

Spring 4-2015

# THE “WRIGHT” MOVE FOR LOVE: A PROS AND CONS REVIEW OF THE WRIGHT AMENDMENT REPEAL COMPROMISE

Andrew Michael Cohler

*Southern Illinois University Carbondale, [acohler@siu.edu](mailto:acohler@siu.edu)*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs\\_rp](http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs_rp)

---

## Recommended Citation

Cohler, Andrew M. "THE “WRIGHT” MOVE FOR LOVE: A PROS AND CONS REVIEW OF THE WRIGHT AMENDMENT REPEAL COMPROMISE." (Spring 2015).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Papers by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact [opensiuc@lib.siu.edu](mailto:opensiuc@lib.siu.edu).

THE “WRIGHT” MOVE FOR LOVE: A PROS AND CONS REVIEW OF THE WRIGHT  
AMENDMENT REPEAL COMPROMISE

by

Andrew Michael Cohler

B.S., Southern Illinois University, 2013

A Research Paper  
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Master’s in Public Administration.

Department of Political Science  
in the Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
May 2015

RESEARCH PAPER APPROVAL

THE “WRIGHT” MOVE FOR LOVE: A PROS AND CONS REVIEW OF THE WRIGHT  
AMENDMENT REPEAL COMPROMISE

By

Andrew Cohler

A Research Paper Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Public Administration

in the field of Political Science

Approved by:

Dr. David A. NewMyer, Chair

Dr. Jose R. Ruiz

Dr. John Hamman

Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
April, 08 2015

## AN ABSTRACT OF THE RESEARCH PAPER OF

Andrew Michael Cohler, for the Masters in Public Administration degree in POLITICAL SCIENCE FIELD, presented on April 8, 2015, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

### THE “WRIGHT” MOVE FOR LOVE: A PROS AND CONS REVIEW OF THE WRIGHT AMENDMENT REPEAL COMPROMISE

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. David A. NewMyer

In 1979 the Wright Amendment was introduced to restrict commercial airline service out of Dallas Love Field to any city outside of Texas and its bordering states in order to reduce competition with the newly built Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport (DFW) following the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978. In 2006, American Airlines, Southwest Airlines, the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth, and the DFW Airport Board agreed on a compromise to repeal the Wright Amendment. Stipulations of the compromise included an eight year cap on the Wright Amendment restrictions, a reduction of gates at Love Field, and a complete renovation of the terminals at Love Field. This research paper will discuss the pros and cons of the Wright Amendment repeal compromise in the form of a literature review.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
CHAPTER 1 – Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER 2 – Background.....	4
CHAPTER 3 – Critical Analysis/Cons of The Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise .....	9
CHAPTER 4 – Findings/Pros of the Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise .....	16
CHAPTER 5 – Conclusion.....	30
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	34
REFERENCES .....	35
VITA .....	40

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1.....	10
TABLE 2.....	18
TABLE 3.....	20
TABLE 4.....	21
TABLE 5.....	22
TABLE 6.....	24
TABLE 7.....	27

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Ronald Reagan is famous for saying, “The most terrifying words in the English language are: I'm from the government and I'm here to help.” Many Americans have felt this way about the 1979 Amendment to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to restrict flights at Dallas Love Field Airport in order to ensure growth of a new large airport in the region. From the outside, the Amendment and legislation surrounding the repeal, was thought by some American passengers and airline companies to be the result of government clinging on to their last string of regulation of the aviation industry following the Deregulation Act of 1978. However, evidence from peer reviewed journals and airport documents present both sides of the argument.

Love Field in Dallas has been surrounded by controversy since the decision to build the New Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport in 1968. Fearing that Love Field service by Southwest Airlines would put a significant amount of competition against Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport (DFW) following the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, Congressman Jim Wright, former Speaker of the House, inserted an Amendment to a transportation bill, the International Air Transportation Act of 1979, that would restrict flights from operating out of Love Field for decades to come. The purpose of the restrictions was to ensure the investment in DFW would be worthwhile, with the intention of making it the dominant airport in the Dallas Region. At the time in 2006, when DFW became one of the top ten busiest airports in the world, a five-party compromise was made to repeal the Wright Amendment. However, the final provisions of the compromise rescinded the Love Field restrictions, but only after eight more years (Wang, 2005).

Commencing this paper will be a detailed review of the history leading up to the Wright Amendment repeal compromise that would put an eight-year cap on the restrictions at Love Field. The further chapters will review the arguments for and against the topic to familiarize the reader with the pros and cons of the Wright Amendment. The findings section of the paper will discuss airport documents that explain the technical factors which served as a catalyst for the Wright Amendment restrictions. Issues of noise pollution, air quality, airport access, and capacity control will be discussed in detail as they are laid out in the Dallas Love Master Plan Update in 2001 and associated documents. Using the Love Field Master Plan (2001) and Love Field Impact Analysis (2006), this paper will show the projections of both documents in regards to the Wright Amendment and how Love Field would be impacted in a variety of scenarios: a 32-gate Wright Amendment scenario; a 32-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario; and a 20-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario (DMJM/AECOM, 2006).

Concluding this paper will be a review of current operating statistics in the first few months of the rescinded Wright Amendment restrictions. This paper was written just months after the lifting of the restrictions on Love Field leaving room for further studies on the effects and impacts of the repeal of the Wright Amendment.

### **Problem**

Most of the peer-reviewed literature written prior to this research paper fails to explain the reasons behind the Wright Amendment repeal compromise stipulations. This paper will fill the gap of knowledge by outlining both the pros and cons of the Wright Amendment repeal compromise.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this research is to describe why the Wright Amendment was created and passed, explain why the Wright Amendment was repealed and the stipulations of the repeal compromise, examine possible impacts of the Wright Amendment repeal compromise, and outline the pros and cons of the Wright Amendment repeal compromise.

**Research Questions**

- What is the Wright Amendment and why was it passed?
- Why was the Wright Amendment repealed and what were the stipulations of the repeal compromise?
- What are the possible impacts of the repeal of the Wright Amendment?
- What are the pros and cons of the Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise?

**Methodology**

The methodology used in this research paper was a literature review examining peer reviewed journal articles, legislative documents, online news articles, books, professional reports, and airport documents relevant to the topic.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **BACKGROUND**

#### **Love Field History**

Dallas Love Field opened in 1917 as an Army flight training facility (Dallas Love Field Website, 2015). The Airport was named by the Army in honor of First Lieutenant Moss Lee Love of the 11<sup>th</sup> Cavalry who was killed in a crash practicing for a military aviation test in 1913 (Dallas Love Field Website, 2015). In 1928, Love Field was purchased by the City of Dallas from the Army for \$325,000 (Farris II & Swartz, 2006). The first commercial service route out of Love Field was served by Delta Air Service, Inc. in 1929 to Jackson, Mississippi with stops in Shreveport and Monroe, Louisiana (Dallas Love Field Website, 2015). Love Field served as the primary commercial service airport in the Dallas region until 1974 when Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport (DFW) was opened (Pharris II & Pohlen, 2006).

