

AMR CORP  
Form 10-K/A  
February 27, 2007

**Table of Contents**

**United States  
Securities and Exchange Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20549**

**Form 10-K/A  
(Amendment No. 1)**

**Annual Report Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934  
For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006**

**Transition Report Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934  
Commission File Number: 1-8400  
AMR Corporation  
(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)**

**Delaware**  
(State or other jurisdiction of  
incorporation or organization)

**75-1825172**  
(IRS Employer  
Identification Number)

**4333 Amon Carter Blvd.  
Fort Worth, Texas 76155**  
(Address of principal executive offices, including zip code)  
**(817) 963-1234**  
(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Title of Each Class	Name of Exchange on Which Registered
<b>Common Stock, \$1 par value per share</b>	<b>New York Stock Exchange</b>
<b>9.00% Debentures due 2016</b>	<b>New York Stock Exchange</b>
<b>7.875% Public Income Notes due 2039</b>	<b>New York Stock Exchange</b>

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act:

**None**

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act.  
 Yes  No

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Act.  
 Yes  No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days.  
 Yes  No

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of the registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K/A or any amendment to this Form 10-K/A.  
 Yes  No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, or a non-accelerated filer. See definition of "accelerated filer" and "large accelerated filer" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large Accelerated Filer  Accelerated Filer  Non-accelerated Filer

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Act).  
 Yes  No

The aggregate market value of the voting stock held by non-affiliates of the registrant as of June 30, 2006, was approximately \$5.4 billion. As of February 16, 2007, 239,895,561 shares of the registrant's common stock were outstanding.

**DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE**

Part III of this Form 10-K/A incorporates by reference certain information from the Proxy Statement for the Annual Meeting of Stockholders to be held May 16, 2007.

---

**Table of Contents**

**EXPLANATORY NOTE**

This Form 10-K/A (Amendment No. 1) is being filed by AMR Corporation (the Company) to revise the presentation of the adjustment resulting from the Company's adoption in 2006 of SFAS 158, Employers' Accounting for Defined Benefit Pension and Other Postretirement Plans, in the Consolidated Statement of Stockholders' Equity (Deficit) included in the Company's original report on Form 10-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on February 23, 2007 (original Form 10-K). These revisions do not change the total stockholders' deficit previously reported or any of the other previously reported ending balances in the Consolidated Statement of Stockholders' Equity (Deficit) as of December 31, 2006.

The only revisions to the Consolidated Statement of Stockholders' Equity (Deficit) included in the original 10-K are as follows:

The line item Adjustment resulting from adoption of SFAS 158 that reduced stockholders' equity (deficit) by \$998 million in 2006 was inadvertently included as a component of the subtotal of total comprehensive income (loss) for 2006 in the Consolidated Statement of Stockholders' Equity (Deficit) in the original Form 10-K. Total comprehensive income (loss) has been revised to exclude the line item Adjustment resulting from adoption of SFAS 158, which is now shown below the Total comprehensive income (loss) subtotal. Revised Total comprehensive income for 2006 is \$917 million.

In addition to the revisions to the Consolidated Statement of Stockholders' Equity (Deficit) referred to above: 1) as required by Rule 12b-15 promulgated under the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, the Company's principal executive officer and principal financial officer are providing new Rule 13a-14(a) certifications in connection with this Form 10-K/A and are also furnishing, but not filing, a new written statement pursuant to section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, and 2) the Company is filing an updated consent of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm.

The only changes to the original Form 10-K being made by this Form 10-K/A are those described above. No attempt has been made in this Form 10-K/A to modify or update disclosures in the original Form 10-K except as required to address the changes in Item 8. This Form 10-K/A does not reflect events occurring after the filing of the original Form 10-K or modify or update any related disclosures. Information not affected by the amendment is unchanged and reflects the disclosure made at the time of the filing of the original Form 10-K.

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**PART I**

**ITEM 1. BUSINESS**

**ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS**

**ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS**

**ITEM 2. PROPERTIES**

**ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS**

**ITEM 4. SUBMISSION OF MATTERS TO A VOTE OF SECURITY HOLDERS**

**PART II**

**ITEM 5. MARKET FOR REGISTRANT'S COMMON STOCK AND RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS**

**ITEM 6. SELECTED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL DATA**

**ITEM 7. MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS**

**ITEM 7(A). QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK**

**ITEM 8. CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

**ITEM 9. CHANGES IN AND DISAGREEMENTS WITH ACCOUNTANTS ON ACCOUNTING AND FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE**

**ITEM 9A. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES**

**PART III**

**ITEM 10. DIRECTORS AND EXECUTIVE OFFICERS OF THE REGISTRANT**

**ITEM 11. EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION**

**ITEM 12. SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT**

**ITEM 13. CERTAIN RELATIONSHIPS AND RELATED TRANSACTIONS**

**ITEM 14. PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTANT FEES AND SERVICES**

**PART IV**

**ITEM 15. EXHIBITS AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT SCHEDULES**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - John W. Bachmann**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Edward A. Brennan**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - David L. Boren**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Armando M. Codina**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Armando M. Codina**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Earl G. Graves**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Ann M. Korologos**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Michael A. Miles**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Phillip J. Purcell**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Ray M. Robinson**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Judith Rodin**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Matthew K. Rose**

**Deferred Compensation Agreement - Roger T. Staubach**

**2007 Annual Incentive Plan for American, as Amended**

**1998 Long-Term Incentive Plan, as Amended**

**Amendment of Stock Option Agreements Under the 1998 Long-Term Incentive Plan to Add Stock Appreciation Rights**

**2007 Employee Profit Sharing Plan**

**Computation of Ratio of Earnings to Fixed Charges**

**Subsidiaries**

**Consent of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm**

**Certification of Chief Executive Officer**

**Certification of Chief Financial Officer**

**Certification Pursuant to Section 906**

## PART I

### ITEM 1. BUSINESS

AMR Corporation (AMR or the Company) was incorporated in October 1982. AMR's operations fall almost entirely in the airline industry. AMR's principal subsidiary, American Airlines, Inc. (American), was founded in 1934. American is the largest scheduled passenger airline in the world. At the end of 2006, American provided scheduled jet service to approximately 150 destinations throughout North America, the Caribbean, Latin America, Europe and Asia. American is also one of the largest scheduled air freight carriers in the world, providing a wide range of freight and mail services to shippers throughout its system.

