reflection of the value of the existing scarcity of slots. That scarcity is not created by the slot market, it is created by the FAA's restriction on the number of landings permitted at an airport, at least during some parts of the day.

Id. at 32.

27 FAR Amendment 93-49, supra note 12, 50 Fed. Reg. at 52,184:

As an example, FTC cites from an FTC staff report which found that in the first quarter of 1981, fares in slot-constrained markets were two to five percent higher than in other markets. FTC concluded that even if carriers were to acquire those slots at their market value (rather than for free, as under the existing rule), the average fare level would not rise. If a carrier's fare in a slot-constrained market did rise, it would indicate that the carrier had not been charging a profit-maximizing fare prior to buy-sell, which is unlikely. FTC further noted that the above conclusion applied to the average of all fares, and that there were circumstances which could result in the increase in fares in some markets and the decrease of fares in others.

28 Id. at 52,185:

American Airlines commented that fares are not always directly related to costs. American also noted that fares might actually be lowered as a result of buy-sell, because the market in slots would increase economic efficiency and allow a more productive use of slots. Other comments pointed out that since the expenditures for slots would only be a small part of overall costs, those expenditures would not have a significant effect on ticket prices.

29 Id. at 52,186:

The Joint Commenters stated that the fear is unfounded that a buy/sell rule would result in shifting of service to small communities from the high density airports, or that slots would be used only with large aircraft. They cite numerous examples of carriers serving small communities and suggest that that will continue. In fact, they suggest that "without buy/sell some small and medium community services might be adversely affected." . . . American cites the recent expansion of service to smaller communities as proof that new ser-
and the Rule’s reservation of slots for commuter carriers. The hub-spoke system requires short-haul routes from the hub, and slots for such purposes will be highly valued and therefore purchased at competitive prices. Slot sales also permit small communities to purchase or lease slots which otherwise might be unobtainable.\(^\text{30}\) (4) Smaller carriers will not necessarily be outbid by larger carriers, since slot sales can be financed. Lenders will be more likely and more willing to lend money for a slot to a carrier making profitable use of a slot. Thus, if anything, Buy-Sell tends to favor smaller, low-cost airlines over some larger carriers.\(^\text{31}\) (Several new entrants under an experimental slot sale program in 1982 obtained twenty-six slots that they had been seeking unsuccessfully prior to that time.)\(^\text{32}\) The “lose it or use it” provision of the Rule, combined

vice will be directed towards small communities to “tap” new markets and feed the established long-haul routes.

Protection and development of service to smaller communities is also achieved by the provision for separate treatment of slots used for service to certain communities under the Essential Air Service (EAS) Program.

\(^\text{30}\) Id.: “DOJ commented that smaller communities may act on their own to preserve air service by entering into contractual agreements with carriers holding slots or by purchasing slots and leasing them to carriers. This rule would allow such arrangements.”

\(^\text{31}\) Id. at 52,185:

The FTC observed that the motivation to purchase in a slot market will be the expectation of providing relatively high-value flights and not simply the availability of cash on hand. If a smaller carrier can obtain higher profitability from an additional operation than can a larger carrier, the smaller carrier should be able to offer a higher purchase price and obtain the slot, even if financing is required. The size of a carrier is not necessarily related to the ability to finance purchases. FTC notes that smaller carriers such as People Express have been able to finance large equipment purchases and should have no more trouble financing slot purchases. Financing should be facilitated by the fact that slots are non-depreciating and readily transferable.

\(^\text{32}\) Id.:

CEA cites the examples of new entrants being able to gain access during the limited buy-sell experiment conducted with interim operations plan slots in 1982. They cite the example in which one carrier acquired 26 slots at that time. The price of the slots did not constitute a barrier to entry or to subsequent profitable operation.
with antitrust enforcement, would prevent anticompetitive behavior in buying slots to keep out a competitor.

In sum, the FAA maintained that under Buy-Sell, benefits would accrue "from the ability to liquidate a slot at a price higher than the value to the using carrier,"\(^3\) or from the opportunity "to acquire a slot at a price which will permit a return on investment higher than the next preferable investment alternative,"\(^4\) thereby increasing air carrier profit by "$100,000 to $130,000 per day."\(^5\) The FAA further opined that new entrants would benefit from being able to obtain access,\(^6\) that the government would benefit through relief from responsibility for monitoring and scheduling benefits,\(^7\) and that society would benefit from improved efficiency in air carrier operations.\(^8\)

This article analyzes the economic and legal consequences of the FAA Buy-Sell Rule. As a background to this analysis, Part II briefly reviews the history and purposes of airline deregulation. Part III discusses airport access restrictions as a threat to free entry and, consequently, to airline deregulation. Parts IV and V review the economic and legal status of existing airport resources so that slot allocation may be viewed in the broader context of airport resources. (It will be shown, for example, that the Buy-Sell Rule fails to address entry at the most critical point of bottleneck, namely terminal space and gates.) Part VI surveys existing and proposed

\(^3\) Id. at 52,194.
\(^4\) Id.
\(^5\) Id.
\(^6\) See supra note 32.
\(^7\) Id. at 52,184:
The Department believes that the rule minimizes the need for government intervention in the continuing allocation and distribution of slots. Because carrier agreement on schedules, as the scheduling committees now operate, is not required, there will no longer be deadlocks in the allocation process.
\(^8\) Id. at 52,185:
An unrestricted market in slots will permit a new entrant to obtain marginally profitable slots from one carrier at a price which will allow the new entrant to compete in a market in which another carrier is maintaining a price above average cost.
means of airport resource allocation so that alternative methods may be compared to Buy-Sell. Part VII reviews possible antitrust enforcement under Buy-Sell. Finally, Part VIII concludes that, while the benefits of Buy-Sell outweigh the disadvantages of existing methods, the threat of anticompetitive behavior under Buy-Sell is substantial and cannot be cured solely by antitrust enforcement. This article, therefore, proposes a modification to Buy-Sell that will reduce substantially the threat of anticompetitive behavior under Buy-Sell. This modification includes the integration of variable landing fees and a supplemental efficiency-bidding system in lieu of a lottery for recaptured slots.

II. AIRLINE ECONOMIC DEREGULATION (1978-1985)

The FAA Buy-Sell Rule must be considered in the broader context of the policies and purpose of the Airline Deregulation Act. The benefits of airline economic deregulation over the past seven years have been widely recognized. It has been suggested that the deregulatory experience has fully vindicated President John F. Kennedy's call, in his 1962 Transportation Message, for "greater reliance on the forces of competition and less reliance on the restraints of regulation."

Airline deregulation was a victory for the economic theorists. Critics resisted deregulation on the theory that it would bring economic disaster to the industry.

---

42 See Dempsey, Transportation Deregulation - On a Collision Course?, 13 TRANSPP. L.J.
decrease service to small communities, result in industry concentration, and, eventually, oligopolization. Deregulation in large measure has proved the inaccuracy of these predictions, as well as the invalidity of the public interest rationale for regulation. Deregulation thus has vindicated economists such as George Stigler, who postulated that "every industry or occupation that has enough political power to utilize the state will seek to control entry." It has been noted, for example, that between 1960 and 1975, "the scholarly view of the regulatory process changed from one of control of private behavior for the benefit of the public to one of use of governmental powers for private or sectional gain."

Prior to airline deregulation in 1978, the airline industry proved the truth of Stigler's hypothesis. In the years


*See Gibney, Continuing Airline Losses Predicted, Denver Post, June 21, 1982, at 3C, col. 1. Gibney quotes Braniff's Chief Executive Officer:

I think within five to seven years you will have no more than five [out of a current eleven] trunk airlines. Then you will have a whole bunch of Southwest Airlines-type carriers that start out from scratch and work to keep costs in line. As decreed by the law of the jungle, only the strong will survive.

Id.

* Dempsey, supra note 42, at 345. Dempsey cites Rowen, Airlines Competing to the Death, Wash. Post, Nov. 11, 1982, at A27, col. 2: "[T]he airline industry under deregulation is on a course where competition is being wrung out by the creation of an oligopoly of a few remaining large airlines . . . ."


* Stigler, The Theory of Economic Regulation, 2 BELL J. ECON. & MGMT. SCI. 3, 6 (1971). Stigler considers two alternative views of regulation: (1) regulation for the benefit of the public; and (2) regulation by vested interest groups through coercive use of governmental power. The interest groups may employ political machinery beneficial to that industry, but harmful to the public at large. See id.

following its creation in 1938, the CAB, through its power to grant certificates of "public convenience or necessity," rigidly controlled entry. During this period of heavy-handed regulation, not a single major carrier was permitted into the industry. The only single significant exception took the form of post-World War II entries by local service carriers, who were granted certificates to replace trunks in providing subsidized service to small communities.

While several factors, such as the general inflation rate, particular inflation rates (fuel, for example), recessionary pressures, and technological advances, must be considered in an analysis of airline industry pricing, most studies examining all these factors have concluded that regulation created artificially inflated fares. The 1975 Kennedy hearings revealed regulated fares ranging from 40% to 100% too high, costing consumers $3.5 billion in excess fares. These statistics reinforced an earlier study suggesting that coach fares were 45% to 84% higher than unregulated fares would be.

Under regulation, fares were based on the average costs

---

50 Id. at 980.
51 CAB STAFF REPORT, supra note 2, at 10. This test put the burden of proof on applicants to show new entry was in the public interest and would not harm an incumbent airline. Since a new entrant had no proven track record to distinguish its merits, it suffered a significant disadvantage in pressing its case.
52 As Professor Dempsey noted: "Between 1950 and 1974, the CAB received 79 applications from firms seeking to obtain operating authority to provide scheduled domestic service. None was granted." Dempsey, The Rise and Fall of the Civil Aeronautics Board—Opening Wide the Floodgates of Entry, 16 TRANS. L.J. 91, 115 (1979) (emphasis added).
53 CAB STAFF REPORT, supra note 2, at 10.
54 During the first four months of 1979, jet fuel costs increased by 86%. J. MEYER, C. OSTER, I. MORGAN, B. BEARMAN & D. STRASSMAN, AIRLINE DEREGULATION: THE EARLY EXPERIENCE 163 (1981) [hereinafter cited as HARVARD PROJECT].
55 Id. at 25-27.
57 Keeler, Airline Regulation and Market Performance, 3 BELL J. ECON. & MGMT SCI. 399, 421 (1972).
of the industry. The CAB focused on achieving a desired rate of return for the industry, without regard for the relationship between fares and costs in particular markets. This myopic policy produced many economic ill effects similar to those that would result in a monopolized industry. The disparity between costs and fares forced carriers in competitive markets to compete by offering frills like "polynesian pubs" or the most free liquor. Inefficient carriers were rewarded with new routes to help keep them afloat while efficient carriers were forced to assume money-losing routes to serve the "public interest."

With such a perversion of market incentives, airlines predictably did their best to discard such routes. As a result of this policy of cross-subsidization, 173 communities lost their air service in the eighteen years before deregulation, devastating those communities and making a mockery of the "social benefit" rationale of regulation.

Deregulation generated dramatic effects. Despite fuel price increases of 105% between March 1979 and March 1980, fares decreased in real terms on an overall basis during that period. While some communities gained service, and others lost it after deregulation, an exhaustive independent study concluded that "as a group, small communities (both small hubs and nonhubs) were receiving more scheduled airline service after deregulation than..."

---

59 CAB Staff Report, supra note 2, at 68. Even the introduction of discount fares allowed only moderate flexibility for deviation from regulated fares. Id. at 69.
62 CAB Staff Report, supra note 2, at 10.
64 Harvard Project, supra note 54, at 163.
65 Id. at 71. The Harvard Faculty Project reported that real average fares decreased by 17% during the first years of deregulation. Id.
In large part, this increase in service resulted from more efficient use of more appropriately sized aircraft on short hauls. Deregulation’s liberalized entry policy enabled fifteen newly formed jet-service airlines to enter the industry by August 1983, more than replacing the older, less efficient airlines that did not survive deregulation. The market share of the six biggest airlines dropped from 70% to 62% during the period 1980-85.

The airlines, who never earned the allowable rate of return in the decade before deregulation, increased their profits by 50% in the very first year of deregulation. While the subsequent recession hit the airline industry hard, by early 1984 the Airline Transport Association (ATA) was predicting a one-half billion-dollar industry profit for 1983. In addition, airline employment has increased during deregulation, even during the recession years.

Safety also has increased during deregulation, declining from .10 fatal crashes per 100,000 takeoffs in 1978 to .08 in 1982. More importantly, performance “indicators” (accidents, injuries, FAA violations) have improved by 30% during the period. In sum, deregulation has...

---

66 Id. at 156.
67 See FTC REPORT OF THE AIRPORT TASK FORCE, supra note 4, at 26. The use of smaller aircraft by commuters also substantially reduced community subsidy levels. See HARVARD PROJECT, supra note 54, at 156-57.
69 Interview with Bill Horn, American Transport Association (July 1, 1986).
70 Id. at 19-24.
73 Id. Airlines have found that maintaining safety standards above those required by the FAA actually can cut maintenance costs. Id.
74 Id. The 1985 crashes of Air India, Japan Airline and the British Airways charter aircraft obviously were not tied to deregulation in this country. Testimony
served the needs of consumers, the airline industry, and its employees.

III. AIRPORT ACCESS LIMITATION AS A THREAT TO AIRLINE DEREGULATION

The foregoing summary of airline deregulation benefits provides a necessary preface to discussion of one of three significant threats to airline deregulation: the denial of airport resources to new entrants. (The second and third threats, not discussed here, consist of insufficiently controlled mergers and discriminatory use of airline reservation computer systems.) The Buy-Sell Rule primarily seeks to deal with this threat to access.

The benefits of airline deregulation have flowed principally from two factors: (1) free entry, and (2) freedom to compete by price and route. The value of the second factor, however, depends upon the first. The lack of free entry reduces the incentive to compete by price. While a reduced incentive to compete by price would be a lesser concern in the heyday of regulation, survival now depends upon providing the best service at the lowest cost to the


consumer.\textsuperscript{77}

What economic deregulation accomplished in the skies can be undone by direct or indirect entry control at the nation's airports. In economic terms, it makes no difference whether new entrants suffer exclusion by formal economic regulation (as was done by the CAB in the years 1938-1978), or by indirect means under the patchwork umbrella of "noise" restrictions, collusive "voluntary" agreements of scheduling committees, or administrative fiat. Entry control by any artificial means ultimately diminishes market forces and the benefits to be derived therefrom.

Free entry is necessary to prevent predatory pricing. Predatory pricing occurs when a large competitor attempts to use its economic power to lower prices to a level which it can absorb, but which bankrupts competitors.\textsuperscript{78} After the bankrupts leave the industry, the large competitor can raise its fares without fear of challenge. Predatory pricing thus involves absorption of short-term losses in the hopes of reaping future excess profits. Predatory pricing becomes irrational, however, in a free-entry market, since a competitor easily can reappear later to prevent the reaping of oligopoly profits. As one scholar notes, predatory pricing can work only where the predatory firm enjoys insurance of its own ability to absorb ruinous losses, and protection by substantial barriers to re-entry by competitors.\textsuperscript{79}

But if the importance of free entry to the continued services of deregulation is widely recognized, the means of achieving it at the airport level is not. The acute nature of this problem stems from the fact that the experience of economic deregulation provides few answers, since the determining factors are different. Economic deregulation has been successful in large part because it allowed so

\textsuperscript{77} See CAB Draft Report, supra note 68, at 27.


