

EPISODE 266

[00:00:08] IP: Hello and welcome to episode 226 of AvTalk. I am Ian Petchenik. Here as always with –

[00:00:17] JR: Jason Rabinowitz. Hello, Ian.

[00:00:19] IP: Hello, Jason. How are you, sir?

[00:00:21] JR: I'm good. It's hot here in the greater Washington, D.C. area. But it's nice and cold in my hotel room. I'm happy.

[00:00:29] IP: That's good to hear. Yeah, Jason's traveling once again to the lovely area of Dulles this week. We've got a kind of abbreviated show. But we'll see how much we can get out of it. Not a huge week as far as goings on go. We're in the doldrums of summer, which I'm enjoying a bit. It's hot here today and about 200 humidity. The weather report concludes, thusly.

[00:00:54] JR: It's hot everywhere except the Southern hemisphere. They get a pass right now.

[00:00:58] IP: Yes. That is true. But before we kind of dive into the news. Jason, the movie Midnight Run recently celebrated its 35th anniversary. Have you ever seen Midnight Run?

[00:01:08] JR: I don't think so.

[00:01:09] IP: It's a great movie and it's definitely one of my favorite movies that involves extensive aviation scenes. And there's three really good aviation-centric scenes. But the movie's not ostensibly about aviation. That got me thinking about some of your favorite movies that have aviation in them but aren't like airplane or airport or focused on the actual plane itself or something like that. Just kind of tangentially. But they're really good.

[00:01:40] JR: So, not Die Hard 2 taking place entirely here at the beautiful Dulles International Airport.

[00:01:45] IP: I think Die Hard 2 would – there's so much of the movie taking place in the actual airport. I'm sure that that one might not count. So something to think about if you have nothing else off the top of your head. If you have any tangentially-related aviation movies, email us at podcast@fr24.com.

But I saw that come across that it was celebrating its 35th anniversary. And I remembered there's a great – a really good scene with Robert De Niro and Charles Grodin in a 747 in first-class. It's a really good scene. I'll put a link in the show notes to see. And you guys can check it out.

[00:02:19] JR: You'll have to give me a heads up next time to think about that question.

[00:02:22] IP: No. I didn't want to. Because I wanted it to be – I wanted to see if you had any that popped immediately to mind. But now you can go and think about it.

[00:02:27] JR: No. My answer is still Die Hard 2.

[00:02:30] IP: All right. We'll stick with it then. We've got a bit of a problem. And by we, I mean, RTX, which is the company formerly known as Raytheon, which is the parent company of Pratt & Whitney. Because yesterday they announced that they are recalling up to 1200 of the 3000 PW1100G engines that they have thus far produced.

[00:02:54] JR: Huh. A recall is not a term we hear too often.

[00:02:58] IP: No. And it's not like stop flying, take them off the wings and send us the engines back. It's not a total recall.

[00:03:06] JR: Ah. I get it. There're no airplanes in that movie.

[00:03:10] IP: None. But the issue here is that the high-pressure discs possibly contaminated from the manufacturing process. There's a powder that goes into the metal as they manufacture these high-pressure turbine discs. And there is the possibility that many of these discs are contaminated.

And so, they're saying that they need to be inspected much sooner than their initial modeling had shown. They're saying 1200 of the 3000 engines. Already 10% of the PW1100G fleet, which powers the A320neo, has been grounded for fixing those defect issues and then not being able to get them into service as quickly as they want to because there's just a lack of qualified service technicians.

But on that front, there's actually some good news. Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Aero Engines, or MHIAEL, they put in the acronym in their naming. Though, I'm not sure why.

[00:04:22] JR: I'm not sure it helps really at all that.

[00:04:24] IP: Yeah. That doesn't – I'm not, "Oh, MHIAEL. Oh, yeah. Yeah, of course. Of course." They are now certified. They've performed their first maintenance visit on the PW1100G-JM. And the -JM has been around. But we don't really use it. And I thought to myself, "What does the JM stand for?" Jason, do you know?