In addition, AMR Eagle Holding Corporation (AMR Eagle), a wholly-owned subsidiary of AMR, owns two regional airlines which do business as American Eagle American Eagle Airlines, Inc. and Executive Airlines, Inc. (Executive) (collectively, the American Eagle® carriers). American also contracts with three independently owned regional airlines, which do business as the American Connection (the American Connection® carriers). The American Eagle carriers and the American Connection carriers provide connecting service from eight of American's high-traffic cities to smaller markets throughout the United States, Canada, Mexico and the Caribbean.

American Beacon Advisors, Inc. (American Beacon), a wholly-owned subsidiary of AMR, is responsible for the investment and oversight of assets of AMR's U.S. employee benefit plans, as well as AMR's short-term investments. It also serves as the investment manager of the American Beacon Funds, a family of mutual funds with both institutional and retail shareholders, and provides customized fixed income portfolio management services. As of December 31, 2006, American Beacon was responsible for the management of approximately \$57.9 billion in assets, including direct management of approximately \$28.2 billion in short-term fixed income investments.

#### **Recent Events**

The Company recorded net earnings of \$231 million in 2006 compared to a net loss of \$857 million in 2005. The Company's 2006 results reflected an improvement in revenues somewhat offset by fuel prices and certain other costs that were higher in 2006 compared to 2005. The Company's revenues increased approximately \$1.9 billion in 2006 compared to 2005. American's passenger revenues increased 7.5 percent despite a capacity (available seat mile) decrease of 1.2 percent. While passenger yield showed significant year-over-year improvement as American implemented fare increases to partially offset the continuing rise in the cost of fuel, passenger yield remains low by historical standards.

The average price per gallon of fuel increased 51.9 cents from 2004 to 2005 and 27.9 cents from 2005 to 2006. These price increases negatively impacted fuel expense by \$1.6 billion and \$787 million in 2005 and 2006, respectively, as compared to the respective prior years. Continuing high fuel prices, additional increases in the price of fuel, and/or disruptions in the supply of fuel would further adversely affect the Company's financial condition and its results of operations.

AMR continues to recapitalize its balance sheet and in May 2006, issued 15 million shares of common stock for net proceeds of \$400 million. On January 26, 2007, AMR issued an additional 13 million shares of common stock for net proceeds of \$497 million.

The Company's ability to become consistently profitable and its ability to continue to fund its obligations on an ongoing basis will depend on a number of factors, many of which are largely beyond the Company's control. Certain risk factors that affect the Company's business and financial results are discussed in the Risk Factors listed in Item 1A. In addition, four of the Company's largest domestic competitors have filed for bankruptcy in the last several years and have used this process to significantly reduce contractual labor and other costs. In order to remain competitive and to improve its financial condition, the Company must continue to take steps to generate additional revenues and to reduce its costs. Although the Company has a number of initiatives underway to address its cost and revenue challenges, the ultimate success of these initiatives is not known at this time and cannot be assured.

**Table of Contents**

**Competition**

**Domestic Air Transportation** The domestic airline industry is fiercely competitive. Currently, any U.S. air carrier deemed fit by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) is free to operate scheduled passenger service between any two points within the U.S. and its possessions. Most major air carriers have developed hub-and-spoke systems and schedule patterns in an effort to maximize the revenue potential of their service. American operates five hubs: Dallas/Fort Worth (DFW), Chicago O'Hare, Miami, St. Louis and San Juan, Puerto Rico. United Air Lines (United) also has a hub operation at Chicago O'Hare.

The American Eagle® carriers increase the number of markets the Company serves by providing connections at American's hubs and certain other major airports—Boston, Los Angeles, Raleigh/Durham and New York's LaGuardia (LaGuardia) and John F. Kennedy International (JFK) Airports. The American Connection® carriers provide connecting service to American through St. Louis. American's competitors also own or have marketing agreements with regional carriers which provide similar services at their major hubs and other locations.

On most of its domestic non-stop routes, the Company faces competing service from at least one, and sometimes more than one, domestic airline including: AirTran Airways (Air Tran), Alaska Airlines (Alaska), ATA Airlines, Continental Airlines (Continental), Delta Air Lines (Delta), Frontier Airlines, JetBlue Airways (JetBlue), Northwest Airlines (Northwest), Southwest Airlines (Southwest), United, US Airways and their affiliated regional carriers. Competition is even greater between cities that require a connection, where the major airlines compete via their respective hubs. In addition, the Company faces competition on some of its routes from carriers operating point-to-point service on such routes. The Company also competes with all-cargo and charter carriers and, particularly on shorter segments, ground and rail transportation. On all of its routes, pricing decisions are affected, in large part, by the need to meet competition from other airlines.

The Company must also compete with carriers that have recently reorganized or are reorganizing, including under the protection of Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code (Chapter 11). It is possible that one or more other competitors may seek to reorganize in or out of Chapter 11. Successful reorganizations present the Company with competitors with significantly lower operating costs derived from renegotiated labor, supply and financing contracts.

**International Air Transportation** In addition to its extensive domestic service, the Company provides international service to the Caribbean, Canada, Latin America, Europe and Asia. The Company's operating revenues from foreign operations were approximately 37 percent of the Company's total operating revenues in 2006, and 36 and 35 percent of the Company's total operating revenues in 2005 and 2004, respectively. Additional information about the Company's foreign operations is included in Note 14 to the consolidated financial statements.

