

The Age 60 Rule

AEROSPACE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
AVIATION SAFETY COMMITTEE,
CIVIL AVIATION SAFETY SUBCOMMITTEE

AEROSPACE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, AVIATION SAFETY COMMITTEE, CIVIL AVIATION SAFETY SUBCOMMITTEE. *The age 60 rule. Aviat Space Environ Med* 2004; 75:708–15.

The impetus for amending the Age 60 Rule compels the review of recent scientific literature pertinent to pilot age and performance. The Rule has been the subject of extensive debate among policymakers and the aviation community. The aviation medical community is in a position to continue research and discussion that may provide additional evidence for the development of future policy decisions. Those addressing the future of the Age 60 Rule may benefit from understanding the nature and limitations of these studies, whether their outcomes are conclusive or not. Hopefully, some measure of guidance may be achieved as they address pilot age limits and related safety, economic, and operational issues of the aviation industry.

Keywords: accidents, aviation medicine, aviation safety, cognitive assessment, commercial air transport operations, incapacitation, legislation, pilot age, pilot assessment, pilot performance.

THE STANDARD established by the International Civil Aviation Organization limits the age of a pilot-in-command to 60 yr (Annex 1 to The Convention on International Civil Aviation, paragraph 2.1.10.1), and a co-pilot to 60 yr (Annex 1, paragraph 2.1.10.2). As of 1998, 24 contracting states have notified the International Civil Aviation Organization of differences with the standard; some have raised the age limit, others have lowered it, and some have done away with it altogether (11).

The requirements of the Joint Aviation Authorities also prohibit a pilot who has attained the age of 60 from engaging in commercial air transport operations, with the exception of multi-pilot crew operations where the pilot is the only one who has attained 60 yr of age, but has not yet reached the age of 65. [JAR-FCL 3, Subpart A, JAR-FCL 3.060, paragraphs a (1), a (2), b].

The Age 60 Rule, implemented by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in 1959, does not allow persons engaged in operations conducted under Part 121 of the Federal Aviation Regulations to serve as a pilot or co-pilot on reaching their 60th birthday [Title 14 CFR, Chapter I, Part 121.383(c)]. Considerable controversy has surrounded the Age 60 Rule since its inception. During the last two decades, various studies have been carried out to assess the relationship between age, experience, and pilot performance. Results have differed significantly from study to study, making a clear understanding of the relationship between age, pilot performance, and safety difficult.

Objective

The objective of this paper is to review and interpret the recent scientific literature dealing with pilot age and performance for consideration by the Council of the Aerospace Medical Association.

BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Aging

Age-related changes in memory, attention, and cognitive skills can affect the in-flight performance of a pilot. Age-related physiological and psychological changes are normally progressive and continuous (12), and theories on aging have suggested a general decline in central processing speed and a reduction in working memory capacity (66,67). Physiological studies consistently show age-related declines in hearing, vision, and perceptual motor skills, etc. (2,6,13,17,20,22,24,56); however, results in other areas are not as clear.

Pilot cognitive performance has been shown to generally decline with age (23,27,33,48,74), with the possible exception of time-sharing tasks (61,75,77,79,80). While pilot performance on most memory tasks has shown age-related declines (49,52), aviation expertise has been shown to reduce age differences on more aviation-related memory tasks (50,53). Some studies document age-related declines in attention (61,75,76,80), while others show that the performance of older subjects equals that of younger subjects (21,77). Simulator studies (39,51,54,55,72,87) and studies of actual flight performance (35,40,43,45,62,63) have yielded equally mixed results. One review (22) con-

From the Aerospace Medical Association, Alexandria, VA.

This manuscript was received for review in April 2004. It was accepted for publication in May 2004.

Address reprint requests to: The Aerospace Medical Association, 320 S. Henry St., Alexandria, VA 22314-3579; www.asma.org.

A report prepared by the Civil Aviation Safety Subcommittee of the Aviation Safety Committee of the Aerospace Medical Association. Members of the subcommittee are: Arnold Angelici; Susan Baker, Vice Chair, Civil Aviation Safety Subcommittee; Mary A. Cimrmanic, Chair, Civil Aviation Safety Subcommittee; Charles DeJohn, Chair, Aviation Safety Committee; Anthony Evans; Harry Hoffman (posthumously); Graeme Maclarn; Geoffrey W. McCarthy; Verba Moore; Pooshan Navathe; Farhad Sahiar; Nathan E. Villaire; Nicholas Webster, Vice Chair, Aviation Safety Committee; and Alex Wolbrink. Other primary authors are: James T. Becker and Dana Broach.

Reprint & Copyright © by Aerospace Medical Association, Alexandria, VA.

cluded that there was only weak evidence that age-related differences in cognition influence pilot performance. However, a more recent simulator study of age and pilot performance found that increased age was significantly associated with decreased aviator performance (87). Overall, the scientific record has not resulted in a clear specification of the relationship between age, cognitive function, and pilot performance. Nor have any theoretical models linking age, cognitive abilities, and specific aspects of pilot performance emerged from the research as the basis for understanding the relationships or making predictions about the effects of age.