#### **Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport**

A study conducted by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in the 1960's deemed Love Field unable to handle demands of future air traffic in the Dallas region (Wang, 2005). In accordance with the study, the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth decided that the need for a large regional airport was imminent (Farris II & Swartz, 2006). In 1968, an agreement was made between the two cities to build a primary airport for the area (Farris II & Pohlen, 2006). The agreement included a phasing out of air traffic at surrounding airports, including Dallas Love Field, to decrease competition at the new DFW. In order to pay for the construction of DFW, the two cities issued a bond agreement in 1968 requiring the airlines that will operate at DFW to fund the project through user fees (landing fees, gate leases, etc.) (Freiberg & Freiberg, 1996).

Complying with the bond ordinance in 1968, all of the eight airlines already operating flights out of Love Field pledged to switch air service over to the new DFW upon completion of the construction (Pohlen, 2006). However, Southwest Airlines, which had not yet started air service out of Love Field, notified the Dallas Fort Worth Airport Board they did not intend to initiate air service at DFW (Dallas Love Field Website, 2015).

### **Southwest Stirs The Pot**

Love Field sits just minutes away from Downtown Dallas making it the ideal airport for the business traveler looking for quick access to and from the city (Freiberg & Freiberg, 1996). This type of business market share was the target of the infant Southwest Airlines (Freiberg & Freiberg, 1996). Southwest Airlines' business model favored Love Field over a larger, more expensive, and less convenient DFW. Southwest had no intention of initiating service at DFW because they had not agreed to the bond ordinance and had not been ordered by the Texas Aeronautics Commission to do so (Freiberg & Freiberg, 1996).

In response, the City of Dallas, the City of Fort Worth, and the DFW Regional Airport Board filed suit against the airline in June 1972, just a year after Southwest Airlines was approved by the State of Texas to operate as an intrastate air carrier serving Dallas (Love Field), Houston (Hobby), and San Antonio. The argument by the cities and the Airport Board stemmed from concern of inadequate funding for the new DFW airport without Southwest's share. In 1973, after a month of deliberations, the Federal District Court ruled that Southwest could continue service out of Love Field (Wang, 2005). In an appeal to the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court in 1974, the decision was upheld (Wang, 2005). Another attempt was made to appeal the decision to the U.S. Supreme Court, which was denied (Wang, 2005). The Dallas Fort Worth Regional Airport opened in January 1974. The name was changed to Dallas/Fort Worth International

Airport in 1985 (Texas State Historical Association, 2015). At that point, all airlines serving Dallas Love Field, except Southwest Airlines, left Love Field and moved operations to DFW (Freiberg & Freiberg, 1996).

### **The Man Behind The Name**

The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978 ended economic control of airlines in favor of a competition-based market. Airlines were now free to control their domestic route structure and choose ticket fares based on their business model (Freiberg & Freiberg, 1996). In response to the newly deregulated market, Southwest Airlines applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) to start operating non-stop service from Love Field to New Orleans (Freiberg & Freiberg, 1996). The CAB granted Southwest Airlines the right to fly their first route outside the State of Texas in 1979 (Farris II & Swartz, 2006).

The news that Southwest was granted interstate service out of Love Field was a shock to City Officials in Dallas, Fort Worth and the airlines serving DFW who were fearful that competition would damage growth at the new DFW (Wang, 2005). One particular person, then House Speaker Jim Wright from Texas, took advantage of the opportunity to restrict flights from Love Field by inserting an amendment into the International Air Transportation Competition Act of 1979, a bill that would further deregulate the airline industry, with the purpose of restricting all commercial flights to intrastate routes out of Love Field (Farris II & Swartz, 2006). However, the U.S. Senate refused to pass the bill with the amendment, which forced a compromise (Wang, 2005). The new amendment compromise, known as the Wright Amendment (Section 29 of International Air Transportation Competition Act, 1979) is outlined in the following bullet points:

- Commercial air transportation from Love Field to any point outside of Texas is prohibited except for (1) charter air transportation not exceeding ten flights per month, and (2) air transportation provided by commuter airlines operating aircraft with a passenger capacity of 56 passengers or less;
- Commercial air transportation by air carriers operating aircraft with a passenger capacity greater than 56 passengers from Love Field are limited to operating non-stop flights to one or more points within the States of Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico.

In 1997, Congress passed the Shelby amendment, which added three more states, Alabama, Kansas, and Mississippi to the Wright Amendment (Farris II & Swartz, 2006).

### **The Right to Fly**

By 2005, DFW was established as the busiest airport in the Dallas region handling 29 million enplaned passengers while Love Field served 2.9 million enplanements the same year (City of Dallas & SH&E/CAM, INC., 2015). Additionally, Southwest had established itself as a prominent airline in the U.S. carrying more than 65 million passengers a year and operating over 400 planes to over 60 cities (Farris II & Swartz, 2006). With the belief that the Wright Amendment had served the purpose of growing DFW, Southwest Airlines started campaigning for a repeal (Freiberg & Freiberg, 1996). In 2005, Texas Republican Congressmen Sam Johnson and Jeb Hensarling introduced the “Right to Fly” Act to repeal the Wright Amendment (Farris II & Swartz, 2006). In the meantime, Senator Kit Bond (R-Mo.) sought and won exemptions to Wright Amendment to allow Southwest Airlines to serve Missouri beginning in 2006, which started a fare war between Southwest and American Airlines (Farris II & Pohlen, 2006). The average fare between St Louis and Love Field dropped by half and the amount of flights

increased between the two cities (Farris II & Pohlen, 2006). In a desperate attempt to stall other senators from gaining exemptions, Texas senators urged that a compromise be made to phase out the Wright Amendment restrictions. The city of Dallas, the city of Fort Worth, Southwest Airlines, American Airlines, and DFW Airport Board participated in a compromise agreement to repeal the Amendment. The compromise was introduced by Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson (R-TX.) on June 16, 2006, and was signed into law by President George W. Bush on October 17, 2006 (DMJM/AECOM, 2008).

**CHAPTER 3**  
**CRITICAL ANALYSIS**  
**CONS OF THE WRIGHT AMENDMENT REPEAL COMPROMISE**

**Background**

The compromise to repeal the Wright Amendment between the city of Dallas, the city of Fort Worth, Southwest Airlines, American Airlines, and the DFW Airport Board was introduced with the following stipulations shown on the next page in *Table 1*.

