

The Wright Amendment: Right or Wrong?

Abstract

Since its enactment in 1979, the Wright Amendment has restricted long-haul passenger flights out of Dallas Love Field. This controversial law has created tension between airlines, particularly Southwest Airlines and American Airlines, as stakeholders across the nation debate its need and purpose. How has the Wright Amendment restricted airlines' freedom to fly? How has the amendment changed since its inception? Why do airlines disagree on the effects of the law? And finally, what effects would a repeal of the law exert on airlines and consumers? Politicians across the nation disagree, and the debate has intensified since Southwest Airlines began actively lobbying in 2004 for the Wright Amendment's repeal.

Contents

- Introduction and Background
 - The Wright Amendment Explained
 - The Airlines' Response to Deregulation
 - The Context: Airports and Airlines in the Metroplex
 - Attacks and Changes to the Wright Amendment
 - Public Opinion Today
 - The Implications of a Complete Repeal
 - Other Alternatives
 - The Debate as Three Streams
 - Conclusion
-

The Wright Amendment: Right or Wrong?

Introduction and Background

Commercial airlines face bitter competition today as they endure fare wars, labor strikes and increased fuel costs. These airlines must continually pursue cost-cutting measures in order to maintain productivity and profitability. The recent slump in passenger travel that followed the terrorist attacks of September 11 provided a major blow to the entire aviation industry, and commercial airlines are just now reaching passenger levels comparable to those before the attacks. In addition, some airlines must deal with increased direct competition as low-fare carriers like JetBlue Airways and Southwest Airlines expand their reach into new markets. Airlines must now, more than ever, look for creative ways to gain an edge in a competitive market. The climate has become increasingly bitter for commercial airlines as they attempt to achieve efficiency amidst heated competition.

Today in Texas, two of the nation's largest carriers are engaged in an intense debate that continues to escalate. American Airlines and Southwest Airlines disagree over the necessity of the Wright Amendment, a federal law enacted in 1979 to help establish Dallas-Fort Worth Airport (DFW) as the region's primary airport for commercial airline travel (U.S. Congress, 1991). The Wright Amendment accomplished this by restricting travel to and from the aging Dallas Love Field, the airport that had previously served all commercial airlines in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex. Politicians like then-House Speaker Jim Wright, for whom the amendment is named, envisioned a grandiose new airport, DFW. Built halfway between Dallas

and Fort Worth, DFW was meant to serve both cities and transform the entire Metroplex into an international center of commerce.

As anticipated, DFW expanded into a thriving economic engine that now supports more than 268,000 jobs in the Metroplex (Magers, 2005). Meanwhile, since the time of the Wright Amendment's passage by the U.S. Congress, Southwest Airlines has been reluctant to shift its operations away from Love Field, citing Love Field as the source for its "competitive niche" that can "liberate the city of Dallas from the exorbitant airfares" (Southwest Airlines 1, 2005).

Just miles away, American has strengthened its operations at DFW and positioned itself as the world's largest air carrier (Marta, 2005).

Since 1979, Southwest Airlines has grown from a small regional carrier to a nationwide market leader. For more than 30 years, Southwest stayed quiet on the issue of the Wright Amendment (Goodwyn, 2004). Then, on Nov. 12, 2004, Southwest announced its stiff opposition to the Wright Amendment, calling it anti-competitive and outdated (Southwest Airlines 2, 2005). To involve the public in the debate, Southwest launched an advertising campaign with a Web site, www.SetLoveFree.com, to promote citizen activism. Southwest wants to continue its tradition of expansion by being granted the right to fly anywhere from its Love Field headquarters. In order for this to occur, though, Southwest says a repeal of the Wright Amendment is necessary. Now joined by the support of some politicians and community groups across the nation, Southwest Airlines continues to fight for the abolishment of this federal law.

The effects of such a repeal would be extraordinary. By eliminating restrictions on travel from Love Field, the success of American Airlines and DFW would be threatened. As Southwest creates additional flights at Love Field, the airport's neighbors may become annoyed

by the noise and traffic generated by increased activity. Changes in trip generation and distribution both in the sky and on the ground would have serious implications for planners, as they must make significant adjustments to long-term transportation plans.