\textsuperscript{79} S. Breyer, supra note 61, at 32.
many new entrants into the industry. Free entry has changed the shape of the industry to fit more closely the economist's definition of a competitive industry: an industry where a sufficiently large number of individual sellers exist to ensure that no one seller controls a percentage of the total market large enough to allow manipulation of the price of its product by restricting or expanding its own production. Traditional market mechanisms such as supply and demand work well when an industry approaches this market pattern, but tend to have misallocative characteristics when it does not. Thus, while many of the benefits economic deregulation spawned were achieved easily by simply eliminating the legal and administrative barriers to entry into the industry, current access restrictions to airports continue to foster many of the same economic ill effects the original administrative entry barriers caused. Access restrictions reduce the number of competitors, confronting incumbent carriers with a more steeply declining demand curve; i.e., a market where the incumbent controls a large enough percentage of the market to affect fares by varying its own output. In a market where an incumbent firm faces such a nonhorizontal demand curve, profit maximization occurs not at the most efficient social pricing level (i.e., where price equals marginal cost), but rather at the point where marginal revenue equals marginal cost. Because this re-

---

80 By 1981, eleven newly formed airlines providing jet service had entered the industry. CAB STAFF REPORT, supra note 2, at 125. The market share of the six largest trunk carriers has eroded steadily since deregulation, from a 70% market share in 1980 to a 62% market share in 1985. Wall St. J., Feb. 28, 1986, at 1, col. 6.

81 P. SAMUELSON, supra note 60, at 460. Conversely, "[i]mperfect competition prevails in an industry or group of industries wherever the individual sellers are imperfect competitors, facing their own nonhorizontal . . . [demand] curves and thereby having some measure of control over price." Id. at 461.

82 Id. "The imperfect competitor is contriving to keep things a little scarce. He is contriving to keep P [profit] above MC [marginal cost] because in that way he sets MR [marginal revenue] = MC and thereby maximizes his profits. So society does not get quite as much of A's good as it really wants in terms of what that good really costs society [to] produce." Id. at 476.

83 See supra note 81 and accompanying text.

84 See supra note 82 and accompanying text.
sults in a price higher than marginal cost, optimum efficiency goes unachieved because “society does not get quite as much of [the firm’s] good as it really wants in terms of what that good really costs society [to] produce.” Thus, in a controlled entry environment, each firm facing an individual downward sloping demand curve maximizes its profits at a price level which results in misallocation of resources.

The nature of the entry control becomes irrelevant in light of the foregoing analysis. Instead, entry control itself creates market conditions conducive to misallocative price levels. The challenge lies in identifying a method of allocation which distributes airport resources to those firms who will use them most efficiently, and which has minimum impact on free entry. The first step toward finding the optimum method of allocation involves determination of a means for establishing the true scarcity value of each airport resource.

IV. Economic Value of Airport Resources

The 1986 FAA Buy-Sell Slot Rule was the result of input from economists, lawyers, and members of the airline industry. The Rule suffers, however, from a general lack of cross-fertilization of ideas between lawyers and economists on the issue of airport resource allocation. In *In re Braniff Airways Inc.*, for example, the court determined the property status of certain Braniff Airlines airport slots in a bankruptcy proceeding. The court rejected Braniff’s characterization of the slots as property, on grounds that the Special Federal Aviation Regulations (SFAR’s) establishing slots were “rules as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act” and that slots established there-

---

85 P. Samuelson, *supra* note 60, at 476.
86 700 F.2d 935 (5th Cir. 1983).
87 Id. at 942.
88 Id.
89 Id.; see 5 U.S.C. § 551(4) (1982) (including any “agency statement of general or particular applicability and future designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy” as a rule under the Administrative Procedure Act).
under "do not lose their character as rules because they modify airlines' claimed rights to slot allocation."\(^9\) The court characterized slots as "restrictions on the use of property — airplanes; not property in themselves,"\(^9\) and thus not within the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court.\(^9\)

The court does not cite any economic studies or analyses to support their conclusion that slots are not property, nor does the opinion contain any indication that Braniff presented an economic analysis of slot values to the court.

Economists rarely refer to legal authority when analyzing an economic problem. For example, in a recent Bureau of Economics Staff Report to the Federal Trade Commission,\(^9\) there is not a single reference to a court decision.\(^9\) (The report notes, however, that during the FAA 1982 six-week slot sale experiment, over 190 slots actually were sold on the open market for considerable sums.\(^9\) The report goes on to explain, in economic terms, why the prices paid for the slots reflected the value of the existing slot scarcity.\(^9\))

In short, lawyers and economists simply do not converse on issues such as slot allocation (perhaps in part because they speak such different languages). The result has been an unfortunate irony in which a court of law can regard a slot as having no property status, while an economist characterizes the same slot as valuable property and even purports to determine its precise market value.\(^9\)

The following sections of this article review both the

---

\(^9\) 700 F.2d at 942.
\(^9\) Id. See also Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. Goldschmidt, 645 F.2d 1309, 1321 (8th Cir. 1981); Air Line Pilots Ass'n, Int'l v. Quesade, 276 F.2d 892, 896 (2d Cir. 1960) (FAA action limiting pilots' licenses to age 60 does not lose rulemaking character because it changes pilots' claimed property rights).
\(^9\) FTC REPORT OF THE AIRPORT TASK FORCE, supra note 4, at 9-10.
\(^9\) Id. There are, however, references to administrative regulations. Id.
\(^9\) Id.
\(^9\) Id. at 33.
\(^9\) Id. at 11: "For restricted hours, we estimated that slot prices would have ranged from about $100,000 per year between noon and 1 in the afternoon to just over $420,000 per year between 5 and 6 in the evening."
economic status and legal status of airport resources, as background to an analysis of the FAA Buy-Sell Rule as well as alternative methods of airport resource allocation. While the Rule itself relates only to "slots," it must be evaluated in the broader context of airport resources, including gates and terminal space.

A. Gates and Terminal Space

Any approach to ascertaining the economic value of an airport gate or terminal facility must be largely theoretical. If gates were freely alienable, the simplest approach would be to determine sale or lease prices on the open market.\(^9\) In fact, however, utilization of many gate and terminal spaces occurs pursuant to long-term leases entered into with airport authorities before regulation.\(^9\) Such long-term leases were not acquired through open-market bidding, but were inextricably bound up with the CAB-sanctioned airline cartel. To complicate matters further, airlines in some cases own terminal facilities outright. Tied down by both long-term leases and airline ownership, an airport's degree of control over facilities varies widely.\(^10\) At some airports, airlines have "majority

\(^9\) The fact that sublease fees are often greatly in excess of the original base fee indicates that the original fee did not reflect true market value. See AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 49-108.

\(^9\) Id. at 54-58. To a large extent, therefore, economic regulation still rules from the grave.

\(^10\) The AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT identified four basic types of airport ownership and control:

(1) AIRLINE OWNED AND CONTROLLED - Ex: Most of the terminal buildings at JFK; Eastern's terminal at Boston; South Terminal Corporation at Boston, owned by American, Northwest, Pan Am, and USAir.

(2) AIRPORT OWNED, BUT AIRLINE MANAGED AND CONTROLLED - Ex: Atlanta Terminal Corporation and New Delta Terminal at O'Hare.

(3) THIRD PARTY OWNED AND LEASED BACK TO AIRLINE OR AIRPORT: This is a new concept with varying degrees of control by all three parties, depending on contractual arrangements. Ex: Huntsville, Alabama (Hertz Corporation); National Terminal at JFK. Due to recent tax incentives, these arrangements may become more prevalent.

(4) AIRPORT OWNED AND AIRPORT CONTROLLED - The amount
in interest” clauses in their written agreements with airport authorities, giving the airlines decision-making powers in critical areas of airport administration. Airlines also influence airport policy through “negotiating” committees representing airline interests.

Even if sufficient data existed, determining gate or terminal value by simply estimating supply and demand values would not prove fully satisfactory since the seller or lessor of such resources usually takes the form of either a monopoly (the airport itself) or an oligopoly (i.e., an incumbent airline) subleasing a gate or space. When gate space has been subleased, it often has been for fees characterized as “excessive.” Sublease fees in excess of value as determined by traditional marginal cost, marginal of airport control varies and is determined by contractual agreements, industry practices, etc. Ex: A majority of U.S. airports.

Id. at 50.

101 Id. at 59. The AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT describes such clauses as follows:

In many airport leases, signatory carriers are given certain rights of approval of airport decision making on specified matters, through what is commonly called a “majority-in-interest” clause. The clause is so named because specified airport proposals must be approved by the signatory carriers constituting a “majority-in-interest.” The definition of a majority-in-interest varies from lease to lease, but is usually cast in terms of a specified percentage of enplanements or operations, such as 60% of passengers or operations.

Id.

102 Id. at 63:

Before deregulation, airlines did their own reallocation of terminal space and only went to the airport owner when the reallocation presented a very competitive situation that could not be worked out. In most cases, the incumbent carrier has a tendency to hold on to its existing space, but would consider a sublease to a new carrier. Without the airport having the right to reassign space, the requesting carrier must negotiate with an incumbent carrier, depending on the availability of surplus space. The terms of these agreements vary considerably and may or may not be subject to airport review or approval.

High fees and reserved rights to recover the space on short notice have been the primary complaints. Only one airport surveyed had the right to review and modify the terms of a sublease agreement.

103 “Marginal cost at any production level q is the extra cost of producing one extra unit more (or less); it comes from subtracting total dollar costs of adjacent output.” P. SAMUELSON, supra note 60, at 429 (footnote omitted). Before deregulation, most airports charged fees based on “equalized” rental rates, spreading the cost of an additional unit over the cost of all previously constructed units. It
original revenue,\textsuperscript{104} or marginal utility\textsuperscript{105} approaches must be considered in light of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, as re-codified in the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982.\textsuperscript{106} This act states that an airport “will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms.”\textsuperscript{107}

has been suggested, however, that this practice be revised to require that the entire cost of the marginal unit be paid for by the carrier using it. See Airport Access Report, supra note 4, at 66. See also Southern Airways, Inc. v. City of Atlanta, 428 F. Supp. 1010 (N.D. Ga. 1977) (failure to incorporate into formulas used in determining rental values of space on concourses an element recognizing alleged differences in value of various concourses was not unreasonable or discriminatory).

\textsuperscript{104} “Marginal Revenue” [MR] is defined as the increment of Total Revenue (plus or minus) that comes when we increase q by an increment of one unit. MR is plus when demand is still elastic, minus when demand is inelastic, and just crosses zero when demand turns from being elastic to being inelastic.” P. S:\textsuperscript{AMELSON, supra note 60, at 470.

\textsuperscript{105} “Marginal utility” here refers to the law of diminishing marginal utility. As you consume more of the same good, your total (psychological) utility increases. However, let us use the term marginal utility, to refer to “the extra utility added by one extra last unit of a good.” Then, with successive new units of the good, your total utility will grow at a slower and slower rate because of a fundamental tendency for your psychological ability to appreciate more of the good to become less keen. This fact, that the increments in total utility fall off, economists describe as follows:

As the amount consumed of a good increases, the marginal utility of the good (or the extra utility added by its last unit) tends to decrease.

\textsuperscript{106} Id. at 410.


\textsuperscript{108} Id. The act provides that

the airport to which the project relates will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination, including the requirement that (A) each air carrier using such airport (whether as a tenant, non-tenant, or sub-tenant of another air carrier tenant) shall be subject to such nondiscriminatory and substantially comparable rates, fees, rentals, and other charges and such nondiscriminatory and substantially comparable rules, regulations, and conditions as are applicable to all such air carriers which make similar use of such airport and which utilize similar facilities, subject to reasonable classifications such as tenants or non-tenants, and combined passenger and cargo flights or all cargo flights, and such classification or status as tenant shall not be unreasonably withheld by any airport provided an air carrier assumes obligations substantially similar to those already imposed on tenant air carriers, and (B) each fixed-based operator at any airport shall be subject to the same rates, fees, rentals, and other charges as are uniformly applicable to all
Traditional approaches to value determination for airport resources have failed to take into account the value of denying entry to competitors. The consequences of denying a sublease to a competitor are as follows: (1) the incumbent will face a steeper declining demand curve for air service; (2) incumbents will have greater control over price; (3) the incumbent firm will maximize profit at a price higher than marginal cost (except when marginal cost equals marginal revenue); (4) the incumbent firm will earn an extra "oligopoly" profit above that which it would earn in the face of free entry and a less steeply declining demand curve to the incumbent; and (5) air service is misallocated since society does not get "as much of [it from the incumbent] as it really wants in terms of what [the air service] really costs society [to] produce."

For the firm with some monopoly power, maximizing profits by equating Marginal Revenue to Marginal Cost leads to a price that is above Marginal Cost. The canny seller contrives an artificial scarcity of his product so as not to spoil the price he can get on the earlier premarginal units.

For a small perfect-competitor, Marginal Revenue works out to be exactly the same thing as Price. With no need to cut your P to sell an extra unit of q, the incremental Marginal Revenue it brings you is precisely the P received for that last unit, with no loss on previous units being subtracted. Hence, MR = MC and P = MR do lead to the special rule for profit maximizing by a perfect-competitor:

\[ P = MR = MC \] at a perfect-competitor's Maximum-profit point
The “oligopoly profit” earned must then be added to the value of the gate held by an incumbent firm who has the power to deny the use of the gate to a potential competitor. When added, it comes as no surprise that subleases have fetched fees considered “excessive.”

The “oligopoly profit” potential of a gate or airport facility must be taken into account in any proposal which simply would allow gates to be sold or leased on the open market, since a sale or sublease of a gate is, in part, a sale of an oligopoly right. Merely allowing an oligopoly right to be sold will not, standing alone, necessarily improve resource allocation or efficiency. For example, at the height of motor carrier regulation, the total value of motor carrier “operating certificates” (i.e., oligopoly rights) was estimated to be worth three to four billion dollars. Indeed, the American Trucking Association noted that “virtually the only way for [a relatively small carrier] to

care so much about economic efficiency, instead we should be concerned about fairness and the social welfare.” Thus, under airline regulation, the regulators had no qualms about enforcing a price higher than marginal cost on some high-density routes, while insisting upon a price lower than marginal pricing on some low-density routes. This required some passengers to cross-subsidize others. Although the regulator rationalizes such a policy on the ground of the “public welfare,” the net result is a tragic waste of society’s resources. The following example may be helpful: Suppose that a regulator decides that, in the interests of “public welfare,” all television sets must be priced at $10, even though it costs $200 to produce them. (The manufacturer is provided with a $190 subsidy to make up the difference in cost). At a $10 price, a consumer may purchase a television just to get the glass for a picture frame since such glass alone costs $15. The rest of the television, now useless, may be discarded. Other consumers, however, to whom the television would provide more than $200 worth of utility, cannot get a television at any price, since there are not enough sets available for all consumers who demand them at the $10 price. The consumer to whom the television set provides only $10 worth of utility ends up wasting $190 worth of society’s labor. The consumer to whom the television set would provide $250 worth of utility gets nothing or may end up buying it on the black market for $500 when it only cost society $200 to produce it. The result is waste, pure and simple, since “society does not get as much of it in terms of what it cost society [to] produce.” Id. If the “public welfare” demands that all consumers be able to purchase a television set, the solution is to redistribute the dollar “votes” — not create an economic environment where price is either above or below marginal cost.