Pilot Incapacitation

Airline pilot in-flight medical incapacitation was a primary concern at the time the Age 60 Rule was adopted (60), and continues to be an important topic (4,5,10,15,30,44,69). A recent FAA study of U.S. airline pilots (37) found that in-flight incapacitations increased significantly with age. While sudden incapacitation is often cited as a major concern in efforts to amend the Age 60 Rule, its frequency and impact on flight safety suggests that, in contrast to many human factors causes of airline accidents (i.e., judgment, decision making, and communication), pilot incapacitation does not pose a significant risk (4,5,15,16,37,59,69). In part, this is due to the fact that flight safety, in the event of pilot incapacitation, is typically assured by the presence of two qualified pilots, captain and first officer, either of whom can take over operation of the aircraft should the other become incapacitated.

Physiological and Perceptual Motor Skills

Many physiological changes that accompany aging may influence performance, including changes in perceptual motor skills, vision, hearing, and sleep patterns. A recent overview of the perceptual-motor skills literature reported that age-related changes in perceptual-motor skills were evident in the pilots tested (22). With age, ocular muscles and lens elasticity may be affected, resulting in visual decline (20). A recent FAA report noted that the percentage of civil airmen older than 40 yr of age increased from 36% of aviators in 1971 to more than 48% in 1991. This may explain, in part, a 12% increase in presbyopic aviators requiring near vision restrictions from 1981 to 1991 (56). Near vision can be a problem for the aging pilot in the cockpit because of the complexity and uniqueness of visual tasks (2). Some studies have found that during ideal conditions, older subjects can accommodate nearly as quickly as younger subjects; however, during degraded visual conditions, the accommodation time for older subjects can increase by as much as ten-fold (13). Senior pilots are often reluctant to admit defective visual acuity; in one study, 90% of pilots tested demonstrated less than 20/20 visual acuity, although 46% stated that the instrument panel could be seen clearly without accommodative lenses (24).

Pilot hearing, compromised by exposure to the noisy aviation environment, can result in age-related changes in the ability to hear high frequency sounds (presbycu-

sis) (28). Although above age 60, there were no significant differences between pilots and non-pilots in hearing loss in a general aviation simulator study (6). This study showed that some older pilots did not hear an autopilot/autotrim alarm; however there are no recent data to determine the extent to which similar changes occur in commercial pilots (6).

An interaction between age and sleep loss for pilots involved in long-haul operations showed that the amount of sleep loss generally increased with age (17). These findings have important implications for the establishment of duty schedules and the development of fatigue countermeasures in aviation.

Pilot Performance and Cognitive Skills

There have been many recent studies of aging and pilot performance that show a general decline with increased age (23,27,33,48,74), but few involve commercial pilots. Although the exception of performance decline in the case of time-sharing tasks has been disputed by some researchers (23), it has been confirmed by others (75,77,79,80). Hardy and Parasuraman conducted the most extensive review, concluding that, with the possible exception of time-sharing, increased pilot experience does not appear to alter the typical age-related decline found in many cognitive skills (22).

Memory

The effect of pilot performance on memory tasks has shown age-related changes for most tasks. While pilots and non-pilots have exhibited similar age-related declines in the recall of less domain-relevant tasks (49,52), aviation expertise has been shown to reduce age differences for tasks that are more aviation-related (50,53).

Attention

Results of age-related studies on attention are mixed. While some studies document age-related declines in performance related to attention (61,75,76,80), especially when task demands are high (81), other studies show that the performance of older subjects equals that of younger subjects (21,77).

Simulator Performance

Simulator research on age-related flight performance has produced mixed results. The primary concern is that a simulation cannot produce sufficient workload to test whether an impaired pilot could manage the necessary time-sharing tasks with adequate speed in an actual in-flight emergency. While some data show age-related declines in performance (39,87), other data do not support age-related differences (22,51,54,55,72), and one showed ambivalent results (26).

Flight Performance

The number of accidents involved in air carrier operations is small, and does not permit effective comparisons across age. Consequently, studies of actual flight data provide conflicting evidence on the effects of age on performance. In a study of general aviation crashes,

Baker and colleagues (3) found that the percent of crashes involving poor decisions or pilot error declined with age. A 1991 study of general aviation pilots determined that older pilots were at less risk than younger pilots for both accidents and violations (43). Likewise, McFadden (45) found that the accident rates of U.S. airline pilots declined as pilot experience (total flight hours and recent flight time) and age increased. Furthermore, Kay et al. (35) found that the accident rates of older pilots with a Class II or III medical certificate evidenced a gradual decline from age 40 through the early 60s, but showed a slight increase from age 65–69. In a longitudinal study of pilots 45 and older, Li et al. (42) found that neither crash circumstances, nor the prevalence and patterns of pilot errors, changed significantly with age. Most recently, Li and colleagues (41) followed a cohort of 3,306 commuter and air taxi pilots for 11 yr who were 45 to 54 yr of age in 1987. They did not find a significant age-associated increase in crash risk, but the risk of a crash decreased by about half among pilots with a total flight time of more than 5,000 h at baseline.

Conversely, information regarding age and training success of pilots transitioning to the Airbus A320 revealed a failure rate of 2 to 5% in 29–44 yr old pilots, approximately 8% for 45–48 yr old pilots, and around 16% for those 49 and older (62). However, the results may have been confounded by a cohort effect because different age groups could have been exposed to dissimilar life experiences. For example, younger pilots could have had a greater exposure to computers and computer games that might have given them an advantage in transitioning to the Airbus.