Recent political activity suggests a repeal of the Wright Amendment is a possibility, although not yet an imminent one. Congress has indeed taken baby steps toward repeal by lifting travel restrictions for certain states in 1997 and 2005. The debate has escalated and generated significant publicity nationwide, however, since Southwest actively professed its opposition and began lobbying for the amendment's repeal last year.

The Wright Amendment Explained

The Wright Amendment is a federal regulation that restricts commercial air travel originating or culminating at Dallas Love Field to airports within Texas and its four contiguous states: New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana. A part of the International Air Transportation Competition Act of 1979, the Wright Amendment was added in an effort to encourage growth at DFW and establish it as the primary airport in the Metroplex (Alexander, 2005).

In addition to restricting travel, the Wright Amendment contains marketing provisions which forbid commercial airlines from advertising and selling flights between Love Field and airports outside of the permitted travel zone. Airlines cannot, for example, combine a Love Field-Tulsa flight segment and a Tulsa-Kansas City flight segment into a single reservation (Stearns, 2005). Consumers may complete such a journey, however, if they decide to purchase each flight segment on a separate ticket.

There are a few exceptions to the travel limitations, however. Aircrafts with a seating capacity of 56 or less are not subject to the restrictions of the Wright Amendment. Also, aircrafts carrying cargo or operating as a charter flight are not restricted (U.S. Congress, 1991).

The permitted five-state zone was expanded by the Shelby Amendment of 1997, which added Kansas, Alabama and Mississippi. Then, in November, 2005, an amendment was passed to add Missouri as the ninth state exempt from Wright Amendment restrictions.

The Airlines' Response to Deregulation

The Wright Amendment was enacted just a year after the passage of the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978. The freedoms granted in the act permitted commercial airlines to set their own routes and fares. The passage of the law by President Jimmy Carter marked the beginning of a generation of competition and rivalries among airlines.

Since deregulation, the commercial airline industry has been anything but stable. Corporate mergers, acquisitions and newly created subsidiaries have dramatically changed the industry landscape. Airlines have introduced random in-flight services and promotions in an attempt to lure passengers, only to eliminate them years later to cut costs. Overall, airfares have dropped as competition has increased. Since deregulation, the average domestic airfare has been cut in half between the years 1977 and 2000, according to a study by the Federal Reserve Bank in San Francisco (Newman, 2003).

Airlines also reacted to deregulation by making changes to their route networks. Most companies, like American, decided to adopt a hub-and-spoke route system, allowing them to concentrate their resources in particular markets (Bailey, 1985). While most airlines proceeded

to develop such a system, Southwest is the single exception (Graham, 1995). Southwest instead created a point-to-point system that emphasizes short flight segments and fast turnaround times. This unique business strategy has allowed it to succeed even with the Love Field restrictions in place.

The Context: Airlines and Airports in the Metroplex

The Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex serves as an international hub for commercial airline travel. The region is home to the world headquarters of both American and Southwest, two of the nation's largest carriers. The region's two primary airports, Dallas/Fort Worth International and Dallas Love, serve as collector points for the millions of traveling Americans living throughout the South-Central U.S.

Of the two airports, DFW is by far the larger in terms of physical size and passenger traffic. DFW served over 59 million passengers in 2004. This huge amount makes it one of the ten busiest airports in the world in terms of passenger traffic, serving more people annually than Paris' Charles De Gaulle and New York City's John F. Kennedy airports (Airports Council International, 2005). Twenty-three commercial airlines use DFW today, including several non-U.S. based carriers like Korean Air and Lufthansa (Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport 1, 2005).

DFW serves as a principal hub for American, the world's largest carrier. Until late 2004, Delta Air Lines also used DFW as a hub, until it reduced its daily flights from 256 to 21 ("Delta dropping Dallas," 2004). Despite these eliminated flights, other airlines such as Midwest Airlines and AirTran have helped fill the void by increasing their presence at DFW (Dallas/Fort

Worth International Airport 2, 2005). Still, American controls 84 percent of the passenger traffic at DFW (Dobberstein, 2005).