In providing international air transportation, the Company competes with foreign investor-owned carriers, foreign state-owned carriers and U.S. airlines that have been granted authority to provide scheduled passenger and cargo service between the U.S. and various overseas locations. The major U.S. air carriers have some advantage over foreign competitors in their ability to generate traffic from their extensive domestic route systems. In some cases, however, foreign governments limit U.S. air carriers' rights to carry passengers beyond designated gateway cities in foreign countries. To improve access to each other's markets, various U.S. and foreign air carriers—including American—have established marketing relationships with other airlines and rail companies. American currently has marketing relationships with Aer Lingus, Air Pacific, Air Sahara, Air Tahiti Nui, Alaska Airlines, British Airways, Cathay Pacific, China Eastern Airlines, Deutsche Bahn German Rail, EL AL, EVA Air, Finnair, Gulf Air, Hawaiian Airlines, Iberia, Japan Airlines, LAN (includes LAN Airlines, LAN Argentina, LAN Ecuador and LAN Peru), Malév Hungarian Airlines, Mexicana, Qantas Airways, Royal Jordanian, SN Brussels Airlines, SNCF French Rail, TAM, Turkish Airlines and Vietnam Airlines.

**Table of Contents**

American is also a founding member of the **oneworld** alliance, which includes Aer Lingus, British Airways, Cathay Pacific, Finnair, Lan Airlines, Iberia, and Qantas. In addition, **oneworld** has extended invitations to join **oneworld** to Japan Airlines, Malev and Royal Jordanian, all of which are expected to begin offering benefits as members of the alliance in April 2007. The **oneworld** alliance links the networks of the member carriers to enhance customer service and smooth connections to the destinations served by the alliance, including linking the carriers' frequent flyer programs and access to the carriers' airport lounge facilities. Several of American's major competitors are members of marketing/operational alliances that enjoy antitrust immunity. American and British Airways, the largest members of the **oneworld** alliance, are restricted in their relationship because they lack antitrust immunity. They are, therefore, at a competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis other alliances that have antitrust immunity.

**Price Competition** The airline industry is characterized by substantial and intense price competition. Fare discounting by competitors has historically had a negative effect on the Company's financial results because the Company is generally required to match competitors' fares as failing to match would provide even less revenue due to customers' price sensitivity.

In recent years, a number of low-cost carriers (LCCs) have entered the domestic market. Several major airlines, including the Company, have implemented efforts to lower their costs since lower cost structures enable airlines to offer lower fares. In addition, several air carriers have recently reorganized or are reorganizing, including under Chapter 11, including United, Delta, US Airways and Northwest Airlines. Reorganization allows these carriers to decrease operating costs. In the past, lower cost structures have generally resulted in fare reductions. If fare reductions are not offset by increases in passenger traffic, changes in the mix of traffic that improve yields (passenger revenue per passenger mile) and/or cost reductions, the Company's operating results will be negatively impacted.

**Regulation**

**General** The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, as amended, eliminated most domestic economic regulation of passenger and freight transportation. However, the DOT and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) still exercise certain regulatory authority over air carriers. The DOT maintains jurisdiction over the approval of international codeshare agreements, international route authorities and certain consumer protection and competition matters, such as advertising, denied boarding compensation and baggage liability.

The FAA regulates flying operations generally, including establishing standards for personnel, aircraft and certain security measures. As part of that oversight, the FAA has implemented a number of requirements that the Company has incorporated and is incorporating into its maintenance programs. The Company is progressing toward the completion of over 100 airworthiness directives including ATR Alpha thermal blanket replacements, enhanced ground proximity warning systems, McDonnell Douglas MD-80 main landing gear piston improvements, Boeing 757 and Boeing 767 pylon improvements, Boeing 737 elevator and rudder improvements and Airbus A300 structural improvements. Based on its current implementation schedule, the Company expects to be in compliance with the applicable requirements within the required time periods.

The Department of Justice (DOJ) has jurisdiction over airline antitrust matters. The U.S. Postal Service has jurisdiction over certain aspects of the transportation of mail and related services. Labor relations in the air transportation industry are regulated under the Railway Labor Act, which vests in the National Mediation Board certain regulatory functions with respect to disputes between airlines and labor unions relating to union representation and collective bargaining agreements.



**Table of Contents**

**International** International air transportation is subject to extensive government regulation. The Company's operating authority in international markets is subject to aviation agreements between the U.S. and the respective countries or governmental authorities (such as the European Union), and in some cases, fares and schedules require the approval of the DOT and/or the relevant foreign governments. Moreover, alliances with international carriers may be subject to the jurisdiction and regulations of various foreign agencies. Bilateral agreements between the U.S. and various foreign governments of countries served by the Company are periodically subject to renegotiation. Changes in U.S. or foreign government aviation policies could result in the alteration or termination of such agreements, diminish the value of route authorities, or otherwise adversely affect the Company's international operations. In addition, at some foreign airports, an air carrier needs slots (landing and take-off authorizations) before the air carrier can introduce new service or increase existing service. The availability of such slots is not assured and the inability of the Company to obtain and retain needed slots could therefore inhibit its efforts to compete in certain international markets.

The Company is one of four carriers that have exclusive rights to fly routes between London Heathrow airport and the United States. The United States government and the European Union are currently evaluating the possibility of allowing a greater number of carriers to fly these routes. To the extent additional carriers are granted the right to fly between Heathrow and the United States in the future, and are able to obtain the necessary slots and terminal facilities, the Company could suffer an adverse financial impact. See Item 1A, Risk Factors, for additional information.

**Security** In November 2001, the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (ATSA) was enacted in the United States. The ATSA created a new government agency, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), which is part of the Department of Homeland Security and is responsible for aviation security. The ATSA mandates that the TSA provide for the screening of all passengers and property, including U.S. mail, cargo, carry-on and checked baggage, and other articles that will be carried aboard a passenger aircraft. The ATSA also provides for security in flight decks of aircraft and requires federal air marshals to be present on certain flights.

Effective February 1, 2002, the ATSA imposed a \$2.50 per enplanement security service fee (\$5 one-way maximum fee), which is being collected by the air carriers and submitted to the government to pay for these enhanced security measures. Additionally, air carriers are annually required to submit to the government an amount equal to what the air carriers paid for screening passengers and property in 2000. In recent years, President Bush has sought to increase both of these fees under spending proposals for the Department of Homeland Security. American and other carriers have announced their opposition to these proposals as there is no assurance that any increase in fees could be passed on to customers.

**Airline Fares** Airlines are permitted to establish their own domestic fares without governmental regulation. The DOT maintains authority over certain international fares, rates and charges, but applies this authority on a limited basis. In addition, international fares and rates are sometimes subject to the jurisdiction of the governments of the foreign countries which the Company serves. While air carriers are required to file and adhere to international fare and rate tariffs, substantial commissions, fare overrides and discounts to travel agents, brokers and wholesalers characterize many international markets.