113 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 51.
114 See Snow & Sobotka, Certification Values, in REGULATION OF ENTRY AND PRICING IN TRUCK TRANSPORTATION 153 (P. MacAvoy & J. Snow ed. 1977) [hereinafter cited as FORD PAPERS].
obtain additional operating authorities is to buy them from other motor carriers." Merely allowing an oligopoly right to be sold has two effects: (1) it shifts oligopoly profits from the seller firm to the buyer firm; and (2) it reduces the oligopoly profits of the buyer firm by the amount paid for the oligopoly right. The sale of a certificate in no way alters the nature of the oligopoly itself, which still enables its holder (whoever that may be) to maximize profit at a price in excess of marginal cost.

In economic terms, possession of a scarce airport gate or facility differs little from possession of an "operating certificate" under economic regulation, for without it a firm simply cannot "operate." It is not surprising, therefore, that those in possession of gates or terminal space are reluctant to give up those possessions at any price. Indeed, the Airport Operators Council International (AOCI) conducted a survey revealing that sixty of the eighty-eight United States airports responding did not have any unleased terminal space for new entries, thirty-one airports indicated infeasible subleasing situations due to high utilization of leased space, or because of "excessive" rates to sublessees. This experience in long-term gate leases raises some concern about the prognosis for slot sales or leases under Buy-Sell. Furthermore, the FAA Slot Sale Rule does not address the problems of access denial to terminal facilities. The usefulness of Buy-Sell as a means of eliminating obstacles to free entry must therefore be evaluated in that context.

---

115 Id. For a tragic example of the injustices caused by the certificate system, see Schaffer Transp. Co. v. United States, 355 U.S. 83 (1957). In that case, the Interstate Commerce Commission had denied a certificate to a carrier offering faster and cheaper service, since slower and more expensive service was deemed "adequate." Id. at 89. Although the Court reversed the ICC decision six years after the agency denied the certificate, Schaffer had gone out of business by that time. See A. Friedlaender, supra note 40, at 114.

116 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 71.

117 Id. Twenty-nine airports indicated that subleasing arrangements were still possible. Id.
B. Landing Slots

Much of the foregoing analysis of gate and terminal space values also applies to landing slots. One very important difference must be recognized, however, before determining the economic value of landing slots — namely, the difference in legal status.\textsuperscript{118} As noted, terminal space may be either leased or owned outright by an air carrier.\textsuperscript{119} Except for possible antitrust considerations,\textsuperscript{120} such leases or sales of space are recognized legally as transfers of legitimate property rights.\textsuperscript{121} The court in the \textit{Braniff} case, discussed above,\textsuperscript{122} described slots as “not property in themselves.”\textsuperscript{123} In the case of slots not recognized as property, valuable economic rights given in earlier years may be retrieved more easily for purposes of allocation \textit{de novo}.

A landing slot is best characterized as the right to take off or land aircraft at an airport — in short, a “reservation” for takeoffs and landings.\textsuperscript{124} Nevertheless, an important common denominator exists with respect to both gates and slots: both carry with them the economic equivalent of an operating certificate. Thus, in determining the value of a slot, the value to a holder of denying entry to a competitor must be considered.

A 1983 FTC Economic Policy Analysis calculated the base value of a slot (\textit{i.e.}, an airline’s willingness to pay for a slot) by a traditional demand and cost approach.\textsuperscript{125} The

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{118} See \textit{Braniff}, 700 F.2d at 942.
  \item \textsuperscript{119} See supra note 100 and accompanying text.
  \item \textsuperscript{120} See infra notes 385-394 and accompanying text.
  \item \textsuperscript{121} See \textit{Airport Access Report}, supra note 4, at 70.
  \item \textsuperscript{122} See supra notes 86-92 and accompanying text.
  \item \textsuperscript{123} 700 F.2d at 942.
  \item \textsuperscript{124} Eastern Air Lines, Inc. v. F.A.A., 772 F.2d 1508, 1510 (11th Cir. 1985). The FTC has noted that the more precise definition of a slot is the “right to use the navigable airspace for a takeoff or landing at a particular airport during a particular hour of the day.” Comments of the Bureaus of Economics, Competition, and Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission before the FAA 2, n.1, Docket No. 24,110 (Aug. 3, 1984) [hereinafter cited as Bureaus Comments].
  \item \textsuperscript{125} FTC \textit{Report of the Airport Task Force}, supra note 4, at 39-69.
\end{itemize}
report, upon which the FAA heavily relied, defines a slot's value as follows:

The maximum price an airline would pay for a slot is the amount that, when added to the other costs of the flight that will use the slot, equals the flight's expected revenues. This amount is directly related to the value that passengers place on the flight which, in turn, is a function of such variables as passengers' income, purpose of trip, [etc.]

... The FTC report opines that if slots could be freely sold, "carriers with high-valued flights would bid slots away from those with low-valued flights." The report further notes that, to the extent that non-market allocation methods prevent free entry, "monopoly profits can be earned in otherwise contestable markets." That non-market allocation methods in fact create such barriers finds support in a reference to the action of an airline scheduling committee at Washington National:

At the last meeting the dispute was so intense that nine airlines voted against a proposal that would have given each of them exactly the number of flights they wanted. They did so, they said, to keep New York Air and USAir from increasing the number of their flights.

But while recognizing the threat of free entry caused by non-market methods, the report minimizes a similar threat posed by a market approach:

The likelihood of successful monopolization by buying slots ... appears to be small. While a slot market would facilitate the obtaining of slots by the airline attempting to monopolize, it would be necessary for the airline to obtain most of the slots available at an airport to monopolize any route into that airport. And, the existence of the slot market would also facilitate entry by rivals, if the would-be

126 Id. at 7.
127 Id. at 8.
128 Id. at 20.
129 Id. at 16 (quoting The Washington Post, Nov. 8, 1982).
monopolizer attempted to raise his price.\textsuperscript{130}

There are two problems with this analysis. First, the alternatives are not total monopolization or total contestability. A declining demand curve can be steeper by degrees. While total monopolization might not be feasible for the reasons given by the report, the fact remains that each slot held by an incumbent firm represents exactly one slot not held by a competitor. Each competitor eliminated from the market causes the demand curve facing the incumbent to become slightly steeper, thereby permitting the incumbent to reap, by degrees, a slightly higher oligopoly profit. Second, the incentive of an incumbent to prevent free entry by manipulating political or non-market procedures or mechanisms (such as a scheduling committee), should be no greater than the incentive to do so by using market power to outbid potential entrants.

The report confidently states that “an airline would not buy a slot in order to operate a flight that is expected to have a relatively low value, simply because it has the cash to do so,”\textsuperscript{131} noting that “[c]apital markets exist precisely to evaluate such investments and to provide funds for those that appear sufficiently attractive.”\textsuperscript{132} The latter conclusion apparently follows from a slot value calculation that fails to account for the oligopoly profits accruing to the large firm able to frustrate free entry of a competitor by outbidding it for a slot.

A slot has a premium oligopoly value for a firm facing a non-horizontal demand curve. Such a firm has a large enough percentage of the market to influence price by varying output. However, this extra oligopoly premium does not exist for the smaller firm facing a horizontal demand curve.\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{130} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Id.} at 28.

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{133} A firm not large enough to affect price by varying output has no incentive to outbid solely for the purpose of depriving a competitor of a slot. To outbid a
The value of a slot to a new entrant or expanding competitor facing a horizontal demand curve nevertheless may be greater than the base value which reflects only the amount which “when added to the other costs of the flight that will use the slot, equals the flight’s expected revenues.” This excess represents the value of the right to do business at all. Thus, for the hopeful entrant, a slot represents more than just a cost of operating a particular flight. The slot serves effectively as an “operating certificate.”

The above proposition is exemplified by a potential new entrant willing to pay a price for a slot in excess of that amount which “when added to the other costs of the flight that will use the slot, equals the flight’s expected revenues.” The entrant will pay the higher price because it knows that the market price of a flight will not cover slot costs; the entrant will take even a loss initially, in order to gain a foothold in the market. As Areeda and Turner noted in their landmark article *Predatory Pricing and Related Practices Under Section Two of the Sherman Act*:

> [P]romotional price is a temporary, low price designed to induce patronage with the expectation that the customer will continue purchasing the product in the future at a higher price. . . . [P]romotional price may be below cost [and such] pricing can facilitate new entry or the expansion of small rivals in an industry dominated by one or a few large firms.

The authors qualify this observation, however, by noting that “the monopolist can make no such case for promotional pricing. . . . In contrast to new entrants or small rivals, he has little need to resort to extreme price reduc-

---

134 FTC REPORT OF THE AIRPORT TASK FORCE, supra note 4, at 7.

135 See supra note 114 and accompanying text.

136 FTC REPORT OF THE AIRPORT TASK FORCE, supra note 4, at 7.

tions to acquaint existing consumers with the merits of his brand.”

For the small entrant facing a horizontal demand curve, a slot’s value includes the right to operate and gain the opportunity to engage in promotional pricing below average cost, an operation that carries with it the potential for reaping future profits at prices above average cost.

The preceding analysis leads to the following proposition: For large firms facing non-horizontal demand curves, the oligopoly premium of a slot (and thus the total value of the slot) will vary with the extent of that firm’s market share. For smaller firms facing horizontal demand curves, the “right to operate” or “opportunity for promotion” premium of a slot (and thus the total value of the slot) will vary with that firm’s potential for future profits at prices above average cost. Thus, to the extent that the large firm’s total premiums exceed the smaller firm’s total premiums, the large firm will have the economic incentive to outbid the smaller firm for a slot. However, as the FTC correctly observed, this does not necessarily mean they will have the economic power to do so. The fact that the major carrier has more money in the bank than the smaller carrier is not determinative. Slot sales can be financed, and generally lenders look to past performance in lending money. (Indeed, the rate of return for the twelve largest firms in 1981-82 was less than for the next smaller group of carriers.) Thus, the smaller carriers might have greater economic power than the larger firms to finance, and, consequently, greater power to purchase slots. This would be particularly true if the large firms lack liquidity or if they have large debt to capital ratios.

Nevertheless, because of the greater value of a slot to large firms, these firms may end up outbidding smaller firms. If this occurs, the following will result: (1) Entry will be inhibited, thus permitting incumbent firms to face

---

138 Id. at 714.
139 FTC REPORT OF THE AIRPORT TASK FORCE, supra note 4, at 28.
140 Id.
a steeply declining demand curve and enabling them to set prices at a profitable, but misallocative, level above marginal cost. (2) Combined with a "lose it or use it" provision, large outbidding firms may use slots for flights that do not cover variable costs in order to keep the slots and thus preserve an oligopoly profit on other flights. To the extent that such a slot might be utilized for a more highly valued flight by an outbid competitor, society sustains a net economic loss.

The foregoing discussion should not be read to suggest that existing non-market allocative methods are superior to Buy-Sell. Rather, the quest simply seeks discovery of a "least anti-competitive" solution. An informed choice of allocative method(s) can be made only after comparison of the economic effects of all methods. The choice of allocative method(s) depends first, however, upon an understanding of the value of the resource to be allocated.

V. LEGAL STATUS OF AIRPORT RESOURCES

Some proposed methods of airport resource allocation will require changes in federal statutory law, regulatory policy, or state or local law; others will not. Thus, any proposed allocation method must take into account the legal status of airport resources as private property.

The first major legislation affecting airlines was the Contract Mail Act of 1925. Rate-setting powers for airmail contracts were given to the Interstate Commerce Commission under an amendment to the Airmail Act of 1934. The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 gave broad economic regulatory powers to the newly created CAB. The Federal Aviation Act gave the FAA responsibility for

---


aviation safety, establishing air-navigation facilities and authority to assign navigable airspace. The FAA frequently has maintained its ultimate power to allocate slots under such statutory grants of authority, in one order asserting that it would impose minute by minute restrictions on slots if carriers could not agree on a voluntary allocation. In general, federal courts have acknowledged FAA's power to assign slots subject to limited review in the appellate courts. The FAA exerts additional influence on airport policies and operations through its ownership of air traffic control equipment.

The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978 brought an end to formal economic regulation of the airline industry. Pursuant to this act, the CAB ceased to exist on January 1, 1985, and its surviving responsibilities were transferred to the DOT and FAA. Economic deregulation since 1978 has brought into sharp focus the existing restrictions on airport access. Before deregulation, airport access restrictions did not result in entry control since CAB regulation already controlled entry. Under deregulation,

---

145 See id. at § 1348(b).
146 See id. at § 1348(c).
150 See id. at § 1348(b).
152 See supra note 5.
153 See supra note 151.
airport access restrictions primarily control entry. Such
airport restrictions therefore have taken on an economic
significance that did not exist during industry regulation.
However, the legal authority relating to these restrictions
has not fully accommodated this change in economic
status.

A. Federal vs. Local Authority

The question of who has the authority to restrict airport
access complicates the problem of determining the legal
status of airport resources. While FAA has authority over
safety and assignment of navigable spaces, the line
sometimes blurs between that power and state and lo-
cal propriety authority to control noise, condemn prop-
erty adjacent to airports, and enter into local leasing
agreements.

137 See, e.g., City of Burbank v. Lockheed Air Terminal, Inc., 411 U.S. 624
(1973); Griggs v. Allegheny County, 369 U.S. 84 (1962); Aviation Safety and
138 S. Rep. No. 1353, 90th Cong., 2nd Sess. 6-7 (1968) provides that:
It is not the intent of the committee in recommending this legisla-
tion to effect any change in the existing apportionment of powers
between the Federal and State and local governments. . . . “The Fed-
eral Government is in no position to require an airport to accept
service by larger aircraft and, for that purpose, to obtain longer run-
ways. Likewise, the Federal Government is in no position to require
an airport to accept service by noisier aircraft, and for that purpose
to obtain additional noise easements. The issue is the service de-
sired by the airport owner and the steps it is willing to take to obtain
the service. In dealing with this issue, the Federal Government
should not substitute its judgment for that of the States or elements
of the local government who, for the most part, own and operate our
Nation’s airports.” The proposed legislation is not designed to do
this and will not prevent airport proprietors from excluding any air-
craft on the basis of noise considerations.
139 Id., reprinted in Bennett, Airport Noise Litigation: A Case Law Analysis, 47 J. Air L. &
Com. 449, 453 n.18 (1982) (quoting Letter from Secretary of Transportation to
Committee on Commerce (June 22, 1968)).
136 See, e.g., Alevizos v. Metropolitan Airports Comm’n of Minneapolis and St.
Paul, 298 Minn. 471, 216 N.W.2d 651 (1974).
139 See supra notes 99-102 and accompanying text.
In *Griggs v. Allegheny County* the United States Supreme Court held local airport authorities, rather than the FAA, responsible for noise damage done to property adjacent to a local airport, even though FAA played a large role in construction of the airport. At least one commentator interprets subsequent congressional acts as assigning primary responsibility for noise control to local authorities while still acknowledging some federal interest. (For example, the FAA has responsibility for setting aircraft noise emission levels.)