[00:04:46] JR: Just maintenance. It's one of the Pratt & Whitney engines where you can only do maintenance on it. You can't ever fly it.

[00:04:55] IP: Oh, no. No, you didn't. The – just maintenance. That's – I don't know why I'm laughing. This is –

[00:05:04] JR: Not the answer you expected I'm sure.

[00:05:07] IP: It's not. JM is a combination of Japan Aero Engines Corporation, MTU Aero Engines, which collaborated to work on the engine initially when it was announced. The JM recognizes their collaboration with Pratt & Whitney on this particular engine. There's your bit of – I don't know if it's useless. But near useless aviation trivia for the day.

Other Pratt & Whitney news is that they have taken for the quarter a \$181 million charge because of Go First's cessation of operations. The RTXs did not specify the airline by name. But

they said a major customer that went and said – there were enough hints for, I think, anyone to work out that it was in fact Go First.

[00:05:57] JR: Didn't even need to read between the lines on that one.

[00:05:59] IP: No. No. There were clear hints. Go First is currently grounded. But they have gotten the go-ahead to restart their operations, which sounds great.

[00:06:17] JR: Might be a little too late for that.

[00:06:19] IP: Yeah. Here's the thing. They've gotten the approval for their plan. But the approval from India's Director General of Civil Aviation includes a number of stipulations. And those stipulations are going to be hard to meet.

[00:06:37] JR: What are they?

[00:06:38] IP: First, they have to secure interim funding.

[00:06:41] JR: Okay. That's a tricky one.

[00:06:42] IP: That's I think that probably the biggest one or at least the second biggest one. As we talked about I think a couple of weeks ago at this point, Go First put out a tender that said, "Hey, does anyone want to buy us?" That tender is out until the 9th of August. If you're interested in purchasing Go First, you have until the 9th of August to express your interest.

They say that they will publish a list of who wants to buy them no less than 10 days later. At that point, there will be a round of bidding and maybe somebody else will own Go First when it's all said and done. That's the first thing. They have to secure funding.

But they also have to have the civil aviation authority in India approve all of their routes. And all of the aircraft that they want to bring back into service must be airworthy. Makes sense. They have to pass inspection. Makes sense. And they have to complete a satisfactory test flight. That all makes sense.

Then there's the fact that all of the legal challenges to their restart of operations needs to be resolved. So, that becomes very difficult because Go First lessors filed this week to deregister all of the airlines' aircraft.

[00:08:06] JR: All of them. That's not great. That's probably going to take a little while to resolve.

[00:08:11] IP: It doesn't seem like they are particularly interested in working things out. They don't seem to have a lot of confidence in Go First's ability to return to the air. And the DGCA received applications from lessors for their 54 aircraft, 49 A320neos and five COs so hat lessors could in fact get their aircraft back.

It doesn't look like Go First – it seems to be, and as days go by, a longer and longer shot that they will get back into the air. I don't think barring some sort of financial miracle. Perhaps some sort of white knight riding in and rescuing the airline or a merger or something. I don't see Go First returning to the skies anytime soon at least in its current form. I guess we'll continue to follow the story.

[00:09:09] JR: Too bad.

[00:09:09] IP: Yeah. It really is too bad. The model was good. And I think like when you write a book about aviation in the teens and 20s, and I'm sure Jason's already deep into his fourth chapter of said book, you're going to look at Airlines like Norwegian and go first and go, "They had a good idea. They stretched a little too far. And then, or also, something outside their control really just kind of was the death now."

[00:09:42] JR: Not to harp back on Norwegian. That was definitely the case for Norwegian where external factors really crushed their hopes and dreams and they never quite recovered. But Go First is just almost purely attributable to this one thing. Engines do not work on their aircraft. They cannot fly half their fleet. They cannot make money. Run out of money. Lessors want their airplanes back. End of story.