**Airport Access** The FAA has designated JFK, LaGuardia, and Washington Reagan airports as high-density traffic airports. The high-density rule limits the number of Instrument Flight Rule operations—take-offs and landings permitted per hour and requires that a slot support each operation. In April 2000, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Air 21 Act) was enacted. It eliminated slot restrictions at JFK and LaGuardia airports effective January 1, 2007. The Company expects that the elimination of these slot restrictions could adversely impact the Company.

In 2006, the FAA issued an order requiring carriers to hold arrival authorizations to land during certain hours at Chicago O'Hare. The FAA also issued two proposed rules to limit operations at LaGuardia after January 1, 2007. The first will limit operations on an interim basis, and is not expected to differ materially from the high-density rule. The second would replace the interim rule and limit operations at LaGuardia indefinitely. The Company, along with other carriers and interested parties, filed comments with the FAA in December 2006 seeking changes to the proposed rules. The rules, as currently drafted, could require the Company to change the routes and service it currently operates at LaGuardia, which could adversely impact the Company.



**Table of Contents**

Under the high-density rule, the FAA permits the purchasing, selling, leasing or transferring of slots, except those slots designated as international, and essential air service slots (certain slots at JFK, LaGuardia, and Washington Reagan airports). Trading of any domestic slot is permitted subject to certain parameters. The FAA's Order places some limits on the ability to buy and sell arrival authorizations. The FAA's proposed orders for LaGuardia also contemplate certain restrictions. Some foreign airports, including London Heathrow, a major European destination for American, also have slot allocations. Most foreign authorities do not officially recognize the purchasing, selling or leasing of slots.

Although the Company is constrained by slots, it currently has sufficient slot authorizations to operate its existing flights. However, there is no assurance that the Company will be able to obtain slots in the future to expand its operations or change its schedules because, among other factors, slot allocations are subject to changes in government policies.

On October 13, 2006, the Wright Amendment Reform Act of 2006 (the Act) was signed into law by the President. The Act is based on an agreement by the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth, Texas, DFW International Airport, Southwest, and the Company to modify the Wright Amendment, which authorizes certain flight operations at Dallas Love Field within limited geographic areas. Among other things, the Act eventually eliminates domestic geographic restrictions on operations while limiting the maximum number of gates at Love Field. The Company believes the Act is a pragmatic resolution of the issues related to the Wright Amendment and the use of Love Field; however, the lifting of geographic restrictions at Love Field could have an adverse financial impact on the Company.

**Table of Contents**

**Environmental Matters** The Company is subject to various laws and government regulations concerning environmental matters and employee safety and health in the U.S. and other countries. U.S. federal laws that have a particular impact on the Company include the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 (ANCA), the Clean Air Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA or the Superfund Act). Certain operations of the Company are also subject to the oversight of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) concerning employee safety and health matters. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), OSHA, and other federal agencies have been authorized to promulgate regulations that have an impact on the Company's operations. In addition to these federal activities, various states have been delegated certain authorities under the aforementioned federal statutes. Many state and local governments have adopted environmental and employee safety and health laws and regulations, some of which are similar to or stricter than federal requirements.

The ANCA recognizes the rights of airport operators with noise problems to implement local noise abatement programs so long as they do not interfere unreasonably with interstate or foreign commerce or the national air transportation system. Authorities in several cities have promulgated aircraft noise reduction programs, including the imposition of nighttime curfews. The ANCA generally requires FAA approval of local noise restrictions on aircraft. While the Company has had sufficient scheduling flexibility to accommodate local noise restrictions imposed to date, the Company's operations could be adversely affected if locally-imposed regulations become more restrictive or widespread.

Many aspects of our operations are subject to increasingly stringent environmental regulations. Concerns about climate change and greenhouse gas emissions, in particular, may result in the imposition of additional regulation. For example, the European Commission is currently seeking to impose emissions controls on all flights coming into Europe. Such regulatory action by the U.S. or foreign governments in the future may adversely affect our business and financial results.

American is a named potentially responsible party (PRP) at the former Operating Industries, Inc. Landfill in Monterrey Park, CA (OII). American is participating with a number of other PRPs in a Steering Committee that has conducted extensive negotiations with the EPA and state officials in recent years. Members of the Steering Committee, including American, have entered into a series of partial consent decrees with EPA and the State of California which address specific aspects of investigation and cleanup at OII. American's alleged volumetric contributions at OII are small when compared with those of other PRPs, and American expects that any future payments will be immaterial.

American also has been named as a PRP for soil contamination at the Double Eagle Superfund Site in Oklahoma City, OK (Double Eagle). American's alleged volumetric contributions are small when compared with those of other PRPs. American is participating with a number of other PRPs at Double Eagle in a Joint Defense Group that is actively conducting settlement negotiations with the EPA and state officials. The group is seeking a settlement on behalf of its members that will enable American to resolve its past and present liabilities at Double Eagle in exchange for a one-time, lump-sum settlement payment. American expects that its payment will be immaterial.

American, along with most other tenants at the San Francisco International Airport (SFIA), has been ordered by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board to engage in various studies of potential environmental contamination at the airport and to undertake remedial measures, if necessary. In 1997, the SFIA pursued a cost recovery action in the U.S. District Court of Northern California against certain airport tenants to recover past and future costs associated with historic airport contamination. American entered an initial settlement for accrued past costs in 2000. In 2004, American resolved its liability for all remaining past and future costs. Based on SFIA's cost projections, the value of American's second settlement is immaterial and is payable over a 30 year period.

**Table of Contents**

Miami-Dade County (the County) is currently investigating and remediating various environmental conditions at MIA and funding the remediation costs through landing fees and various cost recovery methods. American and AMR Eagle have been named PRPs for the contamination at MIA. See Item 3, Legal Proceedings, for additional information regarding remediation efforts at MIA.

In 1999, American was ordered by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) to conduct remediation of environmental contamination located at Terminals 8 and 9 at JFK. In 2004, American entered a Consent Order with NYSDEC for the remediation of a JFK off-terminal hangar facility. American expects that the projected costs associated with the JFK remediations will be immaterial.