Table 1

*WRIGHT AMENDMENT REPEAL COMPROMISE OF 2006***Stipulations**

Through ticketing may be offered by airlines flying out of Love Field

The Wright amendment must be repealed after eight years (October 13, 2014)

International airline flights are permanently restricted to only DFW

Love Field must permanently reduce gate capacity from 32 to 20

A noise curfew must be instated at Love Field between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m.

Love Field must demolish its Legend terminal consisting of 6 gates, plus modernize the main terminal within eight years at a minimum cost of \$150 million

During the eight years, the two cities must oppose any efforts to initiate airline service outside of the Wright Amendment cities at Dallas Love Field

Congress may not exempt additional states from the Wright Amendment

If any airline adds service at another airport in the region other than DFW (and Dallas Love before October 13, 2014,) before 2025, they will be forced to give up gates at Love Field

In the event that Congress passes legislation allowing airlines to serve a destination outside of the Wright Amendment approved cities, each airline will be forced to give up half of its Love Field gates for use by other airlines

Compromise is void if Congress does not enact the legislation by the last day of 2006

Source: (Farris II & Pohlen, 2006)

## **Through Ticketing**

By definition, through ticketing is “a mode of travel where a passenger can purchase one ticket and change between railway lines to complete the journey (dictionary.com, 2014).” In the case of the Wright Amendment compromise, this meant the airlines serving Love Field could assign passengers one ticket that would include a built in stop to one of cities within one of the states that was exempt from the Wright Amendment. These states included Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Kansas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Alabama (Five Party Compromise, 2008). In practical terms, a passenger could buy a one-way ticket to Chicago with a built in stop in New Orleans, without having to buy two tickets to complete the trip. Farris II & Pohlen (2006) argue that the through ticketing provision was amongst the limited stipulations in the compromise that benefitted the flying public and airlines because it made the transaction of buying tickets easier and more cost effective by reducing the amount of tickets.

## **Eight More Years of the Wright Amendment**

According to Farris II and Pohlen (2006), the Wright Amendment repeal compromise failed in that it continued Love Field restrictions for eight more years. Wang (2005) argues that if the intent of the Wright Amendment restrictions was to help fund and protect DFW from competition in order to ensure it would become the dominant airport in the region, than the restrictions should be lifted immediately, as DFW served 29 million passengers in 2005 versus 2.9 million enplaned passengers served at Love Field the same year (City of Dallas & SH&E/CAM, INC., 2015). DFW had become not only the dominant airport in the region, but a contender for the top ten busiest airports in the world (ACI, 2015). Farris II and Pohlen (2006) argue that restricting the Wright Amendment eight more years would further restrict airline competition in the Dallas region, resulting in increased airfares and decreased frequency of

flights for passengers. According to testimony from Honorable Jeb Hensarling (R-TX), [“an eight-year extension of the Wright Amendment translates into another \$5 billion loss to constituents”] (Farris II & Pohlen, 2006). Farris II and Pohlen (2006) argue that,

*“The compromise fails to explain how the eight-year extension will benefit the local or national community and fit into the national transportation system. Representatives from numerous states have expressed interest in the opportunity for air service from Southwest out of Love Field so their constituents can benefit from the “Southwest Effect” as well as the access to other locations”.*

Farris and Pohlen (2006) go on to suggest that the restrictions should be reduced and should last shorter than eight years in order to benefit the local passengers and the national airspace system.

### **Reduced Love Field Gates**

Pursuant with the 2001 Love Field Master Plan, the five party agreements included a permanent reduction of twelve gates, from 32 to 20 (DMJM/AECOM, 2006). According to Farris II & Pohlen (2006), Southwest Airlines saw the agreement as a way for the airline to keep a monopoly at Love Field for at least the next eight years. The allocation of gates in 2006 was split up between 3 airlines, 16 to Southwest Airlines, 2 to American Airlines, and 2 to ExpressJet Airlines Inc. (operating under the Continental Express name). Each gate was deemed as preferential use (each airline leases and has exclusive rights to use their gates) as it was not be subdivided with another airline (DMJM/AECOM, 2006). In the event of new commercial carriers seeking entry into the Love Market, airlines would have a voluntary option to accommodate that carrier (Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise, 2006). If no airline decided to accommodate the air carrier, The City of Dallas would force airlines to share their preferential use gates (Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise, 2006).

Farris II and Pohlen (2006) argue that allowing Southwest Airlines to dominate 80% of gates at Love Field, they become protected from any other competition. This inherent problem is exacerbated by other parts of the compromise that almost exclusively limit long-haul flights in the Dallas area to be operated by American Airlines out of DFW (Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise, 2006). This would negatively impact Dallas passengers by allowing Southwest Airlines and American Airlines to determine ticket prices for another eight years. Farris II and Pohlen (2006) quote Senator Jay Rockefeller,

*(“ For the first time in history, the congress will allow a local community to assign the number of gates at an airport to particular carriers. This action has the effect of sanctioning fortress hubs (Pg. 375).”)*

### **The Legend Terminal**

The compromise parties agreed to redevelop Love Field. The Love Field Modernization Program (LFMP) would modernize the main Love Field terminal as well as demolish the terminal building originally built for Legend Airlines (City of Dallas, 2008). The terminal was built for Legend Airlines in the late 1990's after the airline expressed interest in serving Love Field following the passage of Shelby Amendment (Farris II & Pohlen, 2006). In 2000, Legend Airlines went bankrupt and the City of Dallas took back responsibility of maintaining the terminal (Farris II & Pohlen, 2006). A spending limit of \$200 million and minimum of \$150 (in 2006 dollars), adjusted for inflation, would be enforced for the LFMP and supplemented by increased landing fees, space rental charges, and/or passenger facility charges (PFCs) (City of Dallas, 2008.) Farris II & Pohlen (2006) argue,

*“There appears to be little logic behind spending \$150 million to acquire and destroy some of the newest terminal facilities in the nation and then turn around to spend up to \$200 million to modernize other terminal facilities at the same airport (Pg. 376).”*

### **Restrict Commercial Passenger Service**

The signed five party contract contained an agreement requiring that both cities, Dallas and Fort Worth, oppose efforts to initiate commercial air service at any airport in an 80-mile radius of DFW to any city not exempt from the Wright Amendment restrictions other than DFW (Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise, 2006). Spaceports, and any service covered under Part 135 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (air taxi and charter operations), are exempt from this rule (Wright Amendment Compromise, 2006). The compromise also stated that the parties agree to not make an attempt to further modify the Wright Amendment by exempting more cities from the Wright Amendment restrictions in the eight-year period ending on October 13, 2014 (Wright Amendment Compromise, 2006).