Twelve miles east of DFW sits Dallas Love Field, the metro's second-busiest airport. Because Love Field is subject to the limitations of the Wright Amendment, the airport primarily serves domestic flights traveling within the permitted flying zone. Love Field is owned and operated by the City of Dallas. The airport serves seven million passengers each year (City of Dallas Aviation Department, 2005). Its location seven miles northwest of downtown Dallas makes it an attractive option for many, although freeway congestion can make the drive time to Fort Worth more than one hour long. Still, the location of Love Field is more convenient than the location of DFW for most of the area's inhabitants. Sixty-five percent of people in the Metroplex live and work closer to Love Field than DFW, according to Tim Wagner, an American Airlines spokesman (Stewart 2, 2005).

Most gates at Love Field are rented by Southwest Airlines, which provides nonstop service to 14 cities within the permitting flying zone (Southwest Airlines 6, 2005). Two other regional subsidiaries, Continental Express and Delta Connection ASA, also use the airport. American Airlines recently announced plans to begin operating at Love Field, following the expansion of Love Field's permitted flying zone (Bisbee, 2005).

In addition to DFW and Love Field, several smaller airports operate throughout the Metroplex, offering runways for private jets and student pilots. These reliever airports, like Dallas Executive and Fort Worth Meacham, help to alleviate congestion at the two large commercial hubs.

Attacks and Changes to the Wright Amendment

Since 1979, politicians have launched numerous disputes over the need and purpose of the Wright Amendment. In 1991, Congressman Dan Glickman, a Democrat from Kansas, advocated a repeal of the original amendment, saying it was “nothing more than an egregious, anti-competitive, unconstitutional section of the law.” Glickman, with the help of two Kansas Republicans, Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole and Senator Nancy Kassebaum, successfully introduced legislation to repeal the Amendment. These three Kansas politicians hoped a repeal would bring lower airfares between Wichita and Dallas (“Kansas lawmakers try,” 1991). The efforts of the Kansas delegation led to a Sep. 24, 1991 hearing before the U.S. House of Representatives subcommittee on aviation. Several airlines, airport authorities, members of Congress and aviation associations testified at the hearing (U.S. Congress, 1991). However, their endeavor was met with resistance in Washington as they failed to change the 1979 legislation (“Kansas renews challenge,” 1993).

Not all attacks on the Wright Amendment by politicians have been met with defeat, however. In 1997, Congress passed the Shelby Amendment, a law which added three new states to Love Field’s permitted flying zone: Kansas, Alabama and Mississippi. The amendment, named after Senator Richard Shelby, a republican from Alabama, expanded the flying zone to eight states. While fares on some routes dropped as a result, not everyone was happy. The passage of the Shelby Amendment was cause for concern for American and DFW, and the new law sparked controversy between the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth, who disagreed over the role of Love Field.

A few years after the Shelby Amendment was enacted, officials in Tennessee hoped to draw upon the recent success of their neighbor states. Representative Marsha Blackburn, a Republican from Tennessee, introduced a bill in 2004 that would exempt her state from Wright Amendment restrictions. A few months later, leaders of 10 Tennessee chambers of commerce joined Blackburn's efforts by lobbying Congress to change the law (Recio 1, 2005). The exclusion of Tennessee from restrictions would allow Southwest to operate nonstop flights between Love Field and Nashville. However, Blackburn's bill ultimately failed in the House of Representatives (Magers, 2005).

Legislators in Nebraska have similar aspirations to repeal the Wright Amendment. Nebraska Representatives Lee Terry and Jeff Fortenberry have sponsored a bill in the House to repeal the law, while Nebraska Senator Chuck Hagel introduced a similar bill in Senate. Earlier this year, American lowered fares from Omaha to DFW after Sen. Bill Nelson complained about the high fares (Banstetter, 2005).

Just months after lawmakers in Tennessee and Nebraska introduced measures against the Wright Amendment, politicians in Missouri chipped away at the amendment successfully. In November, 2005, the Wright Amendment debate made headlines nationwide when Missouri was added to the list of states permitting nonstop commercial flights to and from Love Field. The passage of the new provision marked the culmination of a political debate championed by Senator Christopher "Kit" Bond, a Republican from Missouri. Sen. Bond deemed the Wright Amendment an "anti-competitive, anti-consumer policy" and proceeded to add wordage to a 2006 transportation appropriations bill that eventually withdrew Missouri from the restrictions of the Wright Amendment (Recio 2, 2005).