In 1996, American and Executive, along with other tenants at the Luis Munoz Marin International Airport in San Juan, Puerto Rico (SJU) were notified by the SJU Port Authority that it considered them potentially responsible for environmental contamination at the airport. In 2003, the SJU Port Authority requested that American, among other airport tenants, fund an ongoing subsurface investigation and site assessment. American denied liability for the related costs. No further action has been taken against American or Executive.

Pursuant to an Administrative Order on Consent entered into with NYSDEC, American Eagle is implementing a final remedy to address contamination at an inactive hazardous waste site in Poughkeepsie, New York. The costs of this final remedy are immaterial.

The Company does not expect these matters, individually or collectively, to have a material adverse impact on the Company. See Note 4 to the consolidated financial statements for additional information on accruals related to environmental issues.

**Labor**

The airline business is labor intensive. Wages, salaries and benefits represented approximately 32 percent of the Company's consolidated operating expenses for the year ended December 31, 2006. The average full-time equivalent number of employees of the Company's subsidiaries for the year ended December 31, 2006 was 86,600.

The majority of these employees are represented by labor unions and covered by collective bargaining agreements. Relations with such labor organizations are governed by the Railway Labor Act (RLA). Under this act, the collective bargaining agreements among the Company's subsidiaries and these organizations generally do not expire but instead become amendable as of a stated date. If either party wishes to modify the terms of any such agreement, it must notify the other party in the manner agreed to by the parties. Under the RLA, after receipt of such notice, the parties must meet for direct negotiations, and if no agreement is reached, either party may request the National Mediation Board (NMB) to appoint a federal mediator. The RLA prescribes no set timetable for the direct negotiation and mediation process. It is not unusual for those processes to last for many months, and even for a few years. If no agreement is reached in mediation, the NMB in its discretion may declare at some time that an impasse exists, and if an impasse is declared, the NMB proffers binding arbitration to the parties. Either party may decline to submit to arbitration. If arbitration is rejected by either party, a 30-day cooling off period commences. During that period (or after), a Presidential Emergency Board (PEB) may be established, which examines the parties' positions and recommends a solution. The PEB process lasts for 30 days and is followed by another cooling off period of 30 days. At the end of a cooling off period, unless an agreement is reached or action is taken by Congress, the labor organization may strike and the airline may resort to self-help, including the imposition of any or all of its proposed amendments and the hiring of new employees to replace any striking workers.

**Table of Contents**

In April 2003, American reached agreements (the Labor Agreements) with its three major unions – the Allied Pilots Association (the APA) which represents American’s pilots, the Transport Workers Union of America (AFL-CIO) (the TWU), which represents seven different employee groups, and the Association of Professional Flight Attendants (the APFA), which represents American’s flight attendants. The Labor Agreements substantially moderated the labor costs associated with the employees represented by the unions. In conjunction with the Labor Agreements, American also implemented various changes in the pay plans and benefits for non-unionized personnel, including officers and other management (the Management Reductions). While the Labor Agreements do not become amendable until 2008, they do allow the parties to begin contract discussions in or after 2006. In 2006, American and the APA commenced negotiations under the RLA. Also in 2006, American and the TWU commenced negotiations with respect only to dispatchers, one of the seven groups at American represented by the TWU. In January 2007, American and the TWU announced that in November 2007 they would commence negotiations under the RLA with respect to TWU employees in addition to dispatchers. The negotiations between American and the pilots and dispatchers are still in their early stages.

The Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA), which represents American Eagle pilots, reached agreement with American Eagle effective September 1, 1997, to have all of the pilots of the American Eagle® carriers (currently American Eagle Airlines, Inc. and Executive Airlines, Inc.) covered by a single contract. This agreement lasts until October 31, 2013. The agreement provides to the parties the right to seek limited changes in 2000, 2004, 2008 and 2012. If the parties are unable to agree on the limited changes, the agreement provides that any issues would be resolved by interest arbitration, without the exercise of self-help (such as a strike). ALPA and American Eagle negotiated a tentative agreement in 2000, but that agreement failed in ratification. Thereafter, the parties participated in interest arbitration. The interest arbitration panel determined the limited changes that should be made and these changes were appropriately effected. In 2004, the parties successfully negotiated limited changes that became effective on January 1, 2005.

The Association of Flight Attendants (AFA) represents the flight attendants of the American Eagle carriers. The current agreement between the American Eagle carriers and the AFA is amendable on October 27, 2009; however, the parties have agreed that contract openers may be exchanged 90 days prior to that date.

The other union employees at the American Eagle carriers are covered by separate agreements with the TWU. The agreements between the American Eagle carriers and the TWU are amendable beginning with dates ranging from October 1, 2007 to January 26, 2008; the parties have agreed that contract openers may be exchanged at least 60 days prior to October 1, 2007.

**Fuel**

The Company’s operations and financial results are significantly affected by the availability and price of jet fuel. The Company’s fuel costs and consumption for the years 2004 through 2006 were:

Year	Gallons		Average Cost	Percent of AMR’s Operating Expenses
	Consumed (in millions)	Total Cost (in millions)	Per Gallon (in cents)	
2004	3,264	3,969	121.6	21.1
2005	3,237	5,615	173.5	27.0
2006	3,178	6,402	201.4	29.8

**Table of Contents**

The impact of fuel price changes on the Company and its competitors depends on various factors, including hedging strategies. The Company has a fuel hedging program in which it enters into jet fuel, heating oil and crude oil hedging contracts to dampen the impact of the volatility of jet fuel prices. During 2006, 2005 and 2004, the Company's fuel hedging program reduced the Company's fuel expense by approximately \$97 million, \$64 million and \$99 million, respectively. As of December 31, 2006, the Company had hedged, with option contracts, including collars, approximately 14 percent of its estimated 2007 fuel requirements. The consumption hedged for 2007 is capped at an average price of approximately \$68 per barrel of crude oil. A deterioration of the Company's financial position could negatively affect the Company's ability to hedge fuel in the future. See the Risk Factors under Item 1A for additional information regarding fuel.