Li and Baker (40) found that the risk of an accident increased with age in commuter and air taxi accidents when flight time was controlled. However, univariate analyses showed a decrease with age, suggesting that their greater experience keeps older pilots from being at excess risk. Rebok et al. (63) concluded that there “appear to be no significant age differences in the pilot performance factors contributing to aviation crashes.”

Recently, Broach, Joseph, and Schroeder investigated the relationship between age and accident rates (8). They found a “U”-shaped relationship between the age and accident rates of professional pilots holding Class I medical certificates and ATP certificates operating under 14 CFR section 121 and section 135. However, the range of mean differences across age groups was very small and not statistically significant when comparing adjacent age groups on either side of the current rule. In a subsequent study, Broach et al. (9) again found an overall “U”-shaped relationship between age and accident rates for professional pilots holding Class I or II medical and ATP or commercial certificates for accidents occurring under 14 CFR section 121 and section 135. Moreover, they reported that the accident rate for pilots age 60–63 was statistically greater than the rate for pilots age 55–59. That finding has been criticized as an artifact of the design (83), and may have reflected the historically higher risks associated with operations under Part 135, rather than the risk associated with pilot age per se.

Japan, in a study of its over-60 pilots, found that none had been involved in an accident during the 3-yr study period (46), and subsequently raised its age limit from 63 to 65. Standards in 45 countries have been amended to include exceptions that indicate specific circumstances under which pilots over the age of 60 may continue to fly commercial air transport aircraft (14). While many countries have adopted regulations that require additional operational restrictions, proficiency checks, and medical surveillance of older pilots, the regulations are not uniform from country to country (29). Regulations of the Joint Aviation Authorities, applicable to 37 member countries, allow a pilot age 60–64 to operate a multi-crew aircraft provided that no other pilot is 60 yr or older (31,32). Australia, Canada, and New Zealand have no maximum age restrictions for pilots, and many other countries have raised their age limits (29,82). Multinational research evaluating the experience of pilots over age 60 would be valuable.

Expertise

The benefits of pilot expertise on age-related pilot performance are often debated. The common belief is that experience will reduce the effects of age-related performance deficits; however, the results of recent scientific studies are mixed. After reviewing a number of studies, Salthouse concluded that age-related declines in performance were evident in measures of occupationally relevant activities (67). After additional review, however, Salthouse concluded that the accumulation of occupation-specific knowledge might explain how older employees maintain job performance (68). Hardy and Parasuraman suggest that “crystallized intelligence,” the store of information or knowledge an individual builds up through experience, may be less susceptible to aging than is “fluid intelligence” (22). Other researchers have found similar evidence suggesting that the experience gained by pilots reduces, but does not eliminate, the expected age-related decline in performance (38,41,50,78–80).

Alternatives to Chronological Age

Many researchers believe that criteria other than chronological age should be used to assess a pilot's ability to continue to fly (7,19,47,58,64,70,84,85). For example, functional age has been suggested as an alternative to chronological age to determine a pilot's ability to remain in flight status without a mandatory retirement age (7,19,47,58,64,70,84,85). Others believe that cognitive performance (22) or the risk of sudden medical incapacitation (71) cannot be adequately predicted by traditional testing methods; therefore, the use of functional age would be impractical. However, computerized neuropsychological test batteries have been developed that have been shown to accurately evaluate age-related changes in performance that could make functional age a workable concept in evaluating a pilot's ability to perform flight duties safely (18,73,86).

Kay (34) recently used CogScreen-AE to demonstrate that the magnitude of age effects on aviation-related cognitive performance negatively impacted aviation

TABLE I. THE EFFECT OF AGE ON PILOT PERFORMANCE.

		Effect of Age on Pilot Performance				
		Worse with Age	No Change with Age	Less Than Expected Change with Age	Improvement with Age	Other
Pilot Performance	Medical Incapacitation	[4,5,10,15,30,37,44,60,69]				
	General Physiological & Perceptual Motor	[12,22]				
	Vision	[2,13,20,24,56]	[13]*			
	Hearing	[6,28]				
	Cognitive Skills	[23,27,33,48,61,66,67,74]	[61] [†]			
	Memory	[49,52,66,67]		[50,53] [†]		
	Attention	[61,75,76,80,81]	[21,77]			
	Simulator Performance	[39,87]	[22,51,54,55,72]			[26] [§]
	Flight Performance	[5,37,40,62]	[41,42,46,63]		[3,35,43,45]	[8,9] ^{§§}
	Effects of Expertise	[23,61,66]		[22,38,68,78], [61,75,77,79,80] [†] , [50,53] [†]		

*Ideal visual conditions only.

[†]Time-sharing tasks only.

[‡]Aviation relevant tasks only.

[§]Ambivalent results.

^{§§}"U-shaped" relationship between age and accident rate.

performance; however, Kay emphasized that these were group data, and that conclusions based on the aggregate do not necessarily apply to individual pilots. Some older pilots performed better than some younger pilots, and it appeared that some airline pilots who continued to fly past age 60 did not show the predicted level of cognitive deterioration. Considerable investment would be required to implement the non-age-based criteria (36), and additional associated medical screening would be required (59). In addition, reliability and validity would have to be rigorously established in order to withstand the legal challenges that inevitably would be raised over their use, since the tests could potentially involve retirement decisions.