Just days after President Bush signed the transportation bill that lifted travel restrictions between Love Field and Missouri, Southwest began advertising its new, direct routes linking Love Field to Kansas City and St. Louis. Southwest plans to operate four daily direct flights from Dallas to each Missouri city beginning December 13, 2005 (Southwest Airlines 5, 2005). Prior to the appropriation bill's passage, these city pairings had been two of American's monopoly routes (McLaughlin, 2005). To deal with the new competition, American quickly responded by lowering its fares for both Missouri routes (Jordan, 2005). Even with comparable fares, though, competing efficiently with Southwest could prove difficult for American. Prior to its creation of the flights linking Love Field with Missouri, Southwest had already established itself as the largest carrier in Kansas City and the second largest in St. Louis (McLaughlin, 2005; Fuquay, 2004).

The successful addition of Missouri to the permitted flying zone may provide some optimism to political leaders proposing similar initiatives in other states. Although Missouri marked the first new state to be exempted from Wright Amendment restrictions in eight years, the debate has intensified significantly in 2005. Politicians in other areas may now draw upon Missouri's success as they attempt to secure comparable freedoms.

Public Opinion Today

What do the people of north Texas think about all this? Numerous public opinion surveys have been conducted to measure citizens' attitudes, but not all of the research corresponds. An October, 2005 poll by Public Opinion Strategies reportedly showed that 82 percent of respondents "favored allowing passengers to fly from Love Field to anywhere in the

country” (Case, 2005). Additionally, the poll found that 57 percent of respondents favored changing the Wright Amendment (Case, 2005). The survey was paid for by Love Terminal Partners.

In contrast, a survey administered by DFW did not specifically address the Wright Amendment, but it showed that 85 percent of airport users they surveyed were in favor of Southwest Airlines flying from DFW, according to Kevin Cox, the chief operating officer of DFW (“New poll shows,” 2005).

Such measures of public opinion should be taken with precaution, however. Respondents may have varying levels of familiarity with the Wright Amendment and its original purpose. Additionally, because they seek opinions on a controversial topic, these attitudinal studies may have utilized poorly worded questions in an effort to bias results in some direction.

The Implications of a Complete Repeal

A complete repeal of the Wright Amendment would not only affect north Texas. The effects of a repeal would present national implications as commercial airlines adapt to the new freedoms. Airlines would likely respond by changing routings and adjusting fares. While the degree to which a repeal would impact the commercial airline industry altogether is unknown, certain effects are likely to result.

First and foremost, if the Wright Amendment is entirely repealed, it is likely that airfares to and from both Dallas airports would drop as a result of the “Southwest Effect.” This term, coined by Department of Transportation officials, describes the decrease in fares and subsequent increase in passenger travel that occurs when Southwest begins operation in a new city

(Southwest Airlines 3, 2005). Although Dallas has been served by Southwest since 1971, the Southwest Effect would manifest itself again if the Wright Amendment is repealed (Southwest Airlines 4, 2004). This effect would be the cumulative outcome of Southwest adding low-fare flights connecting Love Field to the cities it already serves outside of the restricted zone.

In an effort to stay competitive, American would be forced to lower its fares and make drastic changes to its flight operations. To better understand the possible consequences of a repeal, American recently hired Eclat Consulting, an aviation consulting firm in Reston, Virginia. Eclat conducted a study for American in October, 2005 that predicted American would respond to a repeal by shifting service to Love Field. This shift would then force American to cut an estimated 40 percent of its daily flights at DFW (Stewart 2, 2005). But the biggest losers, the study said, would be the smaller cities that depend on DFW for access to the rest of the nation (Dobberstein, 2005). The potential consequences are certainly enough to worry stakeholders of American and DFW.

Other analyses by independent groups suggest there would be no clear winner between the two airlines if the Wright Amendment is completely repealed. The Boyd Group, an aviation consulting group based in Evergreen, Colorado, published a report in July, 2005 concluding that a repeal of the amendment would neither “torpedo air service at DFW” nor “blacken the Metroplex skies with low-fare flights” (The Boyd Group, 2005). Rather, the report suggests that neither airline would emerge as the true winner.