In *City of Burbank v. Lockheed Air Terminal, Inc.*, however, the Court struck down a local noise regulation on the ground that it was preempted by federal legislation giving the FAA control over noise. Federal courts have...
attempted to reconcile *Griggs* and *Burbank* by making a distinction between "inflight" and "ground" restrictions.\(^{167}\)

They move only by federal permission, subject to federal inspection, in the hands of federally certified personnel. The moment a ship taxis onto a runway it is caught up in an elaborate and detailed system of controls." *Id.* at 633-34.

It also may be significant to note that *Griggs* was decided before the Noise Control Act, and *Burbank* was decided after passage of that act.

\(^{167}\) *See*, e.g., *Luedtke v. County of Milwaukee*, 521 F.2d 38 (7th Cir. 1975); *Air Transp. Ass'n of Am. v. Crotti*, 589 F. Supp. 58 (N.D. Cal. 1975); *County of Cook v. Priester*, 318 N.E.2d 327, 22 Ill. App. 3d 964 (1974). The Court in *Burbank* relied heavily on a letter from the Secretary of Transportation dated June 22, 1968, written in response to a question as to whether the Noise Control Act would "to any degree preempt State and local government regulation of aircraft noise and sonic boom." (asked during *Hearings Before the Aviation Subcomm. of the Senate Comm. on Commerce on S. 707 and H.R. 3400, Aircraft Noise Abatement Regulation*, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 29 (1968)). *Burbank*, 411 U.S. at 624. The letter stated in part:

> The courts have held that the Federal Government presently preempts the field of noise regulation insofar as it involves controlling the flight of aircraft. . . . H. R. 3400 would merely expand the Federal Government's role in a field already preempted. It would not change this preemption. State and local governments will remain unable to use their police powers to control aircraft noise by regulating the flight of aircraft.

*Id.* (quoting the letter). The dissent in *Burbank* responded with a quote from a Senate Commerce Committee report on the 1968 amendments to the Federal Aviation Act:

> However, the proposed legislation will not affect the rights of a State or local public agency, as the proprietor of an airport, from issuing regulations or establishing requirements as to the permissible level of noise which can be created by aircraft using the airport. Airport owners acting as proprietors can presently deny the use of their airports to aircraft on the basis of noise considerations so long as such exclusion is nondiscriminatory.

*Id.* at 649 (Rehnquist, J., dissenting). The dissent concludes,

> Considering the language Congress enacted into law, the available legislative history, and the light shed by these on the congressional purpose, Congress did not intend either by the 1958 Act or the 1968 Amendment to oust local governments from the enactment of regulations such as that of the city of Burbank. The 1972 Act quite clearly intended to maintain the status quo between federal and local authorities. The legislative history of the 1972 Act, quite apart from its concern with avoiding additional preemption, discloses a primary focus on the alteration of procedures within the Federal Government for dealing with problems of aircraft noise already entrusted by Congress to federal competence. The 1972 Act set up procedures by which the Administrator of EPA would have a role to play in the formulation and review of standards promulgated by FAA dealing with noise emissions of jet aircraft. But because these agencies have exclusive authority to reduce noise by promulgating regulations and
One commentator's survey of the cases on noise restriction gleans three criteria for local power over noise abatement: (1) no undue impact on interstate commerce; (2) the local authority meets the federal definition of an "airport proprietor"; and (3) the restrictions are reasonable and non-discriminatory.

Nevertheless, the line between federal and local authority over noise restriction remains blurred. A 1983 Airport Access Task Force Report observed that "the fear of liability attributable to noise... has caused Federal agencies to shrink from fully asserting their preemptive authority over aviation noise, and has also caused some airport proprietors to adopt use restrictions." The report concluded that "[w]hile noise limitations may provide some protection to local residents, they have affected airport access because of operating and use restrictions that have been imposed. Proliferation of such restrictions would significantly degrade the national air transportation system and frustrate competition."

The report suggests that federal action be taken to insure a quieter environment, thus obviating the need for implementing standards directed at one or several of the causes of the level of noise, local governmental bodies are not thereby foreclosed from dealing with the noise problem by every other conceivable method.

Id.

169 See id. and the cases cited therein.
170 See id.
171 The tension between federal and local authorities on the issue of noise control remains high. See Rocky Mountain News, Mar. 6, 1986, at 7, col. 1, in which a heated public hearing discussed an "FAA proposal [which] could eliminate noise restrictions requested by Adams County and void the Denver-Adams County [noise] agreement." Governor Lamm is quoted as complaining, "Is Colorado to have no control over its own destiny?" Id.
172 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 28.
173 Id. at 45. The report made the point even more strongly: Current restrictions prevent deployment of some aircraft at various airports during certain hours, by requiring inefficient flight procedures, by constraining development of markets, by impeding the development of connecting schedules, and by increasing the costs of operators' maintenance and training activities.

Id. at 23.
local restrictions.\textsuperscript{174} In fact, any effective airport resource allocation method will require a high degree of federal action preempting all but the most minimal local restrictions on access under the banner of noise control.

An effective allocation method requires uniform access standards. Since aircraft always travel between two points, one airport's access restriction inevitably affects other airports. Traditional applications of the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution and federal noise statutes have failed to establish the necessary uniformity.\textsuperscript{175} Efficiency in transportation depends upon competition, which in turn depends upon airport access standards that are fair, non-discriminatory, and free. Diverse, local access restrictions, even for such an important social purpose as noise abatement, retard rather than advance the quest for an optimum allocation method.\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{174} \textit{Id.} at 30:
The Task Force urges that the U.S. Congress consider legislation which would involve the Federal Government in the review of local noise restrictions; such legislation would impose liability on the Federal Government to the extent FAA mandates any change to local rules. FAA would then be able to review proposed limitations on airports to: a) assure noise reduction to the maximum extent practical; b) examine proposed local use restrictions; c) determine whether meaningful noise abatement will result; and d) determine when airport use restrictions impose an undue burden on interstate commerce.


Airport proprietors generally have been cautious about adapting some types of use restrictions, knowing that they have a duty to avoid burdening interstate commerce. The tendency has been to minimize use restrictions that actually reduce economic activity, while comparatively liberal application has been made of restrictions that prevent further growth. The result is that few single use restrictions at a single airport can be shown to significantly burden interstate commerce; the question is removed to the nature of "if such-and-such use restriction is applied throughout the nation, would interstate commerce be significantly burdened?" The answer to this question applied to many of the restrictions in place today, is easily answered, "Yes!"

\textsuperscript{176} It should be noted that the Buy-Sell Rule clearly places regulatory authority
B. Terminal Facilities

The present legality of long-term leases and sales of terminal space to private firms endures as the most frustrating legal barrier to an optimum allocative method. Fair and free entry will never be possible as long as major trunk incumbents control primary airport access through such lease interests or ownership. Unfortunately, while entry into such long-term leases in today's deregulated environment might draw antitrust scrutiny, these leases did not draw antitrust attention during economic regulation since they were not the primary instrument of entry control. Indeed, the financial commitments made by private carriers entering long-term leases were considered essential for bond financing. Unlike slots, these leases enjoy the protection of traditional contract and property law principles. As the Airport Access Report so aptly understated, "long term exclusive agreements may create potential competitive problems in today's deregulated environment to the extent that they may enable incumbent carriers at the airport to control access to essential airport facilities."

In view of the legal restraints on altering existing long-term terminal commitments to private carriers, the report could suggest only solutions like "buying out" the incumbents in order to reallocate leased spaces. This solution hardly appears satisfactory, however, since the economic incentives for outbidding a competitor for space also will encourage refusal to sell space to an air-

177 See infra notes 384-394.
178 Entry used to be controlled administratively under the powers granted to CAB by the Civil Aeronautics Act, 52 Stat. 873 (1938) (codified as amended at 49 U.S.C. §§ 1301-1542 (1982)).
179 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 25.
181 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 22.
182 Id. at 93. Other options listed by the report were: (1) require incumbents to sublease; (2) automatically recapture space; and (3) permit the market to force sublease. Id. at 81-82.
port authority who will in turn lease the space to a possible competitor.183

C. Slots

"Planes do not wander about in the sky like vagrant clouds. They move only by federal permission . . . ."

—Justice Jackson
(concurring in
Northwest Airlines v.
Minnesota)184

The economic value of slots has been established.185 Any allocative method, however, must take into account the procedure and source of legal authority for creation and distribution of slots. The Federal Aviation Act offers the natural starting point. This act states, "The Secretary of Transportation is authorized and directed to develop plans for and formulate policy with respect to the use of the navigable airspace; and assign by rule . . . the use of the navigable airspace . . . in order to insure the safety of aircraft and the efficient utilization of such airspace."186

As set forth in Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. C.A.B.,187 it had been assumed for a long time under regulation that the "FAA/DOT bears the primary responsibility for safety regulation while the CAB administers and enforces the economic provisions of the [Federal Aviation] Act."188 Pursuant to its authority to regulate safety, the FAA in 1968 issued the first of a series of High-Density Traffic Airport Rules189 for specified high-density airports; these rules later were expanded to include additional airports after the 1981 PATCO strike.190 Since these regulations

---

183 See supra notes 87-139 and accompanying text.
184 322 U.S. 292, 303 (1943).
185 See supra notes 118-138 and accompanying text.
188 Id. at 259.
clearly sought to ensure that total traffic and slots per hour did not exceed safe capacity, they prompted little controversy as to their legality. Only when FAA/DOT attempted to regulate slot allocation among particular airlines did serious challenges to the FAA/DOT occur. In *Northwest Airlines v. Goldschmidt*, for example, DOT issued Special Federal Aviation Regulation 43 (SFAR/43), which allocated specific slots to particular carriers. DOT issued the order in response to the deadlock of the Airline Scheduling Committee which, despite a grant of antitrust immunity, had failed to reach agreement on slot allocations. This deadlock purportedly had been precipitated by the demand of a new entrant, New York Air, to obtain twenty slots at peak hours to service flights between National Airport in Washington, D.C., and New York City. Although the complaints raised several grounds for seeking judicial review of SFAR/43, including lack of DOT jurisdiction and the merits of the regulation, the critical question centered on the issue of statutory authority. The petitioners argued that the DOT allocation of slots to particular airlines constituted an economic regulation by DOT and that DOT's authority was limited to safety regulation. The court conceded that SFAR/43 went beyond safety regulation, but nevertheless found the action within the bounds of the Federal Aviation Act because that act gave DOT authority not only over safety, but also over "the efficient utilization of such airspace." The court further

---

191 See id.
192 645 F.2d 1309 (8th Cir. 1982).
194 Goldschmidt, 645 F.2d at 1312; see also CAB orders set forth supra note 10.
195 Goldschmidt, 645 F.2d at 1312.
196 Id.
197 Id. at 1313.
198 Id.
199 Id.
200 Id. at 1314.
201 Id.
202 Id. at 1314-15 (citing 49 U.S.C. § 1348(c) (1982), and H.R. REP. No. 2360, 85th Cong., 2d Sess. 2, reprinted in 1958 U.S. CODE CONG. & AD. NEWS 3741,
found that any "incidental economic impact"\(^{203}\) of the regulation did not make it an "economic regulation."\(^{204}\)

In fact, the economic implications of *Goldschmidt* are substantial. By upholding authority to decide which carriers receive valuable slots, the court in effect sanctioned DOT's power to raise or lower entry barriers in the airline industry. Since a slot serves as an "operating certificate"\(^{205}\) no less than the certificates issued by the CAB during formal economic regulation, government authority to regulate the airline industry arguably has simply been transferred to the FAA, and has not been abolished by the Airline Deregulation Act. Two factors, however, lessen the economic impact of *Goldschmidt*: (1) DOT orders such as SFAR/43 and their progeny\(^{206}\) are more restricted in scope than CAB orders under formal economic regulation and generally apply only to a handful of high-density airports\(^{207}\); and (2) in exercise of its powers, DOT has made a substantial effort to accommodate the needs of new entrants\(^{208}\).

DOT orders allocating slots to particular carriers have indicated general reluctance to allocate administratively, preferring allocation by scheduling agreement.\(^{209}\)

3741-42). The court further cited 49 U.S.C. § 1301(29) for a definition of "navigable airspace": "airspace above the minimum altitudes of flight prescribed by regulations issued under this chapter, [including] airspace needed to insure safety in take-off and landing of aircraft." *Id.* at 1315.

\(^{203}\) *Id.* at 1314: "[T]he fact that SFAR 43 may have an incidental economic impact upon the air carriers operating at National [by limiting particular air carriers' operations] does not transform SFAR 43 into an economic regulation."

\(^{204}\) *Id.*: "[W]e agree with the Secretary that SFAR 43 is neither an economic regulation or a safety regulation per se, but instead a regulation of the efficient utilization of the navigable airspace of the United States."

\(^{205}\) See supra notes 114-115.

\(^{206}\) See supra notes 5, 6-10 for examples of such orders.


\(^{208}\) SFAR/43, for instance, allocated eighteen slots to New York Air. See *Goldschmidt*, 645 F.2d at 1313.

\(^{209}\) Former CAB Chairman Dan McKinnon stated in his concurring opinion in *Application for Discussion Authority and Prior Approval of Carrier Agreements to Integrate Schedules*, CAB Order No. 84-10-120 at 1 (Oct. 25, 1984):

The congestions created at the six airports addressed in this Order have become so severe, it is worth a minimal government involve-
deed, the FAA/DOT power to allocate administratively has been used as a club to force agreements. In FAA notice 84-14, for example, the FAA threatened "minute by minute restrictions if carriers could not agree on a voluntary [allocation]." At the same time, however, the CAB (before its demise) granted antitrust immunity for such scheduling agreements only with reluctance. As the CAB stated in its controversial order 84-10-120:

"We recognize that the discussions could have a substantial and adverse effect on competition. Yet on the basis of DOT/FAA representations about the delay problems, we found that a serious transportation need exists and that there is no reasonably available less anti-competitive solution. We concluded that an FAA imposed alternative would not be less anti-competitive because the discussions would give carriers greater flexibility and would involve a smaller regulatory intrusion into the competitive process."

In sum, Goldschmidt represents a now common failure to consider and apply economic principles in a legal decision. The court's conclusion that assignment of slots to individual carriers had only an "incidental economic impact" was made without benefit of economic analysis on the effect of administrative slot allocation on entry control, individual firm demand curves, marginal and va-

---
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ment through antitrust immunity to see if the industry can cooperatively solve the congestion problem.