DISCUSSION

Changes in pilot performance with age are not completely understood and, therefore, cannot be easily explained. The changes discussed in this paper are summarized in Table I. The numbers in the table refer to studies in the reference list. Table I provides an easily referenced summary of the studies that were reviewed for this paper, from which some general conclusions can be drawn. However, it must be emphasized that the number of papers reporting age-related changes in performance in each cell does not necessarily directly indicate the strength of scientific evidence supporting such changes, given that the papers are not all of equal quality. Some of the papers were based on better studies, were better reviewed, and published in peer-reviewed journals, while others were not. Therefore, if a number of studies were to report that performance was worse with age, and an equal number report that performance improved, as was the case with Flight Performance Studies, this may not indicate that the weight of

scientific evidence is equally divided. It would depend on the quality of the individual studies in each cell.

Table I does imply that, while the scientific literature does not unanimously support age-related declines in all aspects of pilot performance, the majority of studies reveal that performance in all areas show declines with age. In fact, all studies reviewed in the areas of in-flight medical incapacitation have shown age-related declines in performance. Cognitive skills show age-related declines with the possible exception of time-sharing tasks, and memory skills show declines with age with the possible exception of aviation-relevant tasks.

Age-related performance declines in other areas of pilot performance are less clear. In several studies, the effects of expertise, while associated with fewer performance declines than expected with age in many studies, showed clear declines. Flight simulator studies and studies of the relationship between flight experience and pilot performance have led to somewhat conflicting results. Flight simulator studies have yielded results that included declining performance, no changes in performance, and ambiguous results with age. Similarly, flight performance studies have yielded mixed results that included declining performance, no performance changes, and improved performance with age.

Recent Challenges to the Age 60 Rule

In December 1995, the FAA acted on issues raised concerning the Age 60 Rule, responding to requested public comments to a 1993 comprehensive review of the Rule: the Age 60 Project, Consolidated Database Experiments, Final Report, 1993 (the Hilton Study) (35). The FAA also responded to issues raised by pilots seeking exemptions from the Age 60 Rule and a petition by the Professional Pilots Federation to remove the Rule. The

FAA cited that there were insufficient facts and analyses to support raising the age 60 limit while assuring that the current level of safety would be maintained or improved, and acknowledged that the medical and scientific literature indicates the lack of a single “obviously right answer.” On that basis, the FAA determined not to initiate rulemaking to change the Age 60 Rule at that time, and decided not to grant any of the pending petitions for exemption or rulemaking (57).

On February 15, 2001, S. 361, A Bill to Establish Age Limitations for Airmen, was introduced by Senator Frank Murkowski (R-AK). Citing a critical shortage of airline pilots, the purpose of the Bill was to change the mandatory retirement age of airline pilots from 60 yr of age to 65 yr. The Bill was read and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, which held hearings on March 13, 2001. On May 22, 2002, the Bill was amended, setting the air carrier pilot age limit to 63, providing that the FAA retains its authority to take measures to uphold air transport safety. At the time of this writing, the bill is still in Committee (1). In June 2002, another Petition for Exemption was filed with the FAA, this time requesting exemptions for 10 members of the Professional Pilots Federation. As of April 2003, the FAA has not responded (88).

On March 4, 2003, H.R. 1063 was introduced to the House of Representatives by James A. Gibbons, (R-NV), under the title: To limit the age restrictions imposed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for issuance or renewal of certain airman certificates, and for other purposes. The purpose of the Bill is to amend Section 44703 of title 49 United States Code to limit age restrictions on part 121 pilots who are age 65 or younger, and is to apply only to those persons who have not reached the age of 60 as of the date of enactment of the subsection. The bill was referred to the House Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and then referred to the Subcommittee on Aviation (25).

On March 12, 2003, Paul Emens, Vice Chairman of Air Line Pilots Against Age Discrimination, testified before the House Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. His support of H.R. 1063 to amend the Age 60 Rule to “at least the age of 65” was based on the belief that the Rule is age discrimination, and has an unfair economic effect on airline pilots. Arguing that the Rule is not a safety issue, he cited a number of agency and expert opinions, the FAA’s practice of granting exemptions to pilots with various medical problems after passing cognitive tests, and that airline pilots in 45 other nations continue to fly past age 60 (14).

S 959 followed just weeks later, entitled: A bill to limit the age restrictions imposed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the issuance or renewal of certain airman certificates, and for other purposes. The Bill was introduced on April 30, 2003 as a measure to end age discrimination among airline pilots by Senator Jim Inhofe (R-OK), who declared that he is the Senate’s only commercially licensed pilot. The Bill proposes to raise the “retirement age to 63 immediately, and then incrementally increases the age limit

to 65,” and would apply to those who did not yet reach the age of 64 as of the date of its enactment. Supporting arguments included the lack of medical and scientific evidence to support a specific age limit (65).

SUMMARY

A transition to a criterion-based process for determining a pilot’s fitness to fly beyond age 60 would require extensive additional research. The economic burden on the FAA and corporations to develop a non-age safety basis for denying pilots continued employment could be significant. It would require the identification and validation of medical and neuropsychological tests that predict which medical or psychological conditions pose a significant risk for continued flying. Considerable resources would be required to develop and validate these procedures and to administer them periodically to all pilots. This could mean that some pilots under the age of 60 would be removed from their positions if they did not perform at an acceptable level.