Perhaps Love Field would be the sole winner. If the amendment is repealed, Love Field would probably become an attractive option for many airlines, not just Southwest and American. At present, landing fees at Love Field are substantially lower than DFW. Love Field charges a mere 35 cents per 1,000 pounds landed, compared with \$4.94 charged for the same weight at

DFW (Wethe, 2005). Secondary airlines which presently operate at DFW would attempt to establish a presence at Love Field. To capitalize on this increased demand, Love Field would likely respond by increasing its landing fees, but significant fee hikes would be necessary to match those of DFW.

If the combination of airline competition and lower landing fees result in lower airfares for the consumer, it is possible that more companies will conduct business in the Metroplex. Dallas Mayor Laura Miller says her city's central location in the United States makes it an attractive place to hold meetings, but high airfares into the city discourage some companies from doing so (Goodwyn, 2004). Southwest's co-founder and chairman, Herb Kelleher, says a repeal of the amendment would bring in an additional 3.7 million passengers a year to Dallas airports (Alexander, 2005).

The side effects of increased traffic at both airports would impact the non-traveling public. Neighbors of Love Field could become frustrated if airplane noise levels increase and highways become congested with airport-bound drivers. Similarly, the exhaust and pollution associated with increased activity may exert harmful on the airport's surrounding environment.

A repeal of the Wright Amendment and a resulting shift of traffic from DFW to Love Field would present serious implications for planners. For decades, planning decisions have been made with the assumption that DFW would remain a central core of activity in the Metroplex. DFW airport and the downtowns of Dallas and Fort Worth have been the region's three vital zones of concentration. Transportation, housing and land use policies have developed with these zones in mind. If a shift in airport activity occurred, long-term regional plans must be adjusted to accommodate changes in traffic. In addition, Love Field's antiquated layout would make widening the roads a difficult and costly task (Barta, 1997).

Other Alternatives

If Southwest truly wants the ability to fly to all of its nationwide destinations from Dallas, yet law prohibits it from doing so from Love Field, it seems natural that Southwest would pursue operations at DFW. After all, doing so would allow Southwest to fly nationwide from Dallas, tomorrow, without an act of Congress (Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport 3, 2005). DFW has even tried to lure Southwest and other carriers by offering financial incentives valued at \$22 million (Stewart 1, 2005). Despite the perks, Southwest has been reluctant to expand operations into DFW, claiming the airport does not fit their business model (Magers, 2005). Southwest relies on quick turnaround times between flights, and the heavy congestion at DFW could make this difficult to achieve.

Another possible action, although unlikely, would be to reverse the recent trend of expanding the permitted flying zone. The 1997 and 2005 amendments could be repealed to restrict travel to and from Love Field to the original five-state zone. Senator James Inhofe, a Republican from Oklahoma, proposes restriction even greater than what the 1979 Wright Amendment allows. Inhofe wants Love Field closed altogether. He filed legislation to shut down the airport to commercial traffic in three years, believing a closed Love Field would help protect jobs at American's Maintenance and Engineering Facility in Tulsa (Bisbee, 2005).

The Debate as Three Streams

The ongoing debate over the need for the Wright Amendment could be analyzed in terms of John Kingdon's multiple streams model of policymaking. In his book, Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies, Kingdon (1984) explains that certain patterns and similarities exist in the complex process of public policymaking (Wong, 2005). Kingdon's policymaking model is characterized by three converging streams: problems, policies and politics (Kingdon, 1984). Policy entrepreneurs then pull these streams together, and if a window of opportunity is provided or created, a policy change may result (Travis, 2002).

The first stream, problems, encompasses the challenging dilemmas that policy entrepreneurs hope to resolve (Travis, 2002). In the Wright Amendment debate, politicians have based their judgments on the many negative outcomes of the amendment and the potential effects of a repeal. Advocates of a repeal say DFW is too congested, the amendment stifles competition, or airfares are too high. On the other hand, opponents of the repeal say operating two airports is inefficient, Love Field is outdated, or the economy of north Texas is dependent upon the success of DFW. By citing these problems, politicians set the agenda and attract public attention by stressing the urgency of the problems.