The alternative could be a frustrated public that eventually could demand a return to some form of re-regulation of another government agency forcefully regulating airline actions without concern for the benefits of competition.

Neither of these alternatives are acceptable in a competitive market-place. So our approval of the voluntary schedule shifts accomplished through grant of antitrust immunity is the best temporary solution. It is imperative that the airlines cooperate effectively to avoid any additional government involvement.

Id. (emphasis added).

210 Id. at 2 n.6.
211 Id. at 2.
212 Goldschmidt, 654 F.2d at 1314.
213 For an example of an analysis that did address this factor, see FTC REPORT OF THE AIRPORT TASK FORCE, supra note 2, at 17:
liable cost pricing,\textsuperscript{215} the potential for oligopolization,\textsuperscript{216} or economic efficiency.\textsuperscript{217}

Subsequent decisions have followed the \textit{Goldschmidt} approach. In \textit{City of Houston v. FAA}\textsuperscript{218} the court upheld an FAA order restricting flights to National Airport.\textsuperscript{219} The FAA based the order not upon any criteria of economic efficiency or priority, but upon an arbitrary “distance to place-of-origin” standard. As noted above,\textsuperscript{220} the \textit{Braniff} court held slots to be “not property,” and held that “any transfer of a state or federal regulatory license or certificate is subject to the continuing jurisdiction and approval of the applicable agency.”\textsuperscript{221} In a similar manner, a federal court in \textit{Eastern Airlines, Inc. v. FAA}\textsuperscript{222} voided the sale of slots by Air Florida to Eastern, but approved the sale of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Absent government imposed restrictions, entry into airline city-pair markets is easy relative to entry into many other industries. Because there are no significant economies of scale in airline operations, carriers can enter a city-pair market at a very small size without incurring higher costs than larger incumbents. In addition, airline costs are not “sunk” in the sense that, on withdrawing from a city-pair market, an airline no longer incurs any costs associated with that market. Because sunk costs are absent, economists describe entry into airline markets as free . . . markets with these characteristics are called contestable. Such markets exhibit most of the desirable performance characteristics of competitive markets, regardless of market concentration; e.g., price is equal to the cost of providing each service.

Although unregulated airline markets would probably be reasonably contestable, FAA slot regulation has imposed entry barriers.

\textsuperscript{214} See id. at 21.
\textsuperscript{215} See Areeda and Turner, supra note 78, at 711; see generally Eads, supra note 75, at 159.
\textsuperscript{216} See FTC REPORT OF THE AIRPORT TASK FORCE, supra note 4, at 4, at 16.
\textsuperscript{217} See id.
\textsuperscript{218} 679 F.2d 1184 (5th Cir. 1982). Airlines have circumvented the rule by having flights to National make a “pit stop” at Dulles. This exacerbates the economic efficiency problems caused by the distance limitation on flights to National.
\textsuperscript{219} Id. at 1192.
\textsuperscript{220} See supra notes 86-93 and accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{221} 700 F.2d at 942 (citing LaRose v. FCC, 494 F.2d 1145, 1149 (D.C. Cir. 1974) (radio license); Barutha v. Prentice, 189 F.2d 29, 31 (7th Cir), cert. denied, 342 U.S. 841 (1951) (motor carrier license); In re Rainbo Express, Inc., 179 F.2d 1, 5 (7th Cir.), cert. denied sub nom., Richardson v. National Acceptance Co., 339 U.S. 981 (1950) (ICC license); In re Airlines Transp. Carriers, Inc., 129 F. Supp. 679, 683-84 (S.D. Cal. 1955) (CAB letter of registration)).
\textsuperscript{222} 772 F.2d 1508 (11th Cir. 1985).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Air Florida as "a going concern" (which included slots) to Midway Airlines. The court rejected arguments that its decision was economic and beyond its statutory powers.

Ironically, Eastern was decided on the eve of the December 1985 DOT order permitting slot sales at designated airports. It became apparent after Eastern, and indeed had been since Goldschmidt, that any allocation method based on economic principles would have to be sanctioned by the FAA/DOT. It is significant that while a host of opinions by private interests were heard by the FAA during hearings, the most forceful views included those of the DOJ, the Bureau of Economics, Competition, and Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission and economists such as former CAB Chairman Marvin

---

223 Id. at 1511.
224 Id. The court drew a distinction between buying routes and buying an airline which included routes. Thus, Midway was permitted to use the Air Florida routes upon satisfaction of two requirements:

(1) Midway must have acquired Air Florida pursuant to a court-approved plan of reorganization, or (2) have in place a court-approved and binding agreement to purchase the company guaranteed by a letter of credit for a substantial percentage of the purchase price which must be exercisable within a reasonable period. Under either condition, [this court] must be convinced that the acquisition or purchase price is at least equal to Air Florida's going concern value.

Id. at 1510.

The court also made an argument similar to the one made in Goldschmidt: Nevertheless, even if the objection were properly raised, it would fail. Eastern argues that the successorship finding made by the FAA administrator was in effect an "economic decision" that only the Department of Transportation had the authority to make. A similar argument was rejected by the Eighth Circuit in Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. Goldschmidt, supra, in which an FAA slot regulation, although it had a tangential economic impact, was not "economic regulation per se" but "instead a regulation of the efficient utilization of the navigable airspace of the United States." This decision represents a similar regulation of airspace—one that the FAA is clearly authorized to make.

Id. at 1512 (citations omitted).

225 See DOJ Comments, supra note 25, at 7. DOJ points out that the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978 "require(s) DOT/FAA to rely to the maximum extent possible on market mechanisms to create an efficient, procompetitive system for allocating source slots." Id.
226 See Bureau Comments, supra note 124.
Cohen. These latter views were based on economic rather than legal principles, and all supported a policy of allowing slot sales.

The survival of the Buy-Sell Rule now may depend upon the defeat of legislative attempts to overturn it. If the rule stands, it will be the first time that the economic value of an airport slot (if not its status as “property”) has been recognized by a permanent order of an agency or department of the United States government.

VI. METHODS OF AIRLINE RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Once the economic value and legal status of an airport resource is determined, a survey of existing and proposed methods of airport resource allocation must be made with a view toward weighing their respective advantages and disadvantages. A valid comparison with Buy-Sell can then be made. To some extent, all allocative methods discussed herein have been tried on at least an experimental basis, and therefore each leaves some track record by which it can be judged.

Entry to the domestic airline industry may be viewed as a series of economic and government-imposed ob-

---


228 See supra notes 225-227 and accompanying text.

229 For example, The Denver Post, Dec. 17, 1985, at 13A, col. 7, reported that Senator Nancy Kassenbaum, Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee’s subcommittee on aviation, said she would “introduce legislation to side track” Buy-Sell.

230 See Bailey & Panzer, The Contestability of Airline Markets During the Transition to Deregulation, 44 LAW & CONTEM. PROBS. 125, 126 (1981). The economic barriers to entry, are not, however, as high as once supposed. In fact, since as early as 1962, economists have accepted the assumption that “there are no significant economies of scale in air transport.” Id.

231 The primary government obstacles (safety requirements) are really forms of economic obstacles. The regulatory obstacles to market entry, of course, largely have been eliminated by deregulation. Nevertheless, regulatory barriers to airport access persist. Today, these obstacles take the form of high-density regulations limiting total capacity, antitrust immunity to incumbent-dominated scheduling committees, and local and proprietary restrictions.
stacles. The first barrier to entry simply involves the need to raise sufficient capital to purchase planes which meet FAA safety requirements, finance corporate organization, and hire necessary employees. This "natural" economic barrier always exists in a capitalist society. The most effective and often most insurmountable barrier, however, is acquisition of terminal space, including gates. In many cases, a carrier is not even "eligible" for a slot unless it already has a gate.\textsuperscript{232}

Each of the allocative methods discussed below constitutes an airport resource system of rationing. Each method differs, however, in purpose, rationale, standards employed, and effect on entry control and economic efficiency. In a very real sense, each system acts as an indirect means of economic regulation of the airline industry itself.

A. Gate and Terminal Leases

At most major airports, post-deregulation demand for terminal space and gates exceeds supply.\textsuperscript{233} At these airports, therefore, free entry may be denied, not because of unavailability of "slots," but because of unavailability of gates and terminal space. Typically these gates and terminal facilities are the subject of long-term leases required by airport proprietors to support revenue-bond financing of these facilities.\textsuperscript{234} Baltimore/Washington airport, for example, has control over only four of twenty-seven gates

\textsuperscript{232} Gate possession is a practical prerequisite to a slot award. Interview with Robert Coates, Airport Manager, Denver Stapleton Airport (Mar. 1986).


\textsuperscript{234} Since deregulation, there has been a renewed interest on the part of some airport owners and operators to regain control of their own facilities. T. James Truby, Maryland's Aviation Administrator, recently stated, "We're interested in agreements that give us as much flexibility as possible to utilize our space as efficiently as possible. We have attempted to gain control of as much of the existing terminal as possible." Shifrin, \textit{Deregulation Bringing Airports More Interest in Own Destiny}, \textit{Av. Week \& Space Tech.}, Nov. 12, 1984, at 174.
at its main terminal. The remaining gates are locked into long-term leases until the year 2003. A large number of the leases give the airline lessee total control of counter space and gates, whether used or not. In other instances, incumbent airlines own or jointly own terminal space, further restricting airport proprietors’ authority to transfer underutilized space from one carrier to another. New entrants thus can obtain gates only in the rare case where a gate is available for lease or where a competitor will sublease the gate space, usually for an extravagant fee.

Following deregulation, the established airlines have emphasized the hub and spoke feeder concept at major airports. Between 1978 and 1984, airline seats on flights from large and medium hubs increased 36% to 38%. This “hubbing” practice involves peak aircraft

---

235 Id. at 175.
236 Id. at 174. Maryland Aviation Administrator T. James Truby comments that airlines in the past have dictated what would happen at most airports preventing them from making capital improvements without general concurrence of signatory carriers to long-term agreement with the airport.

Because the airlines have guaranteed to pay enough rental charges over the length of an agreement to let the airport recover construction costs and break even, the airlines with a majority use of a facility often have the power to turn down future airport construction. Some airport managers are concerned that incumbent carriers might decline to approve capital improvements that could provide space for low-cost new entrants.

Id. at 175-76.

237 Id. at 175.
238 Id. at 175: [Airport officials] who have control of at least some gates said that the airports get more flights out of the gates they control than carrier-controlled gates. They also can offer the use of their gates at more reasonable prices than the carriers typically are willing to sublease them for. [According to T. James Truby, Maryland Aviation Administration,] “There is a tendency for incumbent carriers to want to gouge subleased tenants,” a statement backed by other airport managers.

It could be possible for airline control over gates to prevent a carrier’s entrance to an airport. “I don’t feel airport operators can afford to, in effect, find their space held hostage by airlines which may not always be enthusiastic about accommodating a new entrant,” Truby said.

238 See CAB STAFF REPORT, supra note 2, at 10.
operations at specific times to control on-line passenger connections; for this to work, maximum access to terminal gates becomes essential.

Long-term leases present a variety of potentially anti-competitive barriers to new entrants.\textsuperscript{240} An incumbent may sublet space to new entrants. In practice, however, incumbents usually do so only on terms which reflect their own long-term requirements, and normally only to sub-lessees who engage in non-competitive operations.\textsuperscript{241} “Majority in interest” clauses in many leases present another potential barrier. These clauses give the tenant airlines the right to approve specific proposals.\textsuperscript{242} Initially, these clauses were deemed desirable as a means of protecting carriers from increased fees and rents resulting from unnecessary and extravagant airport expenditures.\textsuperscript{243} The potential exists, however, for incumbents not only to block new entrants’ access to existing facilities, but also to veto the construction of additional terminal facilities that might accommodate new entrants.\textsuperscript{244}

The DOJ has taken the position that available resources should be auctioned to the highest bidder. This would occur on a staggered basis as leases expire:\textsuperscript{245}

“[M]arket allocation . . . ensures that carriers able to meet travelers’ needs at the lowest cost have access to an amount of space commensurate with their cost advantages and that space in particular locations is used by carriers for [whom] those locations are of greatest value. A market system can result in the efficient level of service to travelers and the efficient allocation of service among carriers.”\textsuperscript{246}

Although the DOJ proposal remains controversial, con-

\textsuperscript{240} See supra notes 98-117 and accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{241} Id.
\textsuperscript{242} See supra note 101 and accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{243} Id.
\textsuperscript{244} See supra note 236 and accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{245} Separate Views of the Department of Justice as Applicable to Working Group B-Terminal Space and Gates, in AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 125.
\textsuperscript{246} Id.
siderable agreement exists that the present subleasing system at best constitutes a haphazard means of allocating terminal space.\textsuperscript{247} Because these leasing arrangements generally are not subject to airport review, they often culminate in high fee agreements which also may reserve the right of the lessor to recover space on short notice.\textsuperscript{248} The status of gate and terminal space access as a prerequisite to business for profit gives these spaces significant economic value over and above the costs of construction.

Like railroad terminals, airports provide essential facilities conducive to natural monopoly. Given this, airports must allow open access to other competing airlines upon just and reasonable terms, in fashion similar to that required for the Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis in 1912.\textsuperscript{249} The federal government, while recognizing proprietary rights of airport operators,\textsuperscript{250} also has mandated open, non-discriminatory access to terminal facilities.\textsuperscript{251}

\textsuperscript{247} Id.
\textsuperscript{248} See supra notes 98-117 and accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{249} See United States v. Terminal R.R. Ass'n of St. Louis, 224 U.S. 383, 388-412 (1912). The Terminal Railroad Association acquired several independent terminal companies in St. Louis with the purpose of combining and operating them as a unitary system. The Supreme Court found this arrangement illegal under the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Court remanded the case to bring the association into conformity with the statute by, among other things, "providing for the admission of any existing or future railroad to joint ownership and control of the combined terminal properties, upon such just and reasonable terms as shall place such applying company upon a plane of equality in respect of benefits and burdens with the present proprietary companies." Id. at 411.
\textsuperscript{250} 49 U.S.C. app. § 1305(b) (1982). Section 1305(b)(1) provides that:

nothing in subsection (a) of this section shall be construed to limit authority of any State or political subdivision thereof or any interstate agency or other political agency of two or more States as the owner or operator of an airport served by any air carrier certified by the Board to exercise its proprietary powers and rights.

\textit{Id.} at § 1305(b)(1).
\textsuperscript{251} See, e.g., Federal Aviation Act, 49 U.S.C. app. § 1349(a) (1982). The Federal Aviation Act provides in part:

No Federal funds, other than those expended under this chapter, shall be expended, other than for military purposes (whether or not in cooperation with State or other local government agencies), for the acquisition, establishment, construction, alteration, repair, maintenance, or operation of any landing area, or for the acquisition, es-
Measuring the effect of long-term leases on entry presents difficulty. Air Transport Association members have reported that while they know of no instances where access to terminal space has been denied, new entrants may not have obtained the facilities desired at the time they were desired. 252 Sixty-eight percent of top airports in the United States do not have terminal space available for new entrants. Of these, half indicated impracticability of subleasing as a means of permitting access, either because of high incumbent utilization of existing space or because of exhorbitant rates for subleases. 253 In sum,

252 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 70:
Airlines formed after deregulation, described as “new entrants”, and one carrier operating several years before 1978, reported substantial problems ranging from denial of access, to high cost sublease agreements with compulsory ground handling by sublessor’s personnel. There were cases where space was vacant but refused, and one situation where a ramp had been vacant for 10 years and the incumbent demanded payment for the 10 years of back rent it had paid the airport before it would consider leasing the vacant ramp.