There are flight performance criteria currently in existence. Most major airlines, on an annual basis, have their pilots undergo rigorous flight performance (proficiency) checks, two of which are conducted in a digital simulator. Aircrew must meet the minimum standards described in a long list of objective performance criteria before being operationally certified. Some of these check-rides can last for several hours.

There are three conclusions that can be reached based on the available published data. First, performance on measures of most (not all) cognitive functions decline with advancing age. Second, the group of average effects may not predict the performance of any specific individual. Third, there are limited data demonstrating that the observed “declines” in test performance are predictive of any changes in performance in the cockpit (73).

It is important to remember that the decision to use 60 yr of age as an upper limit for commercial air transport operations was arbitrary. Currently, there is equal lack of justification for setting the age limit at 55 yr or at 65 yr. Finally, the current medical certification process implicitly, but not explicitly, assumes that meeting current medical standards places the aviator at an acceptably low level of risk for developing a medical incapacitation during the time prior to the next medical exam. The current discussion around the cognitive/performance aspects of the Age 60 Rule seems to require that any change in the rule, and any change in the certification process, would explicitly predict that the airman’s performance would not deteriorate below an acceptable level prior to the next medical exam.

Options

It is the recommendation of the Civil Aviation Safety Subcommittee that if the Association wishes to take a position on the Age 60 Rule, it should consider recommending one of the following options:

1. *Abandon the Age 60 Rule:* Based on the small number of accidents involving pilot incapacitation, current medical and performance testing of pilots at 6-mo in-

tervals appears to be successful in identifying high-risk pilots.

2. *Change the Age 60 Rule:* Increase the age limit to age 65, applicable to all pilots who have not reached the age of 60 at the time of the change. This recommendation is comparable to one made by a major FAA-sponsored study (the Hilton Study) that proposed raising the limit to age 63 while studying the results of the change (35).

3. *Consider replacing the age cutoff:* In the future, the age cutoff could be replaced with other tests that would screen out pilots likely to have a crash without unfairly affecting other pilots. This paper does not demonstrate the feasibility of developing such tests. During the years that will be required for development and testing of a predictive decision rule with high sensitivity and specificity, consideration should be given to Number 2 above.

4. *Make a statement:* State that there are no obvious medical or safety issues.

CONCLUSIONS

Age discrimination and a shortage of air transport pilots are but two arguments that have been presented in support of raising the air transport pilot age limit to age 65. Given the current global economic climate, and its effect on the aviation industry, the impetus for amending the Age 60 Rule may be slowed for now. The aviation medicine community is in a position to continue research and discussion that may provide additional evidence for policy-makers in the administrative and legislative arenas when the next challenge presents. Those addressing the future of the Age 60 Rule may benefit from understanding the nature and limitations of these studies, whether their outcomes are conclusive or not. Hopefully, some measure of guidance may be achieved as they address pilot age limits and related safety, economic, and operational issues of the aviation industry.

On review of the existing evidence, the Aerospace Medical Association concludes there is insufficient medical evidence to support restriction of pilot certification based on age alone.

ADDENDUM: RECENT LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

The following comprise the most recent legislative activities associated with the Age 60 Rule, as of, and accessed on, June 8, 2004 at The Library of Congress, Thomas Legislative Information on the Internet, <http://thomas.loc.gov>.

HR 1063: Latest major action was taken on March 5, 2003, when it was referred to the House Subcommittee on Aviation. Status: Referred to the House Subcommittee on Aviation.

S 959 IS: Latest major action: 4/30/03 Referred to Senate committee. Status: Read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Introduced on July 15, 2003: HR 2734 To authorize appropriations for the civil aviation research and development projects and activities of the Federal Aviation Administration and for other purposes. Sponsored by Rep. J. Randy Forbes, [VA-4]. For Fiscal Years 2004–2006, the bill authorizes funding for the FAA to study means of improving the national airspace system. Section 9 of the bill, Pilot Retirement Age Study, states: "The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a research study of whether commercial airline pilots between the ages of 60 and 64 who are employed by foreign air carriers pose a significant safety risk to United States passengers and airspace. The administrator shall transmit the results of the study to

the Congress not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act." It was reported with an amendment and referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for a period ending not later than December 8, 2003. Latest major action: Placed on the Union Calendar 12/8/2003, Calendar No. 231. House Report: 108-405 Part 1.

On August 1, 2003, Senate Bill 1569 The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation Pilots Equitable Treatment Act. Introduced By Sen. Daniel K. Akaka [HI]. The bill "amends the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) . . . to require the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, [PBGC], in the case of commercial airline pilots required by Federal Aviation Administration regulation to retire before age 65, to compute the actuarial value of monthly benefits in the form of a life annuity commencing at the required retirement age." In his introductory statement, Mr. Akaka proposes to lower the age requirement for pilots to receive maximum pension benefits allowed by PBGC for pilots from 65 to 60. PBGC provides a portion of retirement income to retirees whose employers are not able to pay the benefits owed in a defined benefit pension plan. Basic pension benefits are ensured, within legal limits, for present and future retirees, but maximum benefits are substantially lower for those retiring at age 60 than for those retiring at 65. The bill would require recalculation of pilot pension benefits to be comparable to the rate for age 65 retirees. The bill was read twice, referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. Status: In committee.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Very special thanks to Dr. Guohua Li for his informative contributions and guidance in the preparation of this manuscript. The contents of this report and its conclusions and recommendations represent the opinions of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or the policies of the U.S. Department of Defense, the U.S. Navy, the Federal Aviation Administration, the U.S. Department of Transportation, other national or international aviation agencies, or educational institutions.