The second stream, policies (or *solutions*), includes the variety of ideas floating in the "policy primeval soup" (Travis, 2002). There are many ways that Congress may respond to the Wright Amendment debate. First, they could follow the wishes of Southwest Airlines and repeal the amendment altogether. Another option, proposed by several state legislators, is to chip away at the law piecewise and lift Love Field's travel restrictions a few states at a time. This solution has been chosen in the 1997 and 2005 expansions of the permitted travel zone. A third solution,

put forth by Sen. Inhofe, proposes the closure of Love Field altogether. There are numerous ways to confront the problems outlined in the first stream, and politics will determine which policies or solutions will garner support.

Kingdon's final stream, politics, dictates which issues will receive the most attention. The politics stream is dictated by turnover and compositional changes within governmental administrations (Travis, 2005). In the case of the Wright Amendment debate, the actions of junior legislators will influence the policies of the future. It is unknown whether these newbies will pursue implementation of solutions that have already been devised by today's lawmakers. Perhaps they will propose new solutions to quell the debate, or perhaps they will abandon the issue of commercial airlines in Dallas altogether and focus on other arenas. As the compositions of governmental bodies change, their constituents may pursue new initiatives.

Kingdon's model of three streams does not dictate when and to what extent a policy change will actually occur, but the model allows us to better understand the complexity of the Wright Amendment debate. The aspiring policy entrepreneurs involved in the debate have identified a multitude of problems and possible solutions; however, Kingdon says a window of opportunity is necessary to induct change (Kingdon, 1984).

Conclusion

The debate over whether the Wright Amendment is right or wrong has not yet reached consensus. Both sides present respectable arguments. The future of American Airlines is dependent upon its success at a strong DFW airport, while Southwest Airlines wants the freedom to reach all of its destinations from its headquarters. American rightfully complied with

decisions in the 1970s to shift operations away from Love Field and into DFW, while Southwest challenged those legislations and received permission to continue operations at Love Field.

If the debate over the Wright Amendment continues to escalate as it has in recent months, an already competitive airline industry may become further fragmented. A complete repeal of the Wright Amendment could present dramatic implications for employees, consumers and the economy of north Texas. The success of the Metroplex is partly driven by the thousands of jobs provided by both airlines. Division among local citizens with emotional or financial attachments to either of the airlines could harm the state's unique identity and community spirit.

Attempts to repeal or change the Wright Amendments have encountered limited success since 1979. The streams of solutions and policies have not always converged in a window of opportunity. Rather than continue the debate, perhaps the best way for American and Southwest to position themselves for future success would be to utilize both airports. American and Southwest should pursue ways to fulfill their business objectives with the current restrictions in mind, because at this point, the future of the Wright Amendment remains unknown.

Works Cited

- Airports Council International. (2005). *Passenger Traffic 2004 final*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from http://www.airports.org/cda/aci/display/main/aci_content.jsp?zn=aci&cp=1-5-54-55_9_2_/.
- Alexander, K. (2005, November 10). Southwest, American due to spar over Wright Amendment. *Washington Post*, pp. D03.
- Banstetter, T. (2005, July 26). American cuts fares to Omaha. *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, (np).
- Barta, P. (1997, December 17). Love's prospects of increased traffic put officials in a jam. *Wall Street Journal*, pp. T.3.
- Bisbee, J. (2005, December 2). American Airlines' decision may cost state flights. *The Daily Oklahoman*, (np).
- Boyd Group, The. (2005). *Aviation studies – Love Field – Wright Amendment – The Boyd Group*. Retrieved December 9, 2005, from <http://www.aviationplanning.com/studies.htm>.
- Case, B. (2005, November 1). Poll results back Wright repeal. *The Dallas Morning News*, (np).
- City of Dallas Aviation Department. (2001). *Dallas Love Field Love Notes*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from <http://www.dallas-lovefield.com/lovenotes/lovesnotes.html/>.
- Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport. (2005). *Dfwairport.com – Airline Guide*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from <http://www.dfwairport.com/airlines/>.
- Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport. (2005). *Dfwairport.com – Statistics*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from <http://www.dfwairport.com/stats/>.
- Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport. (2005). *Wright is Right*. Retrieved November 16, 2005, from <http://www.keepdfwstrong.com/>.
- Daly Bednarek, J.R. (2001). *America's airports*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- Delta dropping Dallas as hub. (2004, September 9). *Austin Business Journal*, p. XXX?
<http://www.bizjournals.com/austin/stories/2004/09/06/daily13.html>
- Dobberstein, J. (2005, December 2). American entering fray at Love Field: study says flight cuts possible in Tulsa, OKC. *Journal Record*, (np).