Farris II and Pohlen (2006) argue that other airports in the region that would benefit from commercial airline service, including Collin County Regional Airport, would be negatively affected by this rule (Parris II & Pohlen, 2006). It would be impossible for the airport to gain new commercial airline service during that eight-year period.

### **Cons of the Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise**

The following bullet points outline the major cons of the Wright Amendment repeal compromise explained in this chapter:

- The Wright Amendment restrictions limited non-stop commercial flights on aircraft with more than 56 seats continued for eight years after the compromise;

- The compromise agreement permanently decreased the number of airline gates at Love Field from 32-20;
- The compromise parties agreed to demolish the Legend Airlines terminal building at Love Field along with six attached gates;
- The compromise parties agreed to limit new domestic commercial airline service in the Dallas area to only DFW until the official repeal of the Wright Amendment on October 13, 2014;
- International commercial passenger service is permanently limited to DFW in the Dallas region.

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS

#### PROS OF THE WRIGHT AMENDMENT REPEAL COMPROMISE

##### Background

Farris II and Pohlen (2006) argued that the only positive stipulation of the Wright Amendment repeal compromise is the provision for airlines serving Dallas Love to freely issue through ticketing. Through ticketing means that a passenger can buy one ticket for their entire trip, even when there is a stopover at a different city than the destination on the ticket. This was a win for passengers because previous to the compromise, passengers were issued tickets for every leg of the trip, for example, if a passenger was flying Southwest Airlines to Chicago Midway (MDW) with a stop at St. Louis Lambert (STL). Previous to the compromise, the passenger would receive one destination ticket for STL and one for MDW. The reduction in tickets increases passenger convenience and saves money for the airlines (Farris II and Pohlen, 2006).

The provisions in the compromise, explained in previous chapter, which extend the Wright Amendment restrictions for 8 more years, reduces gates and restricts competition, is where opponents arise. This comes to no surprise considering that the Wright Amendment had appeared to do its job ensuring growth at DFW, which had 29 million enplanements (passenger boardings) in 2005 (SH&E/CAM, INC., 2015). However, the Dallas Love Field Impact Analysis (2006), prepared by DMJM and AECOM, which was written for the City of Dallas to show the impacts of a “no Wright Amendment” scenario at Love Field, shows a positive impact from the Wright Amendment restrictions in regards to maintaining a balance between environmental impacts of Love Field to the surrounding community and the economic impact benefitting the

Dallas area (DMJM/AECOM, 2006). “While the efforts of airport management deserve much credit, a major reason for this balance has been a federal regulation known as the Wright Amendment (DMJM/AECOM, 2006).” This includes on-airport and off-airport impacts to the community. The Love Field Master Plan (2001) and the supporting Love Field Impact Analysis (2006) were developed in anticipation of a continuation of the Wright Amendment. The push to repeal the legislation, along with the prior ratifications of the amendment had thrown off the balance between economic impacts and environmental impacts that Love Field once maintained. In order to access the existing at projected balance between growth at Love Field and the environmental impacts including noise pollution, air pollution, and ground traffic impacts, agreed upon in the 2001 Master Plan, the 2006 Impact Analysis was written. The authors of the analysis included planners, engineers, scientists, and economists that were heavily involved in writing the 2001 Love Field Master Plan (DMJM/AECOM, 2006).

### **Analysis of Impacts of the Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise**

The analysis outlines these four areas that were studied with the purpose of assessing the impacts on Dallas Love field in the event of a repeal of the Wright Amendment:

- Airport noise;
- Ground traffic in the airport vicinity;
- Air quality; and
- Economic activity.

The impacts for each of the above areas were tested against two Love Field operational scenarios in the absence of the Wright Amendment, one with 32 airline gates and one with 20 airline gates.

*Table 2* indicates the forecasted increase in passenger and aircraft operations at Love Field in the absence of the Wright Amendment in 2020. The table shows the percentage of

increase in airport operations in 2020 under no Wright Amendment restrictions using both 32 and 20-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenarios. The table denotes that annual enplanements will increase by just over 40 percent in a 20-gate scenario and almost 100 percent in a 32-gate scenario. The table also shows that weekday seat totals would increase by over 53 percent in a 20-gate scenario and would jump to over 108 percent in a 32-gate scenario. It is clearly represented in the table that a 32 gate scenario would accommodate much more operational capacity than the alternative 20 gate scenario.

Table 2			
<i>Summary of Long-Term Forecasts (No Wright Amendment Scenario): 20 and 32 Gate Scenarios</i>			
2020 DAL 20 Gates	Gates	FAA Terminal Area Forecast	Percent Higher
Annual Enplanements	6,155,406	4,391,123	40.2%
Annual Airline Operations	135,947	96,102	41.5%
		April 2006 Official Airline Guide Forecast	
Turns Per Gate	10.4	7.9	31.7%
2020 DAL 32 Gates	Gates	FAA Terminal Area Forecast	Percent Higher
Annual Enplanements	8,757,139	4,391,123	99.4%
Annual Airline Operations	190,848	96,102	98.6%
		April 2006 Official Airline Guide Forecast	
Turns Per Gate	9.1	4.7	94.7%

Source: DMJM/AECOM, 2006

## Noise Impact

The methodology used in the Dallas Love Field Impact Analysis (2006) to calculate the difference in noise impacts between a 20-gate and 32-gate scenario was a comparison with the projected noise impacts in the 2001 Master Plan. Noise exposure is measured in decibels (dB) (DMJM/AECOM, 2006). A decibel is, “a unit used to express the intensity of a sound wave, equal to twenty times the common logarithm of the ratio of the pressure produced by the sound wave to a reference pressure (Dictionary.com, 2015).” DNL, or day-night average sound level, is measured using special sound equipment at different locations within a variety of different noise contours around the airport (DMJM/AECOM, 2006). *Table 3* indicates that noise exposure within the 65 dB areas are over four percent smaller in a 20-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario than the Master Plan 32-gate scenario. However, the impact of a 32-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario is four percent larger within the same 65dB contour. Based on the results of this noise study, a 20-gate scenario would result in less noise impacts to the surrounding community.