REFERENCES

1. A bill to establish age limitations for airmen: Report No. 107-154 on S. 361 RS Before the Senate, The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 383 (May 22, 2002). Retrieved May 2003 from: <http://thomas.loc.gov/>.
2. Backman HA, Smith FD. The design and prescription of multifocal lenses for civil pilots. *Am J Optom Physiol Opt* 1975; 52:591-9.
3. Baker SP, Lamb MW, Grabowski G, et al. Characteristics of general aviation crashes involving mature male and female pilots. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2001; 72:447-52.
4. Bennett G. Harmonization of age limits for professional pilots. Report of the FCL Subgroup on Medical Certification. Presented at the European Civil Aviation Conference; 1990 Sept; Paris, France.
5. Bennett G. Medical-cause accidents in commercial aviation. *Euro Heart J* 1992; 13(Suppl. H):13-5.
6. Beringer DB, Harris HC, Joseph KM. Hearing thresholds among pilots and non-pilots. Implications for auditory warning design. In: Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society. Santa Monica, CA: HFES; 1998; 92-6.
7. Birren JE, Fisher LM. Rules and reason in the forced retirement of commercial airline pilots at age 60. *Ergonomics* 1995; 38:518-25.
8. Broach D, Joseph KM, Schroeder DJ. Pilot age and accident rates report 3: An analysis of professional air transport pilot accident rates by age. Oklahoma City, OK: FAA Civil Aeromedical Institute; 2000. Unpublished Civil Aeromedical Report prepared for Congress; Retrieved May 1, 2003, from: <http://www.camijccbi.gov/aam-400A/AGE60/age60-3.pdf>.
9. Broach D, Joseph K, Schroeder DJ. Pilot age and accident rates report 4: An analysis of professional ATP and commercial pilot accident rates by age. Oklahoma City, OK: FAA Civil Aeromedical Institute; 2000. Unpublished Civil Aeromedical Report