Some carriers reported that even after space was made available, they were subject to prior schedule approval by the incumbent, repeated shifting of flights to different gates within the incumbent’s gate complex, failure to provide or approve adequate signs, and baggage priorities which resulted in the new entrant being routinely handled last.

253 The National Air Carriers Association (NACA) reported that during the
there can be little doubt that the long-term leasing system acts as a significant entry control, thereby defeating the objectives and purpose of the Airline Deregulation Act.

B. Local Noise Controls

As noted, the economic effects of entry control remain the same regardless of the means of entry control. The question of whether federal or local authorities have primary control over noise remains clouded, although local airports do appear to have primary financial liability for noise related-claims. The fact that local noise restrictions fulfill a legitimate and even vital function in no way diminishes the deleterious economic effect on airline deregulation.

A recent Airport Access Task Force concluded that noise and environmental constraints "have significantly impaired airport capacity and access." While aircraft noise at the national level has been reduced in the last ten years due to increased use of new technology aircraft, noise restrictions have placed increasingly greater restraint on airport access and capacity. Statistics show that additional noise-related restrictions were imposed on nineteen of the thirty-five largest passenger-handling air-

1960's and up to the mid-1970's, their members had been denied access to facilities on an equal basis. In many instances NACA members had been denied freedom of choice at airports and had been relegated to service as general aviation rather than as air carriers. Id. at 70. See id. at 71:

On one occasion, a regional carrier is being ground handled by a host carrier that had joint fares with other regional carriers that compete with the handled carrier to the same cities. The joint fare competing carriers receive preferred treatment by the host carrier on ticketing, baggage, and computer information. The handled carrier cannot do anything about it since they are not his employees, and incumbent carriers with vacant space refuse to sublease that space . . . .

254 See supra notes 155-175 and accompanying text.
255 See supra notes 160-161 and accompanying text.
257 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 18.
258 Id. at 33.
259 Id. at 34.
ports and that noise concerns significantly inhibited expansion of new facilities. The Task Force identified sixteen different types of noise restrictions, noting considerable debate over the effectiveness of the restrictions, many of which merely shift noise control from one airport to another. The Task Force also found that while single restrictions at particular airports generally do not substantially burden interstate commerce, haphazard application of local restrictions across the nation would have that effect. The Task Force concluded, therefore, that the "proliferation of such restrictions would significantly degrade the national air transportation system and frustrate competition." The Task Force proposed a more active, clearly defined federal role.

The DOT disagreed with the Task Force suggestion that the FAA be given authority to preempt state and local actions to deal with airport noise. DOT concluded that a national standard might be more efficient for airlines, but might subject individual communities to more or less noise than they might tolerate otherwise. In addition, DOT proposed a system of direct charges based on aircraft noise levels, time of day of operations, and other noise factors.

260 Id.
261 Id.
262 Id. at 37-39.
263 Id. at 39.
264 Noise restrictions must not be unjustly discriminatory nor arbitrary, nor may they interfere unreasonably with interstate commerce. 43 Fed. Reg. 28,417 (1978). The tendency by airport proprietors, therefore, has been to minimize restrictions which reduce economic activity, while liberally applying those which prevent growth. AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 40.
265 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 40.
266 Id. at 45.
267 Id. The Task Force noted that in the past, fear of liability for noise-related damages caused federal agencies to refrain from asserting preemptive authority over aviation noise. Non-proprietary use restrictions at airports are federally preempted. See supra notes 164-166 and accompanying text. However, a clear judicial definition of non-proprietary use restrictions has not emerged.
268 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 54.
269 Id.
270 Id. at 55.
The Separate Comments of The Department of Justice provide a practical and workable solution to the airport noise problem. Presently, airlines may ignore the true "social costs" of their operational decisions because they are not required to bear them. Under the DOJ proposal, the cost of noise would be identified and passed on to airport users, as an alternative to imposition of federal noise restrictions. The imposition of fees on noise producers provides appropriate economic incentives and places the cost of noise on those who produce it. Air carriers who control noise through quieter aircraft or quiet operational procedures during a less noise-sensitive time of day would be rewarded by lower costs. Such a system recognizes noise as an economic cost much like fuel. Thus, aircraft noise which reduces the value of surrounding property involves a partial condemnation of property requiring compensation.

271 Id. at 62-65.
272 Id. at 62.
273 Id. at 63-64.
274 See supra notes 156-174 and accompanying text.
275 See Nierenberg, supra note 256, at 184.
276 Generally, landowners urging inverse condemnation must show a sufficient loss of the use and enjoyment of their property to constitute a taking. United States v. Causby, 328 U.S. 256, 265 (1946). In Causby, the Supreme Court concluded, As we have said, the flight of airplanes, which skim the surface but do not touch it, is as much an appropriation of the use of the land as a more conventional entry upon it. . . . While the owner does not in any physical manner occupy that stratum of airspace or make use of it in the conventional sense, he does use it in somewhat the same sense that space left between buildings for the purpose of light and air is used. . . . We think the landowner, as an incidence to his ownership, has a claim to it and that invasions of it are in the same category as invasions of the surface.

Id. See Greater Westchester Homeowner's Ass'n v. City of Los Angeles, 26 Cal. 3d 86, 603 P.2d 1329, 160 Cal. Rptr. 733 (Cal. 1979), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 820 (1980). In Greater Westchester, the court held that federal preemption, per se, did not preclude private state remedies for noise damages. Id., 603 P.2d at 1335. The court noted that authorities had recognized that property owners have an inverse condemnation remedy for airport-noise-related property damages or loss. Id. The court then declared, "We discern no reason either in law or policy why the common law and statutory remedy of nuisance . . . should not under similar circumstances equally protect the person of the owner or the occupant." Id. For a review of noise litigation cases, see Bennett, supra note 157, at 474-83.
Statistical studies have determined, with relative precision, the effect of aircraft noise on the value of property.\textsuperscript{277} The most widely used measure for cumulative airport noise exposure is the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF), a twenty-four-hour equivalent sound level that accounts for the human ear's extrasensitivity to nighttime noise.\textsuperscript{278} An increase in noise exposure by one NEF reduces the value of property near airports by approximately one percent.\textsuperscript{279} For example, property valued at $50,000 with a noise exposure of 30 NEF would decrease in value by $2,500 if the noise exposure increases to 35 NEF. To calculate the total cost of noise damage, the "noise depreciation" percentage must be multiplied by the number of residences affected.\textsuperscript{280} Noise charges could be figured by dividing the total number of flight operations into the total damage figure, but the significant annoyance factor of nighttime noise should be reflected in the NEF noise measure.\textsuperscript{281}

The easiest method for implementing a noise charge would be assessment of an aircraft type fee using average noise levels.\textsuperscript{282} Measuring noise levels for all takeoffs and landings, however, would result in quieter operational procedures as well as incentives for retrofitting noise engines\textsuperscript{283} and replacing noisier planes.\textsuperscript{284} The technical capacity for monitoring airport noise, in order to impose

\textsuperscript{277} See Nierenberg, supra note 256, at 186 n.101.

\textsuperscript{278} Nelson, A Survey of Recent Evidence, 14 J. TRANSP. ECON. & POL. 37, 40 (1980).

\textsuperscript{279} Nierenberg, supra note 256, at 186-187.

\textsuperscript{280} Id. at 187.

\textsuperscript{281} Id. Nierenberg suggests that the practical approach is to measure noise in Effective Perceived Noise Decibels (EPNdB) as applied to individual takeoffs and landings. This takes into account the effect of louder noise on more people. See id.

\textsuperscript{282} Id. at 189.

\textsuperscript{283} Noise Reduction Kits ("Hush Kits") have been certified by the FAA for the older DC-8-62 engines. These kits reduce takeoff noise from 111.0 EPNdB to 101.7 EPNdB, well under the maximum 103.8 EDNdB allowed. \textit{FAA Certificates Noise Reduction Kits for McDonnell Douglas DC-8-62s}, Av. Week & Space Tech., Oct. 14, 1985, at 49.

\textsuperscript{284} Nierenberg, supra note 256, at 189.
charges, already exists. Funds collected for noise charges either could be surrendered to the local jurisdiction or retained by airports in a fund to compensate property owners who sue to recover for property damage. Such charges would not be inconsistent with airline deregulation and would in fact promote it. Nor does it appear that noise charges conflict with existing federal statutes. Each airline, without regulatory direction or restriction, would be free to choose its own means of reducing or paying for noise. The carrier could select either quieter planes for more noise-sensitive airports, or could choose to fly during less noise-sensitive times of day. Airlines without the more modern, quieter aircraft could choose takeoff and landing procedures that work to reduce noise.

Since a system of noise fees by necessity must be uniform and non-discriminatory, federal (FAA) administration would be required. Far from imposing additional regulations, however, such a system would eliminate the need for federal regulations. In addition, it would elimi-

---

285 Both Washington National and Manchester (England) International Airports have had noise monitoring systems in place for years. Id.

286 DOJ Comments, AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 63.

287 Id. at 64.

288 The Airport Acceleration Act, 49 U.S.C. app. § 1513(b) (1982) provides: Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, nothing in this section shall prohibit a State ... from the levy or collection of taxes other than those enumerated in subsection (a) of this section, including property taxes, net income taxes, franchise taxes, and sales or use taxes on the sale of goods or services; and nothing in this section shall prohibit a State ... owning or operating an airport from levying or collecting reasonable rental charges, landing fees, and other service charges from aircraft operators for the use of airport facilities. (emphasis added).

289 A proposed regulation supported by the Airport Operators Council International will phase out the noisiest (state I) aircraft by January 1, 1988, and the next category (state II) by 1995. However, airlines remain reluctant to make huge financial investments for new aircraft without reasonable assurances that they won't be hamstrung by local airport restrictions. Aviation Daily, Dec. 11, 1985, at 201.

290 For example, aircraft could apply takeoff thrust at certain points, or on approach could maintain above-minimum altitude until glideslope intercept. See AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 38.

nate the need for the present patchwork of overlapping, counterproductive, and self-defeating local restrictions which not only hold very questionable value in reducing noise, but which directly impact on interstate commerce and threaten the free entry indispensable to deregulation and competition.292

C. Scheduling Committee Agreements

Orders issued by CAB prior to its sunset approved a multitude of agreements, including schedule adjustment agreements at various airports and agreements granting antitrust immunity under section 414 of the Federal Aviation Act.293 In many orders, the CAB recognized that such agreements and discussions “could have substantial and adverse effect on competition.”294 DOT, however, has suggested that because such discussions were “voluntary, and because carriers did not discuss city-pairs, an adverse effect on competition was ‘minimized’, if not eliminated.”295

Most airports in the country have negotiating committees open to all regularly scheduled airlines serving the

292 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 48-51.
293 The Federal Aviation Act, 49 U.S.C. app. § 1384 (1982) provides that the Board may, as part of such order, exempt any person affected by such order from the operations of the “antitrust laws” set forth in [the Clayton Act] to the extent necessary to enable such person to proceed with the transaction specifically approved by the Board in such order and those transactions necessarily contemplated by such order, except that the Board may not exempt such person unless it determines that such exemption is required in the public interest. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, on the basis of the findings required by subsection (a)(2)(A)(i) of section 412 [49 U.S.C.S. § 1482(a)(2)(A)(i)], the Board shall, as part of any order under such section which approves any contract, agreement, or request or any modification or cancellation thereof, exempt any person affected by such order from the operations of the “antitrust laws” set forth in [the Clayton Act] to the extent necessary to enable such person to proceed with the transaction specifically approved by the Board in such order and with those transactions necessarily contemplated by such order.
294 CAB Order No. 84-10-120 at 2 (Oct. 25, 1984); CAB Order No. 80-9-100 at 5 (Sept. 17, 1980).
295 CAB Order No. 84-10-120 at 8 (Oct. 25, 1984).
airport, and these committees provide the principal means for presenting the airlines' position on airport affairs.\textsuperscript{296} The 1983 Airport Access Report found that "negotiating committees at many airports may exert substantial influence in virtually all aspects of airport affairs and also may be subject to antitrust scrutiny."\textsuperscript{297} In that respect, such committees serve functions analogous to those served by "majority in interest" clauses in some airport leases.\textsuperscript{298}

Negotiating committees provided a convenient way of allocating airport space during regulation. After deregulation, these committees continued as a convenient means of access control.\textsuperscript{299} As the demand for airport space has increased over the past few years, however, it has become apparent that the negotiating system is heavily weighted in favor of incumbents. This was recognized by the Airport Access Task Force, who acknowledged that "negotiating committees may tend to protect the rights of existing carriers and make the admission of new carriers to the community serving the airport more difficult."\textsuperscript{300}

Airline scheduling committees were created in 1968\textsuperscript{301} to allocate scarce slots among incumbent airlines at five slot-constrained airports.\textsuperscript{302} These agreements were immunized from antitrust scrutiny under section 414 of the Federal Aviation Act\textsuperscript{303} and were subject to periodic review before extension.\textsuperscript{304} The 1981 PATCO strike required implementation of the Interim Operations Plan limiting the number of operations at additional air-

\begin{footnotes}
\item[296] AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 79.
\item[297] Id.
\item[298] Id. at 99.
\item[299] The various airlines may exert their collective power over the airport operator to restrict new entrant access. Id. at 79.
\item[300] Id. at 100.
\item[301] See generally CAB Order No. 68-12-11 (Dec. 3, 1968).
\item[302] This was to implement the FAA's High Density rule initially imposed on Newark, Washington National, LaGuardia, John F. Kennedy, and O'Hare. See 14 C.F.R. § 93.12 (1968).
\item[304] CAB Order No. 68-12-11 at 3 (Dec. 3, 1968).
\end{footnotes}
ports. Though the PATCO-related constraints were terminated in August, 1984, Eastern requested carrier discussions to voluntarily implement control of flight schedules at six airside-congested cities. Although CAB granted the request for antitrust immunity for the proposed agreements from November 1, 1984, to March 31, 1985, the following passage from its order is revealing:

"Specifically at La Guardia, Air Atlanta asks for as short an approval period as possible. For the past six months, it has unsuccessfully attempted to obtain slots from the Airline Schedule Committee. Despite the existence of twenty-five unused slots, the committee has been unable to agree; thus, Air Atlanta's request for ten slots has not been granted. According to Air Atlanta, approval now would eliminate any incentive for the committee to meet and allocate slots. Air Atlanta also asserts that 27 slots remain unused even under the agreements submitted."

In a prior order, the CAB acknowledged that "discussions could reduce competition substantially," but approved the agreements on the ground that "serious transportation needs and public benefits, combined with the lack of reasonably available, less anti-competitive alternatives, justifies their approval."