Table 3			
<i>Noise Impact Analysis</i>			
DESCRIPTION	WRIGHT AMENDMENT	NO WRIGHT AMENDMENT	
	32 Gates	20 Gates	32 Gates
Annual Airline Operations	182,804	135,947	190,848
Fleet Mix	Standard Jets Reconfigured (56 Seats) Regional Jets (50 Seats)	Standard Jets Reconfigured (56 Seats) Regional Jets (50 Seats)	Standard Jets, Longer Haul Routes
Noise Impact: DNL 65 dB Area	4.6 Sq. Miles	4.4 Sq. Miles	4.8 Sq. Miles
DNL 65 Impact (Population)	24,872	21,045	29,219

Source: DMJM/AECOM, 2006

### **Traffic Impacts**

The traffic projection in the Love Field Impact Analysis (2006) was done by analyzing twelve roadway intersections near Love Field (DMJM/AECOM). The traffic was estimated by using the non-airport traffic projections for the 2001 Master plan combined with the forecasted passenger activities from the study. *Table 4* shows that a 20-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario would result in just a slight increase in delay projected in the 2001 master plan. However, the 32-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario would increase impact from 41-seconds-per-vehicle-per-intersection to 74 seconds, or 89%. Additionally, the P.M. delays would be twice that of A.M. delays deeming five of the twelve intersections at over-capacity during

those times. Based on these results, a 20-gate scenario would result in the least amount of traffic impacts to the Love Field Area.

DESCRIPTION	WRIGHT AMENDMENT	NO WRIGHT AMENDMENT	
	32 Gates	20 Gates	32 Gates
2020 Originating Passengers	4.49 Million	4.62 Million	6.57 Million
2020 Average Delay (Sec.) per Vehicle per Intersection (PM Peak Hour)	39	41	74

Source: DMJM/AECOM, 2006

### **Air Quality Impacts**

Air quality was evaluated using an updated forecast compared with the 2001 Master Plan 32-gate scenario (DMJM/AECOM, 2006). The method of conducting air quality projections for the Master Plan update was the use of the Emission Dispersion Modeling System (EDMS) Version 3.2. In order to standardize the results with the 2006 numbers, the results from the Master Plan were updated using the latest Version of the EDMS (Version 4.4). The pollutants observed in the analysis include Nitrous Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), Carbon Monoxides (CO), Hydrocarbons, Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), SO<sub>x</sub>, Particle Pollution (PM<sub>10</sub>), and Particle Pollution (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) (DMJM/AECOM, 2006).

The results show that a 20-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario would emit less nitrous oxide and carbon emissions than the 32-gate Master Plan scenario. In contrast, the 32-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario would emit 12 percent more NO<sub>x</sub> emissions and exceed emissions pollution in the 32-gate Wright Amendment scenario in the Master Plan for

Hydrocarbons, CO, SO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. These results clearly show that a 20-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario would emit less pollution into the surrounding community than the countering 32-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario.

### Passenger Traffic Analysis

Despite the eight year continuation of restrictions on Love Field, limiting non-stop flights to cities within Texas and eight other states set forth by the Wright Amendment repeal compromise, operations and passenger traffic increased in that period. *Table 5* indicates that between 2006 and 2013, enplaned passenger traffic increased over 23 percent.

Table 5			
<i>Analysis of Passenger Traffic and Air Carrier Operations 2006-2013</i>			
YEAR	AIR CARRIER OPERATIONS	ENPLANED PASSENGERS (Millions)	TOTAL ANNUAL PASSENGERS (Millions)
2006	86,772	3.44	6.87
2007	91,354	3.98	7.95
2008	95,238	4.03	8.06
2009	89,594	3.89	7.74
2010	87,193	4.00	7.96
2011	87,063	4.00	7.98
2012	87,726	4.10	8.17
<u>2013</u>	<u>88,028</u>	<u>4.25</u>	<u>8.47</u>
% Change 2006-2013	1.45%	23.55%	23.29%
2014	91,138	4.72	9.41

Source: FAA Air Traffic Activity Data System (ATADS), 2015

## Economic Activity

To forecast economic activity, the Dallas Love Field Impact Analysis (2006) used a variety of sources, including the economic impact analysis developed for the 2001 Love Field Master Plan, and regional economic data in the U.S. Department of Commerce Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS-II) (DMJM/AECOM, 2006).

*Table 6* shows the total regional economic impact of Dallas Love Field under the three scenarios outlined in this chapter. It is important to understand the factors that make up the total economic impact. According to the American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) (2013), there are three primary types of airport economic impact: Direct; Indirect; and Induced. Direct economic impact relates to the actual salaries paid to airport employees and the sales revenue gained from airport businesses. Indirect economic impact relates to the revenue gained by passenger or other users of the airport in the community (lodging, restaurants, and rental cars). Induced economic impact, also called the multiplier effect, attempts to calculate the turnover of money spent in the community to better measure the total economic impact. AAAE (2013) states,

*” For instance, an airport construction project results in expenditures to a local construction company. The company hires additional employees, and together each makes purchases in the community. The increased demand for goods and services results in additional employees being hired and goods being bought. The cycle then repeats itself (pg. 38).”*

The results in *Table 6* show that in both a 20-gate and 32-gate “no Wright Amendment” scenario, total economic impact will be greater than the scenario outlined in the 2001 Love Field Master Plan. While, it is apparent that more gates should increase the ability of the airport to

handle more operations, thus, increasing economic impact, the balance between spurring economic growth and environmental regulations is imperative (DMJM/AECOM, 2006).

Table 6			
<i>Economic Impact Analysis</i>			
DESCRIPTION	WRIGHT AMENDMENT	NO WRIGHT AMENDMENT	
	32 Gates	20 Gates	32 Gates
TOTAL Regional Economic Impact (In Dollars)	4.3 Million	6.1 Million	8.6 Million

Source: DMJM/AECOM, 2006

### **Dallas Love Modernization Program**

In 2008, the city of Dallas, along with the help of consultants, drafted the Terminal Area Redevelopment Program Study (TARPS) and Revised Capital Improvement (C.I.P.) in 2008, to assess future facility developments at Love Field. The TARPS and CIP report was based on the restrictions in the agreement in 2006 to repeal the Wright Amendment. The facility requirements were based on the largest aircraft that regularly operates at the airport and the average number of aircraft turns per gate (City of Dallas, 2008). The design criteria determined the need to handle a Boeing 737-700 with 137 seats and with an average of 10 turns-per-gate using 20 gates.

The TARPS (2008) outlined the following construction initiatives in order to obtain a Level of Service “C” (LOS-C). LOC-C, according to DMJM (2006) is a metric used to determine peak time traffic impacts at various intersections surrounding the airport. It ensures stable flows of passengers through the terminal facility, acceptable delays, and good comfort level for passenger:

- Demolish East, North and West Concourses and replace with one combined concourse with 20 gates

- New ticket hall
- Expanded bag claim and curbside
- Terminal renovation
- Layout efficiency contributes to passenger convenience

According to the Dallas Love Field website (2015), the construction was completed in time for the repeal of the Wright Amendment in October of 2014. The LFMP doubled the space for airport concessions thus, providing more options for passengers (Dallas Love Field Website, 2015).