- prepared for Congress; Retrieved May 1, 2003, from: http://www.cami.jccbi.gov/aam-400A/AGE60/60_4.pdf.
10. Chapman PJC. The consequences of in-flight incapacitation in civil aviation. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1984; 55:497-500.
 11. Curdt-Christiansen CM. The case for an international upper age limit for airline pilots [abstract]. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2002; 73:309.
 12. Czaja SJ, ed. Human factors research needs for an aging population. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 1990.
 13. Elworth CL, Larry C, Malmstrom FV. Age, degraded viewing environments, and the speed of accommodation. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1986; 57:54-8.
 14. Emens P. Testimony: Hearing on Aviation Bill HR 1063: To limit the age restrictions imposed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the issuance or renewal of certain airman certificates, and for other purposes. Before the House Aviation Subcommittee, Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure, 108th Congress, 1st Session (March 12, 2003).
 15. Froom P. The risks of piloting with advanced age. *J Comm Health* 1994; 19:71-2.
 16. Froom P, Benbassat J, Gross M, et al. Air accidents, pilot experience, and disease-related inflight sudden incapacitation. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1988; 59:278-81.
 17. Gander PH, De Nguyen BE, Rosekind MR, et al. Age, circadian rhythms, and sleep loss in flight crews. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1993; 64:189-95.
 18. Gillilandt K, Schlegel RE. Readiness to perform testing: A critical analysis of the concept and current practices. Washington, DC: Office of Aviation Medicine; 1993. DOT/FAA/AM-93/13.
 19. Glazer I. Pilot aging policies in international airlines [abstract]. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1992; 63:428.
 20. Gubser AW. Aging problems and their impact on pilot performance. *Cockpit* 1983; 18:4-9.
 21. Hardy DJ, Mouloua M, Molloy R, et al. Monitoring of automation failures by young and old adults. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on Aviation Psychology; 1999; Columbus, OH: Ohio State University. 1999:1382-6.
 22. Hardy DJ, Parasuraman R. Cognition and flight performance in older pilots. *J Exp Psychol Appl* 1997; 3:313-48.
 23. Hardy DJ, Slick DJ, Satz P, et al. Neuropsychological test performance in middle-aged aviation pilots. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association; 1998; San Francisco, CA.
 24. Harper CR, Kidera GJ. Flight deck vision and the aging eye. *Aerospace Med* 1968; 39:1119-22.
 25. H.R. 1063. To limit the age restrictions imposed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the issuance or renewal of certain airman certificates, and for other purposes. Introduced in the House, 108th Congress, 1st Session, March 4, 2003. Retrieved April 2003, from: <http://thomas.loc.gov/>.
 26. Hyland DT, Kay EJ, Deimler JD. Age 60 rule research, Part IV: Experimental evaluation of pilot performance. Washington, DC: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Aviation Medicine; 1994. Report No.: DOT/FAA/AM-94/23.
 27. Hyland DT, Kay EJ, Deimler JD, et al. Age 60 rule research, Part II: Airline pilot age and performance. A review of the scientific literature. Washington, DC: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Aviation Medicine; 1994. Report No.: DOT/FAA/AM-94/21.
 28. Institute of Medicine. Airline pilot age, health, and performance: Scientific and medical considerations. Washington DC: National Academy Press; 1981.
 29. International Civil Aviation Organization. International standards and recommended practices. Personnel licensing, Annex 1 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation, 8th ed. supplement (June 2000).
 30. James M, Green R. Airline pilot incapacitation survey. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1991; 62:1068-72.
 31. Joint Aviation Authorities. General organization, membership and structure. Retrieved June 24, 2003 from <http://www.jaa.nl/whatisthejaa/jaainfo.html#2.1>.
 32. Joint Aviation Requirements JAR-FCL 3.060 (a), (b), JAR-FCL 3 Subpart A. Flight crew licensing (medical). Cheltenham, England: Joint Aviation Authorities; 1997.
 33. Kay GG. CogScreen aeromedical edition professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.; 1995.
 34. Kay GG. Effects of aging on aviation-related cognitive function in commercial airline pilots [abstract]. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2001; 72:241.
 35. Kay EJ, Hillman DJ, Hyland DT, Voros RS, Harris RM, Deimler JD. Age 60 rule research: Consolidated database experiments final report. Washington, DC: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Aviation Medicine, 1994; DOT/FAA/AM-94/22.
 36. Landy FJ. Alternatives to chronological age in determining standards of suitability for public safety jobs. Vol 1: Technical report. University Park, PA: Center for Applied Behavioral Sciences; 1992.
 37. Larcher JG, Veronneau SJH, DeJohn CA. In-flight medical incapacitation research [abstract]. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2001; 72:306.
 38. Lassiter DL, Morrow DG, Hinson GE, et al. Expertise and age effects on pilot mental workload in a simulated aviation task. Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 40th Annual Meeting; Santa Monica, CA: HFES; 1996: 133-7.
 39. Leirer VO, Yesavage JA, Morrow DG. Marijuana, aging, and task difficulty effects on pilot performance. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1989; 60:1145-52.
 40. Li G, Baker SP. Prior crash and violation records of pilots in commuter and air taxi crashes: A case-control study. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1994; 65:979-85.
 41. Li G, Baker SP, Grabowski JG, et al. Age, flight experience, and risk of crash involvement in a cohort of professional pilots. *Am J Epidemiol* 2003; 157:874-80.
 42. Li G, Baker SP, Lamb MW, et al. Human factors in aviation crashes involving older pilots. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2002; 73:134-8.
 43. Lubner ME, Markowitz JS, Isherwood DA. Rates and risk factors for accidents and incidents versus violations for U.S. airmen. *Int J Aviat Psychol* 1991; 1:231-43.
 44. Martin-Saint-Laurent A, Lavernhe J, Casano G, et al. Clinical aspects of in-flight incapacitations in commercial aviation. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1990; 61:256-60.
 45. McFadden KL. Predicting pilot-error incidents of U.S. airline pilots using logistic regression. *Appl Ergon* 1997; 28:209-12.
 46. Miura Y, Shoji M, Fukumoto M, et al. Three-year evaluation of elderly flight crew over 60 to 63 years old in Japan. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2000; 71:312-4.
 47. Mohler SR. The aging pilot question: History and technology status [abstract]. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1992; 63:427.
 48. Morrow D, Leirer V, eds. Aging, pilot performance, and expertise. In: Fisk AD, Rogers WA, eds. *Handbook of human factors and the older adult*. San Diego: Academic Press; 1997.
 49. Morrow D, Leirer V, Altieri P. Aging, expertise, and narrative processing. *Psychol Aging* 1992; 7:376-88.
 50. Morrow D, Leirer V, Altieri P, Fitzsimmons C. When expertise reduces age differences in performance. *Psychol Aging* 1994; 9:134-48.
 51. Morrow D, Leirer V, Yesavage JA. The influence of alcohol and aging on radio communication during flight. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1990; 61:12-20.
 52. Morrow DG, Menard WE, Stine-Morrow EAL. Expertise and aging in pilot communication: The role of environmental support. Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society; 1999a; Houston, TX. Santa Monica, CA: HFES: 1999:113-7.
 53. Morrow D, Menard WE, Stine-Morrow EAL. The influence of aging and expertise on pilot communication. Paper presented at the 10th International Symposium on Aviation Psychology; 1999b; Columbus, OH: Ohio State University; 1999: 1337-42.
 54. Morrow D, Yesavage J, Leirer V, et al. The time-course of alcohol impairment of general aviation pilot performance in a Frasca 141 simulator. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1993; 64:697-705.
 55. Morrow D, Yesavage J, Leirer V, Tinklenberg J. Influence of aging and practice on piloting tasks. *Exp Aging Res* 1993; 19:53-70.
 56. Nakagawara VB, Wood KJ, Montgomery RW. Vision impairment and corrective considerations of civil airmen. Washington, DC: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Aviation Medicine; 1993. Report No.: DOT/FAA/AM-93/21.
 57. Notice of FAA decisions on Age-60 Rule. The age 60 rule, Docket No. 27264 14 CFR Part 121. Washington, DC: Federal Aviation