Additional information regarding the Company's fuel program is also included in Item 7(A) Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk and in Note 7 to the consolidated financial statements.

**Frequent Flyer Program**

American established the AAdvantage frequent flyer program (AAdvantage) to develop passenger loyalty by offering awards to travelers for their continued patronage. The Company believes that the AAdvantage program is one of its competitive strengths. AAdvantage members earn mileage credits by flying on American or American Eagle, or by using services of other program participants, including bank credit card issuers, hotels, car rental companies and other retail companies. American sells mileage credits and related services to the other companies participating in the program. American reserves the right to change the AAdvantage program at any time without notice and may end the program with six months notice.

Mileage credits can be redeemed for free, discounted or upgraded travel on American, American Eagle or other participating airlines, or for other awards. Once a member accrues sufficient mileage for an award, the member may book award travel. Most travel awards are subject to capacity controlled seating. Mileage credit does not expire, provided a customer has any type of qualifying activity at least once every 36 months. See Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates under Item 7 for more information on AAdvantage.

**Other Matters**

**Seasonality and Other Factors** The Company's results of operations for any interim period are not necessarily indicative of those for the entire year, since the air transportation business is subject to seasonal fluctuations. Higher demand for air travel has traditionally resulted in more favorable operating and financial results for the second and third quarters of the year than for the first and fourth quarters. Fears of terrorism or war, fare initiatives, fluctuations in fuel prices, labor actions, weather and other factors could impact this seasonal pattern. Unaudited quarterly financial data for the two-year period ended December 31, 2006 is included in Note 15 to the consolidated financial statements. In addition, the results of operations in the air transportation business have also significantly fluctuated in the past in response to general economic conditions.

No material part of the business of AMR and its subsidiaries is dependent upon a single customer or very few customers. Consequently, the loss of the Company's largest few customers would not have a materially adverse effect upon the Company.

**Insurance** The Company carries insurance for public liability, passenger liability, property damage and all-risk coverage for damage to its aircraft.

As a result of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 (the Terrorist Attacks), aviation insurers significantly reduced the amount of insurance coverage available to commercial air carriers for liability to persons other than employees or passengers for claims resulting from acts of terrorism, war or similar events (war-risk coverage). At the same time, these insurers significantly increased the premiums for aviation insurance in general.

**Table of Contents**

The U.S. government has agreed to provide commercial war-risk insurance for U.S. based airlines until August 31, 2007 covering losses to employees, passengers, third parties and aircraft. If the U.S. government does not extend the policy beyond August 31, 2007, the Company will attempt to purchase similar coverage with narrower scope from commercial insurers at an additional cost. To the extent this coverage is not available at commercially reasonable rates, the Company would be adversely affected. While the price of commercial insurance has declined since the premium increases immediately after the Terrorist Attacks, in the event commercial insurance carriers further reduce the amount of insurance coverage available to the Company, or significantly increase its cost, the Company would be adversely affected.

**Other Government Matters** In time of war or during a national emergency or defense oriented situation, American and other air carriers can be required to provide airlift services to the Air Mobility Command under the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program. In the event the Company has to provide a substantial number of aircraft and crew to the Air Mobility Command, its operations could be adversely impacted.

**Available Information** The Company makes its annual report on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K, and amendments to reports filed or furnished pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 available free of charge under the Investor Relations page on its website, [www.aa.com](http://www.aa.com), as soon as reasonably practicable after such reports are electronically filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. In addition, the Company's code of ethics, which applies to all employees of the Company, including the Company's Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and Controller, is posted under the Investor Relations page on its website, [www.aa.com](http://www.aa.com). The Company intends to disclose any amendments to the code of ethics, or waivers of the code of ethics on behalf of the CEO, CFO or Controller, under the Investor Relations page on the Company's website, [www.aa.com](http://www.aa.com). The charters for the AMR Board of Directors' standing committees (the Audit, Compensation, Diversity and Nominating/Corporate Governance Committees), as well as the Board of Directors' Governance Policies (the Governance Policies), are likewise available on the Company's website, [www.aa.com](http://www.aa.com). Upon request, copies of the charters or the Governance Policies are available at no cost. Information on the Company's website is not incorporated into or otherwise made a part of this Report.



**Table of Contents**

**ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS**

Our ability to become consistently profitable and our ability to continue to fund our obligations on an ongoing basis will depend on a number of risk factors, many of which are largely beyond our control. Some of the factors that may have a negative impact on us are described below:

**As a result of significant losses in recent years, our financial condition has been materially weakened.**

Although we earned a profit in 2006, we incurred significant losses in recent prior years: \$857 million in 2005, \$751 million in 2004, \$1.2 billion in 2003, \$3.5 billion in 2002 and \$1.8 billion in 2001. As a result, our financial condition was materially weakened, and we remain vulnerable both to unexpected events (such as additional terrorist attacks or a sudden spike in jet fuel prices) and to general declines in the operating environment (such as that resulting from a recession or significant increased competition).

**Our initiatives to generate additional revenues and to reduce our costs may not be adequate or successful.**

As we seek to improve our financial condition, we must continue to take steps to generate additional revenues and to reduce our costs. Although we have a number of initiatives underway to address our cost and revenue challenges, some of these initiatives involve changes to our business which we may be unable to implement. In addition, we expect that, as time goes on, it may be progressively more difficult to identify and implement significant revenue enhancement and cost savings initiatives. The adequacy and ultimate success of our initiatives to generate additional revenues and reduce our costs are not known at this time and cannot be assured. Moreover, whether our initiatives will be adequate or successful depends in large measure on factors beyond our control, notably the overall industry environment, including passenger demand, yield and industry capacity growth, and fuel prices. Given the competitive challenges we face and other factors, such as high fuel prices, that are beyond our control, we must continue to aggressively pursue profit improvement initiatives to achieve long-term success.

**Our business is affected by many changing economic and other conditions beyond our control, and our results of operations tend to be volatile and fluctuate due to seasonality.**

Our business and our results of operations are affected by many changing economic and other conditions beyond our control, including among others:

actual or potential changes in international, national, regional and local economic, business and financial conditions, including recession, inflation and higher interest rates, war, terrorist attacks or political instability;

changes in consumer preferences, perceptions, spending patterns or demographic trends;

changes in the competitive environment due to industry consolidation and other factors;

actual or potential disruptions to the air traffic control system;

increases in costs of safety, security and environmental measures;

outbreaks of diseases that affect travel behavior; or

weather and natural disasters.