It is apparent that part of the eight-year cap on the Wright Amendment was not an ambiguous decision; it was carefully thought out to allow time for the Love Field Modernization Plan to be developed and built before an appeal of the Wright Amendment. The existing infrastructure was built under a Wright Amendment scenario, which could not handle the capacity of a “no Wright Amendment” scenario even with the reduced amount of gates. The eight extra years was enough time to complete the project and prepare for the increased capacity demands of the Wright Amendment repeal.

### **A Glance at Dallas Love Following the Repeal of the Wright Amendment**

The first flight to operate on the day of the Wright Amendment repeal was Southwest Airlines flight 1013 to Denver on October 13, 2014. In December of 2014, one million passengers traveled through Dallas Love Field, an increase of 46.5 percent from December 2013 (Dallas Morning News, 2015). As of February, 2015, the 20-gates are split up three ways: Southwest leasing sixteen gates; United Airlines leasing two gates; and Virgin America operating two gates they acquired after US Airways was required to give up those gates as a stipulation to their merger with American Airlines. Delta currently operates 5 daily departures to

Atlanta using one of the United gates (Wilsonsky, 2014), and Seaport airlines operates two-daily flight to El Dorado using one of Virgin America's gates (Bachman, 2014). However, a report in the Dallas Morning News (2015) states that United Airlines will move all of their Love Field based flights over to DFW in March 2015, leaving two gates open. Southwest announced in February 2015, that they will lease those gates, which brings their gate total up to eighteen. Southwest Airlines, in early 2015, already operates to 17 cities outside of the Wright Amendment area and has boosted daily flight numbers from 118 before the repeal to 153 since the repeal (Maxon, 2015). *Table 7* shows a list of new destination cities operated by Southwest Airlines following the Wright Amendment repeal.

Table 7
<i>New Southwest Destinations from DAL</i>
BEGINNING OCTOBER 13, 2014
Baltimore/Washington (BWI) Denver (DEN) Las Vegas (LAS) Orlando (MCO) Chicago Midway (MDW)
BEGINNING NOVEMBER 2, 2014
Atlanta (ATL) Nashville (BNA) Washington, D.C. (Reagan National) (DCA) Ft. Lauderdale/Hollywood (FLL) Los Angeles (LAX) New York LaGuardia (LGA) Phoenix (PHX) San Diego (SAN) Orange County/Santa Ana (SNA) Tampa (TPA)
BEGINNING APRIL 2015
Boston (BOS) Columbus (CMH) Charlotte (CLT) Charleston (CHS) Detroit (DTW) Indianapolis (IND) Little Rock (LIT) Memphis (MEM) Milwaukee (MKE) Omaha (OMA) Panama City, FL (ECP) Philadelphia (PHL) Pittsburgh (PIT) Portland (PDX) Raleigh/Durham (RDU) Sacramento (SMF) Salt Lake City (SLC) San Jose, CA (SJC) Seattle (SEA)

Source: Southwest Airlines Website, 2015

Despite the anticipated increase in service to passengers, there still lies an inherent problem at Love Field. Just one month after the Wright Amendment repeal, the airport is already seeing capacity constraints. On Thanksgiving 2014, the 4,000 parking spaces at Love Field were completely filled leaving passengers with limited parking options (Young, 2014). According to Young (2014), the City of Dallas plans to build another parking facility with 4,000 spaces to accommodate future growth at Love Field.

In 2021, the new Dallas Love Field Master plan will be completed (City of Dallas, 2015). There will be no change in the number of gates at Love Field. Major changes will consist of a parking expansion project to increase the number of parking spaces available to passengers and the conversion of existing runway 18/36 into a taxiway to accommodate better airfield efficiency (City of Dallas, 2015).

### **Pros of the Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise**

The following bullet points outline the major pros of the Wright Amendment repeal compromise:

- Enplaned passenger traffic and airline operations increased by 23 percent during the eight year period (2006-2014) after the Wright Amendment repeal compromise was signed in to law;
- Noise impacts to the Love Field area were projected to decrease by 15 percent;
- Air pollution impacts to the Love Field area were projected to stay at an acceptable level that was defined in the 2001 Love Field Master Plan;
- Roadway congestion impacts near Love Field were projected at an acceptable level that was defined in the 2001 Love Field Master Plan;

- The Dallas Love Field Modernization Program has doubled the terminal space for concessions, modernized all twenty gates, expanded baggage claim and curbside areas, and increased the layout efficiency to contribute to passenger convenience.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **CONCLUSION**

#### **What is the Wright Amendment and why was it Passed?**

The Wright Amendment of 1979 was passed in order to protect the investment of newly built DFW by restricting commercial airline flights from Love Field. The initial Amendment restricted airlines from operating non-stop flights to any city outside Texas and its bordering states. With the passage of the Shelby Amendment in 1997, Kansas, Mississippi, and Alabama also became exempt from the Wright Amendment restrictions.

#### **Why was the Wright Amendment Repealed and What Were the Stipulations of the Repeal Compromise?**

By 2006, DFW had become one of the busiest airports in the world and Southwest Airlines started a campaign to repeal the Wright Amendment. A five-part agreement was made between Southwest Airlines, the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth, American Airlines, and the DFW Airport Board for a full repeal of the Wright Amendment under certain stipulations. The stipulations include:

- Through ticketing may be offered by airlines flying out of Love Field;
- The Wright amendment must be repealed after eight years (October 13, 2014);
- International airline flights are permanently restricted to only DFW in the Dallas area;
- Love Field must permanently reduce gate capacity from 32 to 20 gates;
- A noise curfew must be instated at Love Field between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m.;
- Love Field must demolish its Legend terminal consisting of 6 gates, plus modernize the main terminal within eight years at a minimum cost of \$150 million;

- During the eight years, the two cities must oppose any efforts to initiate airline service at Love Field to cities outside of the Wright Amendment exempt states;
- Congress may not exempt additional states from the Wright Amendment;
- If any airline adds service at another airport in the region other than DFW (and Dallas Love before October 13, 2014) before 2025, they will be forced to give up gates at Love Field;
- In the event that Congress passes legislation allowing airlines to serve a destination outside of the Wright Amendment approved cities, each airline will be forced to give up half of its Love Field gates for use by other airlines;
- Compromise is void if Congress does not enact the legislation by the last day of 2006.