- Forsyth, P., Gillen, D., Knorr, A., Mayer, O., Niemeier, H., & Starkie, D. (2004). *The economic regulation of airports*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Fuquay, J. (2004, September 28). American Airlines to abandon fare increase. *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, (np).
- Goodwyn, Wade (NPR reporter). (2004). *Battle looms between two Dallas airports* [Digital recording]. Washington, D.C.: National Public Radio.
- Gottdiener, M. (2001). *Life in the air*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Graham, B. (1995). *Geography and air transport*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Jordan, J. (2005, December 2). American drops fare from D/FW airport to St. Louis, Kansas City. *Dallas Business Journal*, (np).
- Kansas lawmakers try to repeal restriction on Dallas Love Field. (1991, February 8). *Journal Record*, (np).
- Kansas renews challenge to Love Field restrictions. (1993, November 24). *Journal Record*, (np).
- Kingdon, J. (1984). *Agendas, alternatives, and political policies*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Magers, P. (2005, April 20). Analysis: Texas airport rule may be target. *The Washington Times*, (np).
- Marta, S. (2005, October 28). American moves to D/FW's Terminal D. *Dallas Morning News*, (np).
- McLaughlin, T. (2005, December 2). New Southwest flight fares beat American by 26 percent. *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, (np).
- New poll shows majority want repeal of Wright Amendment. (2005, November 1). *Airline Industry Information*, (np).
- Newman, R. (2003, December 7). Deregulation was good for travelers, hard on airlines. *The Record*, (np).
- Recio, M. (2005, February 10). Tennessee chamber heads lobby against Wright Amendment. *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, (np).
- Recio, M. (2005, October 20). Missouri may get Love flights. *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, (np).

- Southwest Airlines. (2005). *SetLoveFree.com: History of the Wright Amendment and Southwest Airlines*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from <http://www.setlovetfree.com/historyofwright.html>.
- Southwest Airlines. (2005). *SetLoveFree.com: Dallas Love Field and the Wright Amendment Timeline*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from <http://www.setlovetfree.com/timeline.html>.
- Southwest Airlines. (2005). *SetLoveFree.com: The Southwest Effect and the Wright Amendment*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from <http://www.setlovetfree.com/southwesteffect.html>.
- Southwest Airlines. (2004). *Southwest Airlines – A Brief History*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from http://www.southwest.com/about_swa/airborne.html.
- Southwest Airlines (2005). *Southwest Airlines announces new nonstop service from Dallas Love Field to Kansas City and St. Louis*. Retrieved December 9, 2005, from <http://phx.corporate-ir.net/phoenix.zhtml?c=92562&p=irol-newsArticle&ID=791859&highlight=>.
- Southwest Airlines. (2005). *Southwest Airlines Interactive Route Map*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from http://www.southwest.com/travel_center/routemap_dyn.html.
- Stearns, M. & Heaster, R. (2005, November 19). Ding! Southwest soon will be free to fly directly from KC to Dallas. *The Kansas City Star*, (np).
- Stewart, D.R. (2005, October 11). Wright-repeal findings debated. *Tulsa World*, (np).
- Stewart, D.R. (2005, December 1). AA to offer Love Field service. *Tulsa World*, (np).
- Travis, R. & Zahariadis, N. (2002). A multiple streams model of U.S. foreign aid policy. *Policy Studies Journal*, 30 (4), 495-514.
- U.S. Congress. (1991). *To repeal section 29 of the International Air Transportation Competition Act (pertaining to commercial airline operations at Love Field, Dallas, TX)*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Wethe, D. (2005, December 1). Love Field money woes revealed. *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, (np).
- Wong, A. & Chuang, C. (2005). *Wellesley College - Health Politics and Policy – Study Guides*. Retrieved December 9, 2005, from http://www.wellesley.edu/Polisci/tb/Health_Politics/Studyguides/studyguides.html.