But it really seems like the terms and conditions to bring them back seem really stacked against them at this point almost to the point where it's very unlikely to happen.

[00:10:18] IP: And I completely understand the DGCA's position here, where we don't want an airline to restart operations, to get people back, to have airplanes that might not be safe, to start selling tickets to the public to only then two weeks later say, "Okay, we're out of money again." And then how many more people have been negatively impacted?

[00:10:37] JR: And it's not like Norwegian, to bring them up again, where they flew a little too close to the sun, I guess you could say, and try to expand their ambition with long haul and then the 787 issues happen. In this case, Go First, all they did was fly mostly A320neos regionally or even domestically in India. And it's not like they have another operation to fall back on. Because Norwegian still exists. It still operates. We just talked about them a couple weeks ago purchasing another carrier. In this case, there is nothing for Go First to fall back to except – I don't know. Maybe selling their in-flight catered meals on the ground. We've seen airlines do that to make some money during COVID. But that probably won't pay the leases for all of those aircraft.

[00:11:24] IP: No. I don't think that's going to work out in the long run for them. Let's head to Italy where a Delta Airlines 767 flew through a hail storm shortly after departing Milan earlier this week on the 24th of July. So, on Monday. Delta flight 185 from Milan to New York diverted to Rome after flying through a hailstorm on departure and landed pretty busted up.

The photos of the damage showed a completely smashed radome, leading edges of both wings, punctures in the right wing, damage to the engines and the windscreen. But fortunately, no one was injured.

[00:12:03] JR: It's a 767. It's just a flesh wound. No big deal.

[00:12:06] IP: They could have made it to New York.

[00:12:07] JR: Yeah. I'd love to know. And I'm sure there will be an investigation to look into why the crew either chose to fly through this storm or ended up having to fly through this storm. I'm

sure there might be air traffic control. Reasons why they just were able to deviate around it. But typically, we don't see damage quite that extensive. Usually, it's, "Oh, maybe the windshield is busted or the radome, which is designed to crumple apart and break away, gets busted up." But this damage is really quite extensive.

And we never want to say, "Oh, this aircraft is going to be scrapped." Because we'll be proven wrong a million times when we say that. But this is an old aircraft. There may be a chance that Delta doesn't even want to fix even if it can. We'll have to keep our eye on that.

[00:12:52] IP: It's only 26-years-old.

[00:12:54] JR: Oh, in that case, it's got another at least 15 years with Delta.

[00:12:58] IP: And then another 25 with Amazon or somebody else. Yeah.

[00:13:00] JR: With a cargo. Yeah. I think Delta said they're keeping them around until at least another few years. I don't know. We'll see what happens with it. But it might be a while.

[00:13:11] IP: This particular incident happened pretty much right after takeoff. I mean, they were still climbing. Things happened quickly. And I wonder if because they were still climbing if the guidance from air traffic control on the climb out, if the weather was changing quickly. I'm not exactly sure. But it'll be interesting to see why this happened or the particular circumstances that led to this. Because it is quite rare these days to see an aircraft fly through a hailstorm quite this bad. I mean, to see the radome completely smashed. Usually, if they fly through a hail, you see some slight damage. But this is like a gaping hole in the radome. You can see the entire weather radar.

[00:13:54] JR: Makes it easy to get in there and service it.

[00:13:57] IP: Yeah. It's a convertible now.

[00:14:00] JR: Yep. But thankfully, no one was injured. Not that you would think that anyone would be injured in this situation. But we'll keep our eye on that aircraft. You know what? I'm going to set an alert for this aircraft and see when or if it operates ever again.

[00:14:12] IP: All right. And just to let folks following along at home know, the aircraft itself is a Boeing 767-300ER. The registration is N189erDN. There you go.

[00:14:30] JR: I've been on that aircraft. Now I have skin in the game here.

[00:14:32] IP: Now you have a vested interest.