Scheduling agreements were a viable means of allocating airport slots during economic regulation. CAB policy prevented entry by new firms, so there existed a lesser need for rationing. The anti-competitive effects of such agreements also posed little concern since CAB already had a policy of preventing any competition from new entrants. Under economic deregulation, however, scheduling agreements conflict with the policies and objectives

---

305 See generally CAB Order No. 81-10-162 (Oct. 27, 1981).
306 CAB Order No. 84-10-120 at 9 (Oct. 25, 1984). These included Denver, Atlanta, O'Hare, JFK, LaGuardia, and Newark. Id.
307 Id. at 9. The CAB, however, promised review if there was evidence that passengers were not suffering delays which would justify such approval. Id.
308 Id. at 4-5.
309 CAB Order No. 84-8-129 at 9 (Aug. 31, 1984).
310 See Hardaway, supra note 39, at 134-51.
of the Airline Deregulation Act.\textsuperscript{511} Although allowing airlines to collude on slots does not stifle competition to the same degree as price-fixing, such collusion prevents free entry in the long run.

D. Lotteries

Since scheduling agreements require unanimity,\textsuperscript{312} a problem arises when the participants reach deadlock.\textsuperscript{313} Although the ATA pledged to develop an effective deadlock-breaking mechanism in 1981,\textsuperscript{314} to date that has not occurred with the trunk carriers.\textsuperscript{315} On June 7, 1984, the FAA proposed a deadlock-breaking mechanism.\textsuperscript{316} Under that proposal, incumbents would maintain previously allocated slots.\textsuperscript{317} After being notified of deadlock and after essential air service requirements were fulfilled, the FAA would determine the order of slot selection by a random lottery.\textsuperscript{318} New entrants would be eligible, but only for 15\% of each classification of slots.\textsuperscript{319} Further, slots not used within sixty days of the lottery by existing carriers or new entrants would be lost.\textsuperscript{320} The FAA Buy-Sell Rule now provides for withdrawal of up to 5\% of air carrier slots for purposes of redistribution by lottery at high-density airports.\textsuperscript{321}

Some regional and commuter agreements already have purported to accommodate new entry demand by provid-

\textsuperscript{511} In 1982, DOJ asserted that scheduling agreements were anti competitive. \textit{See} 47 Fed. Reg. 29,814 (1982). Proponents of market force distribution of slots maintain that such agreements present an insuperable barrier to new entrants. \textit{Id.} at 29,814-15.

\textsuperscript{312} \textit{See} CAB Order No. 83-6-43 at 10 (June 3, 1983).

\textsuperscript{313} For example, the inability of scheduling committees to agree to slot allocation simply leaves slots in the same hands. \textit{See} Ott, \textit{U.S. Reviews Airport Slot Policy}, AV. WEEK & SPACE TECH., Apr. 16, 1984, at 32.

\textsuperscript{314} \textit{See} CAB Order No. 81-10-162 at 4 (Oct. 27, 1981).

\textsuperscript{315} \textit{See generally} Subcommittee Testimony, \textit{supra} note 227.


\textsuperscript{317} \textit{See id.} at 23,807.

\textsuperscript{318} \textit{See id.}

\textsuperscript{319} \textit{See id.} at 23,808.

\textsuperscript{320} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{321} \textit{See} 14 C.F.R. § 93 (1985).
ing a deadlock lottery when voluntary schedule adjustments cannot be made.\textsuperscript{322} In practice, however, these lotteries provide new entrants with only an arbitrarily set, and usually small number, of slots.\textsuperscript{323} While CAB Order 84-6-17 approved, for an interim period, three scheduling committee agreements, the order also recognized that

the agreements are ultimately likely to perpetuate existing slot allocations. In the event of a deadlock, there would be no allocation of slots at JFK, and the lotteries at ORD [Chicago] and LGA [LaGuardia] cover only newly created slots. This is "grandfathering," a practice we condemned under section 412 as a substantially anticompetitive practice.\textsuperscript{324}

In fact, this flawed grandfathering approach could act to encourage incumbents to reach deadlocks, thereby limiting airport expansion and inflating the value of airport slots.\textsuperscript{325}

Even if lotteries allocated existing utilized slots as well as the more limited number of "available" slots,\textsuperscript{326} the author submits that such a method of airport space allocation would be economically inefficient and inconsistent with airline deregulation. Such a lottery presumably would give the appearance of offering new entrants a chance to obtain a slot. It was not the purpose of airline deregulation, however, to grant economic favors, even by chance, to incumbents or new entrants. Deregulation instead seeks to allow development of an economic environment in which efficiency, good service, and low fares produce economic rewards, while inefficiency, poor service, and high fees subject an airline to economic punish-

\textsuperscript{322} See, e.g., CAB Order No. 84-6-17 at 1 (June 8, 1984); CAB Order No. 83-6-43 at 1-3 (June 15, 1983).

\textsuperscript{323} See CAB Order No. 84-6-17 at 1 (June 8, 1984).

\textsuperscript{324} CAB Order No. 84-6-17 at 8 (June 8, 1984).

\textsuperscript{325} See Subcommittee Testimony, supra note 227.

\textsuperscript{326} The slots would either be unused or become available as a result of the "use it or lose it" provision, a provision which the CAB found was not adverse to the public interest. CAB Order No. 84-6-17 at 9 (June 8, 1984).
The lottery system, regardless of scope, fails utterly in this task. Such a system allocates economically valuable airport space not on the basis of efficiency or service, but by the roll of the dice. This seems even less rational than previous CAB policy under regulation, which at least paid lip service to awarding slots or routes on a "public interest" basis, if not an efficiency basis. When the question of lotteries arises, it brings to mind the lottery system of military punishment used during World War I as dramatized in Stanley Kubrick's film, Paths of Glory. In that film, several thousand soldiers refused to obey a general staff order to make a suicidal charge against entrenched enemy positions. Since the military authorities could not realistically execute several thousand soldiers for disobedience, the military held a lottery to select three unlucky individual soldiers for execution.

Lotteries for airport access are equally irrational and unfair. The CAB expressed hope that discussions among airlines would be productive, so that airlines could avoid the randomness of the deadlock-breaking mechanism. Nevertheless, lotteries have been deemed an essential safety valve for situations in which scheduling committee members with unequal bargaining positions cannot agree on a schedule. The sole merit of a lottery system, however, lies in its equally irrational treatment of all applicants, precluding any one carrier from a deliberate discrimination argument. In light of the millions of dollars wasted each year due to misallocation of airport resources, such a policy hardly seems a fitting premise for allocation by lottery.

---

327 The DOT, for example, has rejected the broad use of lotteries as too random and too disruptive. See Ott, Economy Council Pushes Sale of Busy Airport Landing Slots, Av. Week & Space Tech., Feb. 11, 1985, at 39.
328 See supra note 51 and accompanying text.
329 CAB Order No. 83-6-43 at 13 (June 3, 1983).
330 Even CAB once stated that, despite reservations, it would not intervene as long as all carriers had a chance of getting slots through a lottery. CAB Order No. 84-8-24 at 5 (Aug. 6, 1984).
E. "First Come, First Served"

Some airports apply the general policy of "first come, first served" to allocate slots. At Stapleton Airport in Denver, for example, aircraft purportedly merely wait their turn in line to obtain runway space. In fact and as already noted, however, the limiting factor at such airports is not "slots" per se but, more particularly, gates and terminal space. In other words, without possession of a gate, an airline cannot "get in line."

In any case, a "first come, first served" system does not offer an economically efficient means of allocating slots. To grant a valuable slot based upon who has wasted the most time in line proves even less rational than a chance-based lottery system for slot allocation. In fact, a time-priority system actually encourages the inefficient use of time and facilities, not to mention fuel. Stapleton Airport officials estimated that delays under such a system cost airlines $104 million in 1985 alone. Furthermore, this method does nothing to alleviate the peak-hour bunching problem at airside-congested airports.

F. Administrative Regulation

The legal basis for administrative allocation of airport slots already has been discussed. Under economic regulation, CAB substituted the views of its members for those of the airlines and the public. In the same manner, administrative regulation and allocation of airport slots involves substitution of a bureaucratic "public interest" determination for the actual views of the public and air-

---

331 Under this method, when the ceiling has been reached for each hour, planes are either stacked to the next hour or diverted to other airports. CAB Order No. 80-9-148 at 7 (Sept. 24, 1980).
332 See supra notes 177-183 and accompanying text.
333 A B-727 burns approximately 80 pounds (12 gallons) of fuel per minute waiting for takeoff at a cost of $9.75 per minute. Interview with Bruce Burrows, Training/Check Manager, United Airlines Training Center, Denver, Colo. (Dec. 17, 1985).
335 See supra notes 184-229 and accompanying text.
lines as manifested by what they buy and sell in the marketplace. Administrative regulation also involves the cumbersome process of administrative hearings and proceedings that further inhibits the free market as it did under the years of CAB regulation. Moreover, neither FAA, DOT, nor the carriers presently seek or desire such regulation. Indeed, evidence suggests that several airport scheduling committee agreements were reached only because many members believed the alternative was administrative regulation. In Order 84-8-129, the CAB stated that "government interference with carrier scheduling must be kept at a minimum." In a subsequent order, the CAB repeated that position and further espoused the view that FAA regulation of carrier schedules did indeed adversely affect competition. In a concurring opinion, CAB Chairman Dan McKinnon stated that congestion at six airports had become so severe that antitrust immunity would be needed to see if the carriers could voluntarily cooperate to solve the problem through scheduling agreements. The government granted antitrust immunity only because "[t]he alternative could be a frustrated public that eventually could demand a return to some form of re-regulation or another government agency forcefully regulating airline actions without concern for the benefits of competition." In sum, administrative regulation of airport slots offers the least viable, and certainly least palatable, method of slot allocation.

G. Variable Landing Fees

Airports, both domestic and international, impose a

---

336 Hardaway, supra note 39, at 134-51.
339 CAB Order No. 84-8-129 at 11 (Aug. 31, 1984).
340 CAB Order No. 84-10-120 at 8 (Oct. 25, 1984).
341 Id. at 10.
342 Id.
343 For a discussion of differential and peak charges at European airports, see generally C. Phillips (Chief Economist, Finance British Airport Authority), Differential and Peak Charges, AOCI, International Airport Economic Subcomm. Working
wide variety of landing fees,\textsuperscript{344} property taxes,\textsuperscript{345} noise charges,\textsuperscript{346} and service charges.\textsuperscript{347} The kind of charge imposed depends largely upon political factors existing at each airport. In \textit{Evansville-Vanderburgh Airport Authority District v. Delta Airlines},\textsuperscript{348} for example, a local airport in Indiana charged a flat fee based on passengers enplaned.\textsuperscript{349} A local airport in New Hampshire charged a fee based on the number of passengers enplaning on aircraft of specific weights.\textsuperscript{350} Logan International Airport imposed noise charges based on decibel levels and flight times.\textsuperscript{351} A survey of noise charges at twenty-three major airports shows charges per operation ranging from .82 cents in Portland to $196.67 at Laguardia.\textsuperscript{352} Airports have charged a flat passenger embarkation fee,\textsuperscript{353} a flat fee on aircraft movements,\textsuperscript{354} a fee based on the weight of aircraft,\textsuperscript{355} a fee based on distance,\textsuperscript{356} and fees based on time of landing and departure.\textsuperscript{357}

Fees at domestic airports have been restrained by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982.\textsuperscript{358} This act

\textsuperscript{344} See Levine, supra note 3, at 90-102.
\textsuperscript{346} Nierenberg, supra note 256, at 185, identifies three types of noise charges: (1) revenue-generating charges; (2) compliance-related charges; and (3) damage-related charges.
\textsuperscript{348} 405 U.S. 707 (1972).
\textsuperscript{349} Id. at 709.
\textsuperscript{350} Id. at 710.
\textsuperscript{351} Nierenberg, supra note 256, at 187.
\textsuperscript{352} Id. at 207.
\textsuperscript{353} \textit{Evansville}, 405 U.S. at 710.
\textsuperscript{355} See Nierenberg, supra note 256, at 97.
\textsuperscript{356} Id.
\textsuperscript{357} See Nierenberg, supra note 256, at 168.
requires, as a precondition to approval of an airport development project, that the airport be "administered in a manner [consistent with the goals] of fostering competition, preventing unfair methods of competition in air transportation, maintaining essential air transportation, and preventing unjust and discriminatory practices." Airport fees also are subject to Commerce Clause restraints as set forth by the United States Supreme Court in Evansville. Specifically, airport fees must not discriminate between interstate and intrastate flights and must reflect "a fair, if imperfect, approximation of the use of facilities for whose benefits they are imposed." Further, fees must "not be excessive in relation to costs incurred by the taxing authorities." The fact that airport fees meet constitutional standards, however, does not insure that such fees result in optimum allocation. Indeed, an optimum method may run afoul of one or more of the Evansville requirements.

Economic studies severely criticize the present system of landing fees based on a flat rate per landing, aircraft weight, passenger embarkation, type of aircraft, or fuel flowage. In his groundbreaking article, "Landing

---

560 Evansville, 405 U.S. at 717. See infra notes 361-363 and accompanying text.
561 Id. (citing Nippert v. Richmond, 327 U.S. 416 (1946)).
562 Id.
563 Id. No violation of the Commerce Clause occurs if the airport fees imposed are "reasonable and are fixed according to some uniform, fair and practical standard." Id. at 713.
564 The problem with the Evansville requirements, from an economic standpoint, is that they relate only to the cost side of the equation. The requirements fail to consider that an optimum price for slots and gates must reflect their scarcity value. A price which reflects scarcity value may appear excessive under the Evansville standards. See supra note 112.
565 Levine, supra note 3, at 102 n.6; see generally Steiner, Peak Loads and Efficient Pricing, 71 QJ. Econ. 585 (1957); Grampp, An Economic Remedy for Airport Congestion: The Case for Flexible Pricing, 9 Bus. Horizons 21 (1968).
566 Levine, supra note 3, at 90.
567 Id. at 101.
568 Id. at 90.
569 Id. at 94.
Fees and the Airport Congestion Problem,\textsuperscript{370} Michael Levine summed up the economic inefficiencies of the common types of landing fees. For example, fees based on weight cause

maximizing airline[s] \[to\] schedul[e] as many flights as possible at peak hours. Since the airline will experience the average, rather than the marginal, delay, measuring the cost to the airline of adding the schedule against the incremental revenue will yield a more favorable result than would be the case if the costs to all users were taken into account.\textsuperscript{371}

The flat rate system

does not allow those airlines who prefer to schedule tightly and increase aircraft utilization the opportunity to use the savings possible from this method to buy the delay-free operations which are a precondition to full implementation of that policy. It delays equally long-haul passengers who have few substitutes for air travel and short-haul passengers who have many.\textsuperscript{372}

Fuel flowage fees

courage the most frivolous airport uses: the recreational flight for lunch or a cup of coffee, the short trip to pick up or drop off a passenger who could have made the trip by surface, the instructional approach and landing to give the student a taste of operating at a busy airport.\textsuperscript{373}

\textsuperscript{370} Id.; see also Kahn, \textit{Raise the Cost of Landing at Peak Hours}, N.Y. Times, Sept. 9, 1984, at 2F, col. 2.
\textsuperscript{371} Levine, \textit{supra note 3}, at 91.
\textsuperscript{372} Id. at 92.
\textsuperscript{373} Id. at 94. Levine notes that embarkation fees do not measure with any precision the use made of the airport's landing area by the aircraft in which the passengers are carried. They result in smaller aggregate charges being assessed against unpopular flights than against popular ones—precisely the opposite of the effect desired at peak hours when capacity is of prime value.