As a result, our results of operations tend to be volatile and subject to rapid and unexpected change. In addition, due to generally greater demand for air travel during the summer, our revenues in the second and third quarters of the year tend to be stronger than revenues in the first and fourth quarters of the year.

**Our indebtedness and other obligations are substantial and could adversely affect our business and liquidity.**

We have and will continue to have a significant amount of indebtedness and obligations to make future payments on aircraft equipment and property leases, and a high proportion of debt to equity capital. We may incur substantial additional debt, including secured debt, and lease obligations in the future. We also have substantial pension funding obligations. Our substantial indebtedness and other obligations could have important consequences. For example, they could:



**Table of Contents**

limit our ability to obtain additional financing for working capital, capital expenditures, acquisitions and general corporate purposes, or adversely affect the terms on which such financing could be obtained;

require us to dedicate a substantial portion of our cash flow from operations to payments on our indebtedness and other obligations, thereby reducing the funds available for other purposes;

make us more vulnerable to economic downturns;

limit our ability to withstand competitive pressures and reduce our flexibility in responding to changing business and economic conditions; or

limit our flexibility in planning for, or reacting to, changes in our business and the industry in which we operate.

**We may be unable to comply with our financial covenants.**

American has a fully drawn \$740 million Credit Facility, which consists of a \$295 million Revolving Facility with a final maturity on June 17, 2009 and a \$445 million Term Loan Facility with a final maturity on December 17, 2010. The Credit Facility contains a liquidity covenant and a ratio of cash flow to fixed charges covenant. We complied with these covenants as of December 31, 2006 and expect to be able to continue to comply with these covenants. However, given fuel prices that are high by historical standards and the volatility of fuel prices and revenues, it is difficult to assess whether we will, in fact, be able to continue to comply with these covenants, and there are no assurances that we will be able to do so. Failure to comply with these covenants would result in a default under the Credit Facility which if we did not take steps to obtain a waiver of, or otherwise mitigate, the default could result in a default under a significant amount of our other debt and lease obligations, and otherwise have a material adverse impact on us.

**We are being adversely affected by increases in fuel prices, and we would be adversely affected by disruptions in the supply of fuel.**

Our results are very significantly affected by the price and availability of jet fuel, which are in turn affected by a number of factors beyond our control. Although fuel prices have moderated somewhat from the record high prices reached in July and August 2006, they are volatile and remain high by historical standards.

Due to the competitive nature of the airline industry, we may not be able to pass on increased fuel prices to customers by increasing fares. In fact, recent history would indicate that we have limited ability to pass along the increased costs of fuel. If fuel prices decline in the future, increased fare competition and lower revenues may offset any potential benefit of lower fuel prices.

While we do not currently anticipate a significant reduction in fuel availability, dependency on foreign imports of crude oil, limited refining capacity and the possibility of changes in government policy on jet fuel production, transportation and marketing make it impossible to predict the future availability of jet fuel. If there are additional outbreaks of hostilities or other conflicts in oil producing areas or elsewhere, or a reduction in refining capacity (due to weather events, for example), or governmental limits on the production or sale of jet fuel, there could be reductions in the supply of jet fuel and significant increases in the cost of jet fuel. Major reductions in the availability of jet fuel or significant increases in its cost, or a continuation of current high prices for a significant period of time, would have a material adverse impact on us.

While we seek to manage the price risk of fuel costs by using derivative contracts, there can be no assurance that, at any given time, we will have derivatives in place to provide any particular level of protection against increased fuel costs. In addition, a deterioration of our financial position could negatively affect our ability to enter into derivative contracts in the future.

**Table of Contents**

**The airline industry is fiercely competitive and we are subject to increasing competition.**

Service over almost all of our routes is highly competitive and fares remain at low levels by historical standards. We face vigorous, and in some cases, increasing competition from major domestic airlines, national, regional, all-cargo and charter carriers, foreign air carriers, low-cost carriers and, particularly on shorter segments, ground and rail transportation. We also face increasing and significant competition from marketing/operational alliances formed by our competitors. The percentage of routes on which we compete with carriers having substantially lower operating costs than ours has grown significantly over the past decade, and, as of December 31, 2006, we now compete with low-cost carriers on approximately 82 percent of our domestic network.

Certain alliances have been granted immunity from anti-trust regulations by governmental authorities for specific areas of cooperation, such as joint pricing decisions. To the extent alliances formed by our competitors can undertake activities that are not available to us, our ability to effectively compete may be hindered.

Pricing decisions are significantly affected by competition from other airlines. Fare discounting by competitors has historically had a negative effect on our financial results because we must generally match competitors' fares, since failing to match would result in even less revenue. More recently, we have faced increased competition from carriers with simplified fare structures, which are generally preferred by travelers. Any fare reduction or fare simplification initiative may not be offset by increases in passenger traffic, a reduction in costs or changes in the mix of traffic that would improve yields. Moreover, decisions by our competitors that increase or reduce overall industry capacity, or capacity dedicated to a particular domestic or foreign region, market or route, can have a material impact on related fare levels.

There have been numerous mergers and acquisitions within the U.S. airline industry since its deregulation in 1978, and there may be additional mergers and acquisitions in the future. US Airways' recent bid to purchase Delta, and other factors, could spur consolidation within the industry in the near term. Any airline industry consolidation could substantially alter the competitive landscape and may result in changes in our corporate or business strategy. We cannot reliably predict the impact on us of, and our role in or response to, airline industry consolidation.

**We compete with reorganized and reorganizing carriers, which may result in competitive disadvantages for us or fare discounting.**

We must compete with air carriers that have recently reorganized or are reorganizing, including under the protection of Chapter 11, including United, the second largest U.S. air carrier, Delta, the third largest U.S. air carrier and Northwest, the fourth largest U.S. air carrier. It is possible that other competitors may seek to reorganize in or out of Chapter 11. With the Chapter 11 filings of Delta and Northwest, two out of the four largest U.S. air carriers are now operating under the protection of the Bankruptcy Code, with United having emerged from Chapter 11 in the first quarter of 2006. We cannot predict the outcome of any airline bankruptcy proceedings or the consequences of such a large portion of the airline industry's capacity being provided by bankrupt or recently reorganized air carriers.