[00:14:34] JR: Yes, I do. I flew it in 2016 from – it looks like JFK to Amsterdam. I have vested interest in the life of this aircraft. I want to know.

[00:14:46] IP: Well, I guess we'll find out when it flies. It's going to have to fly again. They're not going to leave it in Rome.

[00:14:51] JR: I mean, there have been situations where aircraft involved in incidents have been scrapped at whatever airport they divert to. It happens. Although, it's exceptionally rare.

[00:15:00] IP: Fair enough. I just don't think they're going to leave it in Rome. That's all I'm saying.

[00:15:04] JR: No.

[00:15:05] IP: All right. News out of Oshkosh this week. As the world's largest gathering of aviation continues, there is news from NASA and Boeing this week. Jason, what's the bigger news here? The kind of description of the program or the fact that the aircraft now has a livery? What's your take on that?

[00:15:25] JR: Probably the description of the program. Because, dare I say, the livery is lacking.

[00:15:30] IP: Allegiant-ish?

[00:15:31] JR: Yeah. It's kind of a hybrid Allegiant. Kind of I see Southwest in there with the orange and the red.

[00:15:38] IP: Yeah. Yeah. I'm not sure what's going on here.

[00:15:39] JR: It's mostly Euro white. The paint is really just on the tail. It has a blue swoosh, and an orange swoosh and a red swoosh. And it says X-66a on the tail. But the details of this aircraft are far more interesting than the very uninspired paint. Tell us more.

[00:15:56] IP: Indeed, they are. The X66-A, formerly known as the Transonic Truss-Brace Wing concept.

[00:16:04] JR: Oh, thank goodness, we got away from that.

[00:16:06] IP: Yes. Has officially moved to it's a real plane. The X Delta MD-90 that had been sitting in the California desert moved to a different part of the California desert. Now registered N930TB. The aircraft has moved to the Palmdale, California site where it will be modified over the next few years. They will chop off the tail-mounted engines. They will shorten the aircraft and then they will add very, very, very long wings.

This particular craft will end up with 145-foot wingspan that is supported by the truss-brace so that the wings can be long and very, very thin. And then they will initially fit, here we go again, Pratt & Whitney PW1100G geared turbofan engines. And then as we talked about a few weeks ago as the development of the CFM open fan RISE program proceeds, the aircraft will eventually be fitted with the CFM RISE open fan engines. That much we all knew.

Some new information about what's going on here is that Boeing has formed a coalition of airlines that are going to be involved from the get-go with not necessarily the design of the aircraft, but inputs into things like operational efficiencies. How the aircraft handles? How it's going to be maintained? Because it'll be the airline's maintenance personnel maintaining the

actual aircraft. And airport compatibility. Because the aircraft itself is going to have a very long wingspan. So how does it fit into the airports of now and the airports of the future?

[00:17:53] JR: Poorly by the look of it. They're going to have to figure that out.

[00:17:58] IP: They'll figure that out. So that group will include Alaska Airlines, American Airlines, Delta Airlines, Southwest Airlines and United Airlines. That group will follow the development. They will have the availability of a simulator as things progress so that their pilots can fly a simulator of the X-66A and understand how the aircraft handles, and make suggestions for improvements and things like that.

It's happening. They've got the airplane. They're going to start work on it. They've got a group that they're putting together so that they can make it as good of a plane as they can from the get-go, which makes sense to me. And glad to see you guys are doing it.

[00:18:43] JR: Yeah. And actual flight testing is slated for 2028 and 2029 out of NASA's Armstrong Flight Research Center at Edwards Air Force Base. I would very much like to be there for the first takeoff of this Franken plane. Just looking at the picture, it's just all wrong. It's an MD-90 with like two sets of wings. The engines are wing-mounted. They're not in the rear. It just looks weird back there at T-tail. It's all weird.

[00:19:11] IP: There's a lot going on. There's a lot going on.