- Administration, Department of Transportation; December 11, 1995. Retrieved May 2003, from: <http://www.avweb.com/other/age60rul.txt>.
58. Odenheimer G. Function, flying, and the age-60 rule [editorial]. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1999; 47:910-11.
 59. Office of Technology Assessment. Medical risk assessment and the age 60 rule for airline pilots. Washington, DC: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, Committee on Public Works and Transportation, U.S. House of Representatives; 1990.
 60. Orlady HW. The case against compulsory retirement. *The Airline Pilot* 1959 Aug; 28:4-14.
 61. Parasuraman R, Mouloua M, Molloy R. Monitoring automation failures in human-machine systems. In: Mouloua M, Parasuraman R, eds. *Human performance in automated systems: Current research and trends*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1994.
 62. Pelegrib C, Maho V, Amalberti R. Pilot age and training performance. In: *Aviation psychology: Training and selection. Proceedings of the 21st Conference of the European Association for Aviation Psychology*; 1995; Brookfield, VT. Aldershot, UK: Avebury Aviation; 1995:354-63.
 63. Rebok GW, Grabowski JC, Baker SP, et al. Pilot age and performance as factors in aviation crashes. Poster presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association; 1999; Boston, MA.
 64. Salive ME. Evaluation of aging pilots: Evidence, policy, and future directions. *Mil Med* 1994; 159:83-6.
 65. S. 959. A bill to limit the age restrictions imposed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the issuance or renewal of certain airman certificates, and for other purposes. Introduced before the Senate of the United States, 108th Congress, 1st Session (2003). *Congressional Record-Senate*: S5607. Retrieved May 2003 from: <http://thomas.loc.gov/>.
 66. Salthouse TA. *A theory of cognitive aging*. New York: North-Holland; 1985.
 67. Salthouse TA. Influence of experience on age differences in cognitive functioning. *Hum Factors* 1990; 32:551-69.
 68. Salthouse TA. Age-related differences in basic cognitive processes: Implications for work. *Exp Aging Res* 1994; 20:249-55.
 69. Simmons M, Valk PJJ, Krol JR, et al. Consequences of raising the maximum age limit for airline pilots. *Proceedings of the Third ICAO Global Flight Safety and Human Factors Symposium*; 1996; Auckland. *Human Factors Digest* No. 13; CIRC 266-AN/158:248-55.
 70. Stoklosa JH. Review of performance, medical and operational data on pilot aging issues [abstract]. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1992; 63:428.
 71. Stuck AE, van Gorp WG, Josephson KR, et al. Multidimensional risk assessment versus age as a criterion for retirement of airline pilots. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1992; 40:526-32.
 72. Taylor JL, Dolhert N, Morrow D, et al. Acute and 8-hour effects of alcohol (0.08% BAC) on younger and older pilots' simulator performance. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1994; 65:718-25.
 73. Taylor JL, O'Hara R, Mumenthaler MS, et al. Relationship of CogScreen-AE to flight simulator performance and pilot age. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2000; 71:373-80.
 74. Tsang PS. A reappraisal of aging and pilot performance. *Int J Aviat Psychol* 1992; 2:193-212.
 75. Tsang PS. Age and pilot performance. In: Telfer R, Moore PJ, eds. *Aviation training: Learners, instruction and organization*. Brookfield, VT: Avebury; 1997:21-40.
 76. Tsang PS, ed. A microanalysis of age and pilot time-sharing performance. In: Harris D, Tsang PS, eds. *Engineering psychology and cognitive ergonomics. Vol. One: Transportation systems*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate; 1997a:245-51.
 77. Tsang PS. Retention and transfer to time-sharing skill as a function of age and flight experience. *Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium on Aviation Psychology*; 1999 May; Columbus, OH: Ohio State University; 1999:833-7.
 78. Tsang PS, Shaner TL. Age, expertise, structural similarity, and time-sharing efficiency. *Proceedings of the 39th annual meeting of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*; Santa Monica, CA: HFES; 1995:124.
 79. Tsang PS, Shaner TL. Age, attention, expertise, and time-sharing performance. *Psychol Aging* 1998; 13:323-47.
 80. Tsang PS, Voss DT. Boundaries of cognitive performance as a function of age and flight experience. *Int J Aviat Psychol* 1996; 6:359-77.
 81. Vincenzi DA, Mouloua M. Monitoring automation failures: Effects of age on performance and subjective workload. In: Scerbo MW, Mouloua M, eds. *Automation technology and human performance: Current research and trends*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1999.
 82. Watson D, Navathe P, Callaghan K, et al. Sometimes it's illegal to discriminate using age: A New Zealand regulatory perspective on pilot upper age limits [abstract]. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2002; 73:309.
 83. Wilkening R. The age 60 rule: Age discrimination in commercial aviation [abstract]. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2002; 73:194.
 84. Williams JD, Williams JA. Commercial pilots and mandatory retirement. In: Dietz SR, Thomas WE, eds. *Pilots, personality, and performance*. New York: Quorum Books; 1991:125-43.
 85. Williams TF. Testimony before a joint hearing of the House Select Committee on Aging and the Education and Labor Subcommittee on employment opportunities on the problem of age discrimination in employment. 24 September 1991: Washington, D.C.; 102nd Congress, First Session.
 86. Yakimovich NV, Strongin GL, Govorushenko VV, et al. CogScreen as a predictor of flight performance in Russian pilots [abstract]. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1994; 65:443.
 87. Yesavage JA, Taylor JL, Mumenthaler MS, et al. Relationship of age and simulated flight performance. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1999; 47:819-23.
 88. Yetman B. Our petition. *PPF Newsletter* 2003 Apr;13(4):1-3. Retrieved April 2003 from: <http://www.ppf.org>.