#### **What are the Possible Impacts of the Repeal of the Wright Amendment?**

Many of the stipulations in the Wright Amendment Compromise were based off an impact study done by DMJM and AECOM (2006) outlining the possible impacts of repealing the Wright Amendment. The study compared three gate scenarios, 20-gate and 32-gate configurations in the absence of the Wright Amendment, and the original 32-gate configuration under the Wright Amendment which Love Field was built for. The 2006 report discussed four main impacts resulting from each configuration:

- Airport noise;
- Ground traffic in the airport vicinity;
- Air quality; and
- Economic activity.

Based on the Dallas Love Field Impact Analysis (2006), a 20-gate scenario under an absence of the Wright Amendment would result in the least amount noise, ground traffic, and air quality impacts while still allowing for economic activity to increase in the Dallas region.

In order to meet the demands of the stipulations, the Terminal Area Redevelopment Program Study (TARPS) 2008 was written to plan for reducing Love Field gate-capacity from 32 to 20-gates, demolishing the Legend terminal, building a new ticket hall, renovating the main Love Field terminal, and changing the layout of the terminal to increase passenger convenience.

### **What are the Pros and Cons of the Wright Amendment Repeal Compromise?**

The major pros of the Wright Amendment repeal compromise are outlined in the following bullet points:

- Enplaned passenger traffic and airline operations increased by 23 percent during the eight year period (2006-2014) after the Wright Amendment repeal compromise was signed in to law;
- Noise impacts to the Love Field area were projected to decrease by 15 percent;
- Air pollution impacts to the Love Field area were projected to stay at an acceptable level that was defined in the 2001 Love Field Master Plan;
- Roadway congestion impacts near Love Field were projected at an acceptable level that was defined in the 2001 Love Field Master Plan;
- The Dallas Love Field Modernization Program has doubled the terminal space for concessions, modernized all twenty gates, expanded baggage claim and curbside areas, and increased the layout efficiency to contribute to passenger convenience.

The major cons of the Wright Amendment repeal compromise are outlined in the following bullet points:

- The Wright Amendment restrictions limited non-stop commercial flights on aircraft with more than 56 seats continued for eight years after the compromise;
- The compromise agreement permanently decreased the number of airline gates at Love Field from 32-20;
- The compromise parties agreed to demolish the Legend Airlines terminal building at Love Field along with six attached gates;
- The compromise parties agreed to limit new domestic commercial airline service in the Dallas area to only DFW until the official repeal of the Wright Amendment on October 13, 2014;
- International commercial passenger service is permanently limited to DFW in the Dallas region.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

It is the hope of the author that this research will either be expanded upon or used as a jump-off point for another study. The following bullet points are suggests for further topics related to this paper:

- A study of the economic and environmental impacts at Dallas Love Field following the Wright Amendment repeal;
- Analysis of the effects on DFW economic impact, aircraft operations, and passenger number following the Wright Amendment Repeal;
- A comparison study between Dallas Love Field and other secondary airports (E.G. Chicago Midway and Houston Hobby);
- A forecast of growth at Love Field providing recommendations on how to ensure airport noise, ground traffic, air quality, and economic activity balance;
- A financial comparison between Dallas Love Field under Wright Amendment restrictions and without;
- Analysis of average airfares in the Dallas region before and after the Wright Amendment restrictions;
- A study of how the Wright Amendment repeal may impact American Airlines' operations at DFW with increased competition from Southwest Airlines at Dallas Love Field.

## REFERENCES

- S.3661 - Wright Amendment Reform Act of 2006. (2006, October 13). Retrieved November 8, 2014, from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/109th-congress/senate-bill/3661/titles>
- 49 USC 1301-International Air Transportation Act of 1979 Section 29. (1980, February 15). Retrieved March 3, 2014 from <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-94/pdf/STATUTE-94-Pg35.pdf>
- Ahles, A. (2014, October 4). DFW, Love Field get makeovers in time for end of Wright Amendment. *Star-Telegram*. Retrieved October 7, 2014, from <http://www.star-telegram.com/news/business/article3876055.html>
- ACI Airport Statistics and Data Center. (2014, January 1). Retrieved January 8, 2015, from <http://www.aci.aero/Data-Centre>
- American Association of Airport Executives. (2013). *Legislative Affairs, Marketing and communications, & Air Service Development*. Fifth Edition
- Bachman, J. (2014, October 8). Airlines Let Sharp Elbows Fly in Dallas Love Field Reshuffle. Retrieved February 12, 2015, from <http://www.bloomberg.com/bw/articles/2014-10-08/airlines-let-sharp-elbows-fly-in-dallas-love-field-reshuffle>
- CAPA Centre For Aviation. Southwest Airlines projects 6% capacity growth in CY2015 as long haul from Dallas ramps up. (2014, November 14). Retrieved November 20, 2014, from <http://centreforaviation.com/analysis/southwest-airlines-projects-6-capacity-growth-in-cy2015-as-long-haul-from-dallas-ramps-up-197468>
- Contract Among the City of Dallas, the City of Fort Worth, Southwest Airlines Co., American Airlines, Inc., and the DFW International Airport Board Incorporating the Substance of

- the Terms of the June 15, 2006 Joint Statement Between the Parties to Resolve the “Wright Amendment” Issues. (2006, January 1). Retrieved February 4, 2015, from [http://www.lovefieldmodernizationprogram.com/docs/FINAL\\_EXECUTED-ContractToResolveTheWrightAmendmentIssues.pdf](http://www.lovefieldmodernizationprogram.com/docs/FINAL_EXECUTED-ContractToResolveTheWrightAmendmentIssues.pdf)
- Chang, K. (2014, July 12). How Southwest Airlines Beat the Wright Amendment. Retrieved September 30, 2014, from <http://www.cnbc.com/id/43714139>
- DMJM/AECOM & City of Dallas. (2006, May 31). Dallas Love Field Impact Analysis Update In The Absence of the Wright Amendment. DMJM/AECOM. Retrieved February 6, 2015 from <http://www.dallas-lovefield.com/pdf/WrightImpactReport.pdf>
- DMJM & City of Dallas. (2008, June 25). *The Terminal Area Redevelopment Program Study (TARPS)*. Retrieved February 4, 2015, from [http://www.dallas-lovefield.com/pdf/dal\\_tarps.pdf](http://www.dallas-lovefield.com/pdf/dal_tarps.pdf)
- Dallas Love & City of Dallas. (2001, March 30). Dallas Love Field Airport Impact Analysis /Master Plan Technical Report. Retrieved February 4, 2015, from <http://www.dallas-lovefield.com/pdf/masterplan/Cover-TOC.pdf>
- Maxon, T. *Dallas Love Field Carries Over a Million Passenger in December*. (2015, January 1). *The Dallas Morning News*. Retrieved February 10, 2015, from <http://www.dallasnews.com/business/airline-industry/20150125-dallas-love-field-carries-over-a-million-passengers-in-december.ece>
- Dallas Love Field Website. (2015). *Resources-Passenger Statistics*. Retrieved January 15, 2015, from [http://www.dallas-lovefield.com/resources-traffic-statistics\\_current.html](http://www.dallas-lovefield.com/resources-traffic-statistics_current.html)

Dallas/ Fort Worth International Airport. (2009). *DFW Airport Development Plan Update*.