[00:19:13] JR: And I encourage you just go look at the picture. None of this makes sense. But I hope we get some good lessons out of this program that can be deployed to an actual new build, not McDonnell Douglas-built aircraft.

[00:19:27] IP: That it'll work differently than that. And it'll look interesting. And we'll leave it at that. But hopefully, they have some sort of livery redesign contest. Because –

[00:19:37] JR: Yeah. As long as the end result isn't take all of the MD-90s out of the desert and modify them all. Hopefully, we actually get to the point where Boeing can, or I guess Airbus,

create a new aircraft based off this. And we're not just going to pluck all the McDonnell Douglas trash out of the desert.

[00:19:54] IP: All of the MD-90s that are stored get this treatment.

[00:19:57] JR: And 717s as well. I guess all of this could apply to 717s, which are still very much in service. I just saw one today. It was weird. I guess I could apply to that as well. So maybe they get a second lease on life. I don't know. I hope not. But that would be interesting. Absolutely.

[00:20:13] IP: All right. Well, there is a new final rule coming into place in the US. But this will affect not only domestic US airlines but also foreign air carriers. This will affect plane makers as they introduce new aircraft.

The final rule is regarding accessible lavatories on single-aisle aircraft. For many flyers with reduced mobility who are either in need of assistance or using a wheelchair of any kind, using the lavatory on a single-aisle aircraft is incredibly difficult at best.

These new rules would make it so that any new single-aisle aircraft large enough needs to have a lavatory large enough to carry a passenger with a disability and an attendant. And then here's where it gets interesting, both equivalent in size to a 95th percentile male. Two very big people to approach, enter and maneuver within as necessary to use the aircraft lavatory.

And so, this is a final rule. There has already been public comment periods. And this goes into effect 60 days after it's entered into the federal register, which I believe is today. In 60 days, this becomes a final DoT rule. And any new aircraft will need to have lavatory that is large enough to accommodate those requirements.

[00:21:39] JR: That's good. Doesn't take effect until 2035 for new build aircraft. But I wish it were sooner. Because I'm sure many of you who are listening to this have fought with the lavatories on board many single-aisle aircraft today. Even with foamability, you can barely turn around. Let alone wash more than one hand in the sink at a time.

And there are solutions to this. Airbus cabin flex or Spaceflex, I forgot the exact name of it, combines multiple lavatories in the rear of the aircraft to create one accessible aircraft. That is very much an option for airlines. That is not a standard configuration. At least there are some interim measures until then. But it's good to see this formally written down for airlines that you must adhere to this rule by 2035, which is a bit sooner.

[00:22:31] IP: Yeah. Speaking of Airbus, Jason, they got some not great news this week.

[00:22:35] JR: Yeah. I think we all kind of saw this coming. It's been alluded to for a long time. But Reuters came out with an exclusive this week. Headline; Airbus A321XLR jet faces range gap after design safeguards. And we've talked about this before, where what makes the XLR the XLR is an extra fuel tank under the cabin area towards the rear of the aircraft. And there were issues about insulation over the very cold fuel tank possibly not meeting fireproof standards or something along those lines. So they had to add a significant amount or maybe not a significant amount, but an amount of weight.

The article says two industry sources said the cumulative total to the changes to the structure have added some 700 to 800 kilos to the weight of the aircraft compared with the previous 200 to 300 estimate. And that could potentially trim the maximum range of the aircraft down by 200 nautical miles, which is not the end of the world. Realistically, most, if not all Airlines were never going to push the maximum, maximum range of this aircraft.

But it goes on to say that Airbus is offering to move some of these Airlines up to an A330neo, which seems kind of like in unserious offer. Like, "Sorry. This narrow body can't do the absolute full range we promise. So how about this much larger aircraft you didn't want in the first place?" I don't know. But it's not a huge hit to the XLR. But it is noticeable.