The second unfortunate effect, which follows from the first, is that the cross-subsidy of landing areas from revenues extracted from terminal concessions results in distortions of demand which in turn produce investment mistakes. Lowering prices on landing areas creates a higher demand for those facilities—demand which, as we have seen, does not necessarily produce increased terminal revenues to finance the facilities required to accommodate it. Using passengers
Levine, like other economists, recognizes that landing fees can serve far higher purposes than raising revenue; namely, reducing congestion and increasing economic efficiency. Levine recognizes, however, that landing fees necessary to accomplish these purposes “may require higher-than-cost prices.” For this reason, such fees must be scrutinized closely in light of Evansville. The experience of the New York Port Authority illustrates the capacity of landing fees to reduce congestion. In 1968, the latter authority imposed higher fees on peak-hour general aviation use of runways, resulting in a 30% decline in use of high-peak slots.\textsuperscript{375}

H. Slot Exchanges, Sales, and Auctions

Under Special Federal Aviation Regulations 44 through 44-3,\textsuperscript{376} the FAA for some time permitted slot exchanges on a one-for-one basis. In the FAA’s view, slot exchanges increase scheduling flexibility among carriers, but still do not adequately meet scheduling needs. As stated by the FTC at a hearing before the FAA: “[E]lementary economic principles demonstrate . . . that an exchange system that permits only barter is inferior to one that allows

\begin{itemize}
  \item as a “meter” creates incentives for frequent scheduling of lightly-loaded aircraft.
  \item Finally, by raising the prices of concession-supplied services, this policy deprives consumers of the full utility they might derive from using them at competitive prices.
\end{itemize}

\textit{Id.} at 101.

\textsuperscript{374} \textit{Id.} at 88. As Levine explains:

In such instances, there is a question (partially political rather than economic in nature) as to who should capture the profit. But using this criterion it is less than obvious that airlines are more worthy beneficiaries than taxpayers at large, especially where giving the profit to airlines in the form of reduced landing fees may defeat the very purpose of extracting it; that is, to allocate the use of scarce airport resources. In any case, the profit should be only as large as is necessary to accomplish the rationing and the purpose which engendered it should not be vitiated by the way in which it is distributed.

\textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{375} \textit{Id.} at 90.

\textsuperscript{376} See supra note 7 and accompanying text.
both barter and cash sales."

As a result, in May of 1982, the FAA approved a six-week experimental program permitting slot sales. Unfortunately, the short duration of this program made it impossible to draw any firm conclusions. Several hundred slots did trade hands during this period. New entrants, such as People Express, were able to purchase a large number of slots at National Airport, from which they previously had been excluded. Indeed, the success of People Express in obtaining slots so pleased that airline that it since has testified vigorously for Buy-Sell at subsequent hearings on slot allocation procedures. People Express believes that the only way to achieve access to additional slots is through a slot sale program, and the airline credits the experimental program with allowing it to continue operating under the high-density restrictions imposed in the aftermath of the PATCO strike. The People Express experience exemplifies the fact that inferior economic power alone will not prevent acquisition of slots.

In short, the little data available from the 1982 slot sale experiment is positive: at least one new entrant obtained access and was not outbid by firms with far greater assets. The experience from gate subleasing, however, offers less encouragement and suggests that Buy-Sell may provide greater anti-competitive incentives than have been recognized by FAA.

---

577 FTC REPORT OF THE AIR FORCE TASK FORCE, supra note 4, at 3.
579 AIRPORT ACCESS REPORT, supra note 4, at 7.
580 Id.
581 Id.
582 It should be noted that Buy-Sell differs from the mere auction of slots. Auctions would begin the allocation process at base zero, retrieving all slots and then selling them to the highest bidder. Buy-Sell "grandfathers" existing slots and merely permits existing slot owners to sell as they see fit. The FAA has rejected slot auction proposals on several grounds, including unresolved legal questions and the possibility of service disruptions during transition. See 50 Fed. Reg. 52,183-86 (1985).
VII. Antitrust Enforcement Under Slot Sales

The FAA Comments to the Buy-Sell Rule confidently state, "[T]he use-or-lose provisions of the rule, in conjunction with existing antitrust laws, will be sufficient to deter anti-competitive behavior." However, the comments do not specify which antitrust provision(s) apply.

Section 2 of the Sherman Act provides that "[e]very person who shall monopolize . . . any part of the trade or commerce . . . shall be punished . . ." In early 1985, the DOJ set forth "Vertical Restraints Guidelines," explaining DOJ enforcement policy under this section:

Vertical restraints — particularly, exclusive dealing — may have the effect of excluding rivals by prohibitively raising either their cost of a vital input or their cost of distribution. . . . Alternatively, a firm . . . may enter into long-term exclusive contracts for the supply of a vital input, leaving little or no present production of the input for new entrants or fringe firms. In the short run, a rival firm would be unable to obtain a sufficient amount of the input to allow it to operate . . .

The DOJ guidelines set forth three criteria for determining whether or not anti-competitive exclusion exists:

1. The "nonforeclosed market" is concentrated and leading firms in the market use the restraints;
2. the firms subject to the restraints control a large share of the "foreclosed market"; and
3. entry into the "foreclosed market" is difficult.

Although written before Buy-Sell, these guidelines appear applicable to circumstances that might arise under that Rule. Most case law under section 2 of the Sherman Act is not precisely on point. Several cases, however, provide a possible basis for antitrust enforcement against anti-competitive behavior during Buy-Sell.

383 Id. at 52,186.
386 Id. at 6,267.
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In the leading case of *United States v. Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis* the Supreme Court struck down a scheme by which large railroads took control of a central railroad terminal in St. Louis and excluded competitors from its use. Likewise, in *Otter Tail Power Co. v. United States* the Supreme Court found a violation of the Sherman Act when a dominant power company used its economic power to "foreclose potential entrants into the retail arena from obtaining electric power from outside sources of supply." In *In re Carterfone*, the FCC held that AT&T could prevent connection of competitive lines to its system only if the devices would cause harm to the system.

The fact that some antitrust precedent exists for action against carriers using Buy-Sell for anti-competitive purposes, however, does not mean that a practical method of enforcement easily could be devised. The airline industry stands distinct in two particulars: (1) demand for the industry's product is highly elastic (that is, a 1% reduction in fares likely will result in a greater than 1% increase in demand); and (2) the industry's product is highly perishable, making the industry especially sensitive to price competition by even relatively small competitors. Even temporary exclusion from a market can have immediate and devastating effects. A firm may cease to exist long before antitrust protection becomes available.
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Low, unrestricted fares were available only in a limited number of markets in 1979 and the beginning of 1980. At that time, these low fares often resulted from the entry of another carrier. For example, the fare in Denver-Salt Lake fell by 62 percent when Texas International entered the market.
In addition, difficult questions will arise in determining whether an antitrust violation has occurred. For example, there appears no easy answer as to whether a large carrier, who operates a flight from a particular slot at a very marginal profit because of high labor costs, engages in anti-competitive conduct by simply refusing to sell at any price to a small competitor, who because of its lower costs can reap a higher profit from use of the slot, but whose lower fares threaten to take passengers from the large carriers. In other words, could a large carrier keep a "grandfathered" slot for which it has made a considerable investment over the years, in order to flatten its own individual demand curve, and thus reap an oligopoly profit? If not, how would such a motive be proven, and what standards would apply? Areeda and Turner point out that oligopoly pricing below marginal costs may be justified and not predatory under certain circumstances, such as where a competitive response is required or where the price is set for promotional purposes. For this reason, these authors suggest that "extreme care be taken" in formulating antitrust rules on predatory pricing. The same also can be said with regard to formulation of antitrust rules under Buy-Sell. Ideally, a Buy-Sell system should incorporate an internal market-based mechanism to deter anti-competitive behavior without sole resort to antitrust law enforcement.

VIII. Conclusion

Existing methods of airport resource allocation are unsatisfactory. Administrative regulation has proven cumbersome and inefficient. Scheduling committees inhibit free entry, and discourage competition and efficiency. Lotteries are irrational, inefficient and unfair. "First come, first served" results in waste and misallocation of
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resources. Only variable landing fees and Buy-Sell promise to allocate resources at an efficient level.

The case for variable landing fees has been persuasively documented. Such fees have the added advantage of providing a working solution to the airport noise problem, since noise abatement incentives can be built into the fees. For example, air carriers who control noise by operating quieter aircraft or operating during less noise-sensitive times of day can be rewarded by lower fees. Air carriers who choose to operate noisy aircraft or choose to operate at noise-sensitive times would be subject to a higher fee. That part of a fee based on noise could be placed in a compensation fund for surrounding landowners who suffer actual loss in value to their property. Such a system recognizes noise control as an economic cost.

Variable fees also can provide economic incentives to use low-peak slots, thus eliminating congestion and reducing costly delays. Negative fees (subsidies) might even be awarded to carriers who use extremely low-peak slots. Fees for high-peak slots simply would be raised to the point at which carriers willing to pay the fees equal the number of slots available. Thus, variable fees may be used to ration slots to those carriers who value the slots most highly. A slot used by a jumbo jet with 500 people aboard, for example, will command a higher fee than a recreational flier in a Piper Cub would be willing to pay. A market mechanism that gives preference to the interests of 500 people over one person reflects greater allocative efficiency. (If political pressures demand preference for general aviation, reduced fees or subsidies could benefit general aviation or commuters.)

To avoid the possibility that some carriers might choose to cross-subsidize high-peak flights by refusing to include the higher landing fees in ticket prices, the landing fees could be imposed directly on passengers as a high-peak
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surcharge. In this manner, a business passenger who values a high-peak departure time could obtain his preferred flight, but would have to pay for it. The recreational passenger would get a less desirable departure time, but would pay a lower price. In this manner, direct as well as indirect economic pressure would prompt carriers to shift lower valued flights to low-peak slots.

Variable landing fees have two important limitations, however: (1) they do nothing to solve the problem of airport access to terminal space and gates, and thus they serve only to even out high-and low-peak usage by carriers already possessing terminal and gate space; and (2) they do not allow for long-term scheduling guarantees. But Buy-Sell also has two critical weaknesses: (1) It creates an economic incentive for large carriers to outbid small carriers for anti-competitive purposes; and (2) like variable fees, Buy-Sell fails to address free entry to terminal space and gates.

The first weakness of Buy-Sell can be cured by assessing a variable landing fee per operation to each slot available for “purchase.” A high landing fee will make an otherwise prime slot less desirable, thereby reducing the anti-competitive incentive to purchase it. A high landing fee also can serve to offset the “oligopoly surplus” that the large carrier otherwise would earn while in possession of the slot.

To ensure free entry, a certain percentage of slots should be recalled for redistribution. Redistribution of these slots will flatten the slope of the demand curve for larger firms, thus lessening the anti-competitive incentive to corner a slot. The FAA Buy-Sell Rule attempts to accomplish this result by lottery. As noted, however, a lottery offers an inefficient means of initial allocation since it makes no distinction between carriers who place different values on the slot. Of course, once slot allocation occurs (by whatever means), a slot after-market eventually
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will put slots to work where they will do the most good. But this does not justify allocation by chance in the first instance.

The author submits that a system of efficiency bidding provides a far better means of distributing available slots. In such a bidding system, a certain percentage of slots (say 5% of each incumbents' slots, plus any other slots made available by new construction or returns to the slot pool) could be made available for auction on a quarterly basis. Unlike the DOJ system of selling to the carrier offering the most cash, or the Buy-Sell system of distribution by lottery, an efficiency bidding system would allocate slots to the carrier offering to provide air service to the public for the lowest cost. A formula could be devised to incorporate a fare/mileage equivalency table, equating long-and short-haul fares, so that fare bids for long-haul routes would not be unfairly compared to fare bids for short-haul routes. Bid winners would receive a slot for the time periods indicated in the bid or for a predetermined length of time (perhaps six months or a year), after which the slot would revert to the original owner if previously owned or to the slot pool if not previously owned. Remaining time periods available for the slot would go to the next highest bidder or would be returned to the auction pool. If the winning bidder raises the fare during the period awarded, any competitor who previously entered a bid could, within one week of the fare increase, demand that the slot be returned to the auction pool. Fares could be lowered, of course, without consequence. A winning bidder could change the route indicated without penalty as long as the fare for the new route was less than the fare
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for the old route under the formula's fare/mileage equivalency table. Winning bidders would be required to pay the prevailing variable fee for the slot awarded. All bidders, of course, would be required to meet FAA safety, capital, and other requirements presently needed for certification.

The danger always exists, of course, that any devised formula under such a system could be misused to reinstate, in disguised form, administrative regulation. A formula incorporating government authorities' views and opinions as to routes or service to small communities, for example, could be used to achieve such a result. The system proposed here, however, would utilize a formula incorporating a factor already voted upon by consumers under economic deregulation, namely price.

The success of a bid system, of course, would depend upon the establishment of a non-discriminatory and anonymous bidding system. Even if formulators insisted on including factors such as service to small communities, the system proposed still provides a reasonably available and least anti-competitive method of allocating recaptured slots.

While true that some administrative input would be required in devising the initial formula and overseeing the bidding system, efficiency bidding otherwise would be as self-regulating and free from the need for government interference as Buy-Sell itself. Based on objective data and criteria, an efficiency bidding system would "mirror" the free market and provide the same economic incentives that exist in the airline industry as a whole under deregulation. The author recognizes that no efficiency bidding formula would be able to distinguish between levels of in-flight service. It is submitted, however, that such a means of distributing a certain percentage of recalled slots still would be preferable to the indiscriminate allocation of a
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lottery. Unlike lotteries, a bid system avoids the likelihood of allocation to the very carriers for whom Buy-Sell creates an anti-competitive incentive.

The second weakness of Buy-Sell, failure to address gate and terminal space free-entry problems, can be cured only by: (1) expansion of airport facilities; (2) condemnation of existing terminal space or leasehold interests for redistribution purposes (with fair compensation paid for the value of the property seized); and (3) application of Buy-Sell to terminal space. Gates would be treated as slots or as paired with slots (i.e., only for particular time periods), and could be sold or leased only as slots. Variable use fees then should be imposed according to the high-or low-peak use of the gate. As with slots, a certain percentage of gate space would be recalled for distribution by efficiency bidding.

The inefficiencies in airport allocating methods cost airlines and consumers billions of dollars each year. Buy-Sell will go far to reduce this waste. Integration of variable fees, efficiency bidding, and application of Buy-Sell to terminal space and gates will further reduce waste and increase economic efficiency.