Retrieved on February 6, 2015, from

[https://www.dfwairport.com/cs/groups/webcontent/documents/webasset/p1\\_056466.pdf](https://www.dfwairport.com/cs/groups/webcontent/documents/webasset/p1_056466.pdf)

Federal Aviation Administration Air Traffic Activity Data System (ATADS). (2015). Retrieved

March 01, 2015 from: <https://aspm.faa.gov/opsnet/sys/Main.asp>

Federal Aviation Administration Website. (2015). Retrieved on January 09, 2015 from

[http://www.faa.gov/airports/planning\\_capacity/passenger\\_allcargo\\_stats/passenger/?year=2006](http://www.faa.gov/airports/planning_capacity/passenger_allcargo_stats/passenger/?year=2006)

Farris II, T., & Pohlen, T. (2006). Deregulation Delayed Is Deregulation Denied: Appealing the

Wright Amendment. *Transportation Journal*, 45(4), 67-71. Retrieved October 1, 2014,

from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20713655>

Farris II, T., & Pohlen, T. (2006). Tribulations in Effort to Reach a Compromise for the Wright

Amendment (A Follow-Up). *Journal of Transportation Law, Logistics and Policy*, 73(3),

371-380. Retrieved November 17, 2014, from <http://trid.trb.org/view.aspx?id=792689>

Farris II, T., & Swartz, S. (2006). The Wright Amendment: Time for Repeal: A Policy Issue

Note. *Transportation Journal*, Volume 45, Pgs. 52-60. Retrieved November 17, 2014,

from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20713625>

Freiberg, K., & Freiberg, J. (1996). *Nuts! Southwest Airlines' Crazy Recipe for Business and Personal Success*. Austin, Texas: Bard Press.

Kaskovich, S. (2014, November 1). What Free Love Means For Dallas Airfares. *D Magazine*.

Retrieved December 15, 2014, from: [http://www.dmagazine.com/publications/d-](http://www.dmagazine.com/publications/d-ceo/2014/november/wright-amendment-free-love-dallas-fort-worth-airfare)

[ceo/2014/november/wright-amendment-free-love-dallas-fort-worth-airfare](http://www.dmagazine.com/publications/d-ceo/2014/november/wright-amendment-free-love-dallas-fort-worth-airfare)

- Leatherwood, A. (2010). Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport. *Texas State Historical Foundation*. Retrieved May 3, 2015, from <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/epd01>
- Maxon, T. (2014, October 14). Win-win? Both American Airlines and Southwest Airlines say they're doing well in the wake of the Wright amendment's end. *The Dallas Morning News*. Retrieved October 27, 2014, from <http://aviationblog.dallasnews.com/2014/10/win-win-both-american-airlines-and-southwest-airlines-say-theyre-doing-well-in-the-wake-of-the-wright-amendments-end.html/>
- Maxon, T. (2014, September 16). AA president: Opening up Dallas Love Field will hurt us a bit. *The Dallas Morning News*. Retrieved September 18, 2014, from <http://www.dallasnews.com/business/airline-industry/20140916-aa-president-opening-up-dallas-love-field-will-hurt-us-a-bit.ece>
- Maxon, T. (2014, October 11). [Http://aviationblog.dallasnews.com/2014/10/ceo-gary-kelly-opening-up-love-field-will-be-a-big-bang-for-southwest-airlines.html/](http://aviationblog.dallasnews.com/2014/10/ceo-gary-kelly-opening-up-love-field-will-be-a-big-bang-for-southwest-airlines.html/). *The Dallas Morning News*. Retrieved October 27, 2014, from <http://aviationblog.dallasnews.com/2014/10/ceo-gary-kelly-opening-up-love-field-will-be-a-big-bang-for-southwest-airlines.html/>
- Schnurman, M. (2014, October 11). Post-Wright agenda: More freedom to fly. *The Dallas Morning News*. Retrieved October 27, 2014, from <http://www.dallasnews.com/business/columnists/mitchell-schnurman/20141011-post-wright-agenda-more-freedom-to-fly.ece>

SH&E/CAM, INC. (2006) Analysis of Existing Conditions: Prepared for Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport. Retrieved March 17, 2015 from:

[https://www.dfwairport.com/cs/groups/webasset/documents/webasset/p1\\_011844.pdf](https://www.dfwairport.com/cs/groups/webasset/documents/webasset/p1_011844.pdf)

Southwest Airline Website. (2015). Retrieved on February 12, 2015, from

<http://southwest.investorroom.com/index.php?s=43&item=1863>

Wang, J. (2005). Comment: Time for Congress to Spread the Love in the Air: Why the Wright

Amendment was Wrong Before, and why it Deserves Repeal Today. *Southern Methodist University School of Law Journal of Air Law and Commerce*, 70 *J. Air L. & Com.* 353, 1-37. Retrieved November 17, 2014, from

[http://www.ccsb.com/Publications/BankruptcyGroup/Wright\\_Amendment.pdf](http://www.ccsb.com/Publications/BankruptcyGroup/Wright_Amendment.pdf)

Wilonsky, R. Delta Air Lines cuts deal with Dallas, United to remain at Love Field for 180 days

(for now). (2015, January 8). *The Dallas Morning News*. Retrieved February 4, 2015, from <http://cityhallblog.dallasnews.com/2015/01/delta-air-lines-cuts-deal-with-dallas-united-to-remain-at-love-field-for-180-days-for-now.html/>

Young, S. (2014, December 8). After Thanksgiving Parking Nightmare, Love Field to Add 4,000 Spots. Retrieved January 12, 2015, from

[http://blogs.dallasobserver.com/unfairpark/2014/12/after\\_thanksgiving\\_parking\\_nightmare\\_love\\_field\\_to\\_add\\_4000\\_spots.php](http://blogs.dallasobserver.com/unfairpark/2014/12/after_thanksgiving_parking_nightmare_love_field_to_add_4000_spots.php)

VITA  
Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University

Andrew Michael Cohler

cohlerandrew@gmail.com

Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
Bachelor of Science, Aviation Management, May 2013

Research Paper Title:

THE “WRIGHT” MOVE FOR LOVE: A PROS AND CONS REVIEW OF THE WRIGHT  
AMENDMENT REPEAL COMPROMISE

Major Professor: Dr. David A. NewMyer