[00:24:07] IP: Yeah. So it would take the range from what? 4,700 nautical miles down to 4,500 nautical miles? And like Jason said, it's not huge. But it's significant enough where it definitely takes the headline away a bit.

[00:24:20] JR: It all adds up.

[00:24:22] IP: Yeah. Exactly.

[00:24:23] JR: On top of that, if you're departing from a hot airport, which seems to be everywhere now, or a high airport or there's headwinds, that stuff is going to matter. There are times where that 200 nautical miles taken off the maximum range is going to matter operationally. But the aircraft is still looking like an absolute unchallenged champ in the industry right now. I don't think Airbus has all that much to worry about at least externally.

[00:24:51] IP: And at least for right now.

[00:24:52] JR: Yeah.

[00:24:54] IP: Jason?

[00:24:54] JR: Yes.

[00:24:55] IP: Let us close the show on – well, I guess, is it good – I don't know if this is a good news story, a bad news story. A bad news story that became a good story?

[00:25:05] JR: It's interesting it's news. It's thinking on your feet.

[00:25:08] IP: It's new.

[00:25:08] JR: It's news.

[00:25:09] IP: Yes. Thinking on your feet – the thinking on your feet award of the week.

[00:25:13] JR: Yes. Goes to British Airways? That's unusual.

[00:25:18] IP: What?

[00:25:18] JR: But. Yeah, this one comes to us from one mile at a time who picked up on this story that BA operates some interesting flights in the Caribbean. This one was going from Turks

and Caicos, then to Nassau Bahamas, and then to London, England. And it turns out that there was some sort of unfortunate mishap in Turks and Caicos where the catering went bad for the flight. There was an issue with the refrigeration of the meals. And if there's an issue with the refrigeration, you can't use those meals. They were all thrown out at an outstation in somewhere small like Turks and Caicos. They can't just magically spin up 250 additional meals out of nowhere. That's just not going to happen. Ian, do you know what the quick-thinking ground crew in Turks and Caicos did?

[00:26:05] IP: I mean, I do. Because I'm looking at the –

[00:26:06] JR: You do. But what's cool –

[00:26:10] IP: Because I'm looking at the article. But Jason, tell me, what did they do?

[00:26:15] JR: They picked up their phone and called the nearby KFC and ordered everybody one piece of chicken for the 12-hour flight to London. I'm guessing it's the most that this poor little KFC in Turks and Caicos could manage. It's probably not too often they get a hurry last minute call saying, "We need chicken for 250 people and we need it now." They probably ran this little KFC supply dry.

But I think that's quite interesting. Because if given the choice between you're not going to have the catered meals, but you can have a piece of chicken. Or we could take a 12-hour delay because the flight crew is going to time out and then we'll leave in the morning and you're all going to have to sleep and eat on the floor of the airport. I'm taking that piece of chicken.

[00:27:02] IP: Yeah. I mean, fly me and my piece of chicken to London. I'm with you. Let's do it.

[00:27:05] JR: Yeah. And I think the chicken was served on like napkins. Because they didn't even have the like plates or the silverware or the dining set because that's all a part of the catering kit I believe. At least the one picture I see is just this girl in business class holding a piece of chicken on a napkin.

What the article does not go into, if there was any compensation for passengers, which I hope there is some sort of compensation. Because if I put booked –

[00:27:31] IP: Sorry. We didn't feed you anything but a piece of chicken.

[00:27:33] JR: If I booked a many thousand dollar business class ticket and was fed one piece of chicken on a napkin, I'd probably want some compensation, if not an outright refund. But I'd still be happy that I got where I wanted to go.

[00:27:47] IP: The thing that gets me is always like how things come about? Like, who has an idea to do something? And so, what British Airways station manager or catering person in Turks and Caicos, it was like, "How do we –" they're like standing around and they're like, "My cousin works at KFC. Let's call him."

[00:28:10] JR: You do what you got to do.

[00:28:12] IP: I mean, I just thoroughly enjoy thinking about how these things come about and how people come up with solutions to seemingly intractable problems.

[00:28:16] JR: And it's usually pizza.

[00:28:19] JR: Pizza is a lot easier to manage. Usually, when there's a flight delay, the captain pulls out his corporate card or whatever and orders 15 pizzas. I'm a little surprised. But, hey, you got to do what you got to do.

[00:28:30] IP: I mean, yeah, I'll take what I can get to get the flight out. You're aware of what happened. Because it's a tag flight. Turks and Caicos go over to the Bahamas. The aircraft's coming from that. Did they tell the passengers beforehand, like, "Hey, you should fill up, grab some snacks, because there's only a piece of chicken waiting for you on the plane?"

[00:28:49] JR: Oh, I don't know. I hope so. There was probably – these little Caribbean airports don't have all that much in the way of restaurants and dining options in some cases. If 250 people suddenly flood the available options, that might be a bit problematic.

[00:29:04] IP: All of the trail mix is gone.

[00:29:07] JR: All of the trail mix. You know what? Before we go in, there is some breaking news, which happened before we stopped recording.

[00:29:12] IP: Ooh. I love breaking news. I love breaking news.

[00:29:16] JR: Yeah. If you're an airline passenger in the US in the last couple weeks, you know that things have been rather tough flying in and out of New York or tougher than usual because it's always kind of tough. But recently, United's had a really, really bad time operationally out of Newark between the weather and the FAA issues. And general, just Newark being a terrible airport for operations on a good day. And they recently said they were going to reduce their flight schedule even further than they already did. And now we have some details on that.

The reductions, they say, impact less than 4% of travelers flying United out of Newark during a time period. Most of which will be re-accommodated within two hours of their original arrival time. Importantly, they are adjusting from about 410 daily flights down to 395. I'm not a huge movement. But it's not nothing. No international flights are impacted. But most interestingly, don't really know the reasoning for this. But they'll temporarily end service between Newark and Honolulu through September 4th and our re-accommodating passengers in one of their other 12 daily flights to Honolulu from other hubs.

I find that one interesting because I'm pretty sure that's a morning departure where things are kind of normal. But maybe they want to keep a spare aircraft at Newark for flights? I'm not really sure. But there you go.

[00:30:37] IP: Yeah, that one – I did not think that would be one of the flights they cut.

[00:30:42] JR: No. That's a weird one. And that flight has been kind of unfortunate circumstance flight for United recently. A couple weeks ago they had a spot where the flight was canceled for days in a row because they did not have any aircraft to operate the flight. It's usually operated by

767-400 and they had too many out for retrofit of their new business class at once. And they just did not have any aircraft to operate this flight.

But I guess if you're going to cancel a flight to Honolulu, doing that in the dead of summer is probably the best time. Because I don't know how many New Yorkers are itching to go to Honolulu in the high of summer rather than winter. But just an odd one to trim there. But I guess they have their reasons. But no other markets will be exited, which is interesting.

[00:31:26] IP: Oh. Well, there you go.

[00:31:30] JR: Ithaca will still have its two daily flights or whatever.

[00:31:34] IP: Oh, thank goodness.

[00:31:35] JR: I know. Well, maybe not two. Maybe down to one. I don't know. It's probably be zero. But Ithaca, Binghamton, all those little airports will still have their flights.

[00:31:44] IP: All right then. There you go. And breaking news before we stopped recording. I'll take what I can get.

[00:31:50] JR: Just under the wire.

[00:31:52] IP: There you go. And with that bit, Jason, are you going to have chicken for dinner?

[00:31:57] JR: I am now.

[00:31:58] IP: That was my first thought, "I kind of want some fried chicken." But we'll see if there's any food-related stories next week.

This has been episode 226 of AvTalk. I am Ian Petchenik. Here as always with –

[00:32:15] JR: Jason Rabinowitz. Thanks for listening.

[END]