Successful reorganizations by other carriers present us with competitors with significantly lower operating costs and a stronger financial position derived from renegotiated labor, supply, and financing contracts, which could lead to fare reductions. These competitive pressures may limit our ability to adequately price our services, may require us to further reduce our operating costs, and could have a material adverse impact on us.

**Table of Contents**

**Fares are at low levels and our reduced pricing power adversely affects our ability to achieve adequate pricing, especially with respect to business travel.**

While we have recently been able to implement some fare increases on certain domestic and international routes, our passenger yield remains low by historical standards. We believe this is due in large part to a corresponding decline in our pricing power. Our reduced pricing power is the product of several factors including: greater cost sensitivity on the part of travelers (particularly business travelers); pricing transparency resulting from the use of the Internet; greater competition from low-cost carriers and from carriers that have recently reorganized or are reorganizing including under the protection of Chapter 11; other carriers being well hedged against rising fuel costs and able to better absorb the current high jet fuel prices; and, more recently, fare simplification efforts by certain carriers. We believe that our reduced pricing power could persist indefinitely.

**We may need to raise additional funds to maintain sufficient liquidity, but we may be unable to do so on acceptable terms.**

To maintain sufficient liquidity as we continue to implement our restructuring and cost reduction initiatives, and because we have significant debt, lease, pension and other obligations in the next several years, we may need continued access to additional funding.

Our ability to obtain future financing has been reduced because we have fewer unencumbered assets available than in years past. A very large majority of our aircraft assets (including virtually all of our aircraft eligible for the benefits of Section 1110 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code) have been encumbered. Also, the market value of our aircraft assets has declined in recent years and those assets may not maintain their current market value.

Since the terrorist attacks of September 2001, which we refer to as the Terrorist Attacks, our credit ratings have been lowered to significantly below investment grade. These reductions have increased our borrowing costs and otherwise adversely affected borrowing terms, and limited borrowing options. Additional reductions in our credit ratings could further increase borrowing or other costs and further restrict the availability of future financing.

A number of other factors, including our financial results in recent years, our substantial indebtedness, the difficult revenue environment we face, our reduced credit ratings, high fuel prices, and the financial difficulties experienced in the airline industry, adversely affect the availability and terms of financing for us. As a result, there can be no assurance that financing will be available to us on acceptable terms, if at all. An inability to obtain additional financing on acceptable terms could have a material adverse impact on us and on our ability to sustain our operations over the long term.

**Our corporate or business strategy may change.**

In light of the rapid changes in the airline industry, we evaluate our assets on an ongoing basis with a view to maximizing their value to us and determining which are core to our operations. We also regularly evaluate our corporate and business strategies, and they are influenced by factors beyond our control, including changes in the competitive landscape we face. Our corporate and business strategies are, therefore, subject to change.

**Our business is subject to extensive government regulation, which can result in increases in our costs, limits on our operating flexibility, reductions in the demand for air travel, and competitive disadvantages.**

Airlines are subject to extensive domestic and international regulatory requirements. Many of these requirements result in significant costs. For example, the FAA from time to time issues directives and other regulations relating to the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and compliance with those requirements drives significant expenditures. In addition, the ability of U.S. carriers to operate international routes is subject to change because the applicable arrangements between the United States and foreign governments may be amended from time to time, or because appropriate slots or facilities are not made available.

**Table of Contents**

Moreover, additional laws, regulations, taxes and airport rates and charges have been enacted from time to time that have significantly increased the costs of airline operations, reduced the demand for air travel or restricted the way we can conduct our business. For example, the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, which became law in 2001, mandated the federalization of certain airport security procedures and resulted in the imposition of additional security requirements on airlines. In addition, many aspects of our operations are subject to increasingly stringent environmental regulations, and concerns about climate change, in particular, may result in the imposition of additional regulation. For example, the European Commission is currently seeking to impose emissions controls on all flights coming into Europe. Laws or regulations similar to those described above or other U.S. or foreign governmental actions in the future may adversely affect our business and financial results.

The results of our operations, demand for air travel, and the manner in which we conduct our business each may be affected by changes in law and future actions taken by governmental agencies, including:

changes in law which affect the services that can be offered by airlines in particular markets and at particular airports;

the granting and timing of certain governmental approvals (including foreign government approvals) needed for codesharing alliances and other arrangements with other airlines;

restrictions on competitive practices (for example court orders, or agency regulations or orders, that would curtail an airline's ability to respond to a competitor);

the adoption of regulations that impact customer service standards (for example new passenger security standards); or

the adoption of more restrictive locally-imposed noise restrictions.

In November 2005, the United States and the European Union reached a tentative air services agreement that would provide airlines from the United States and E.U. member states open access to each other's markets, with freedom of pricing and unlimited rights to fly beyond the United States and both within and beyond the E.U. The tentative agreement is subject to approval by the E.U. Transport Council of Ministers. Under the agreement, every U.S. and E.U. airline would be authorized to operate between airports in the United States and London's Heathrow Airport. Only three airlines besides American are currently allowed to provide that service and Heathrow routes have historically been among our most profitable. The agreement, if approved, would result in our facing increased competition in serving Heathrow if additional carriers are able to obtain necessary slots and terminal facilities.

**We could be adversely affected by conflicts overseas or terrorist attacks.**

Actual or threatened U.S. military involvement in overseas operations has, on occasion, had an adverse impact on our business, financial position (including access to capital markets) and results of operations, and on the airline industry in general. The continuing conflict in Iraq, or other conflicts or events in the Middle East or elsewhere, may result in similar adverse impacts.

The Terrorist Attacks had a material adverse impact on us. The occurrence of another terrorist attack (whether domestic or international and whether against us or another entity) could again have a material adverse impact on us.

**Our international operations could be adversely affected by numerous events, circumstances or government actions beyond our control.**

Our current international activities and prospects could be adversely affected by factors such as reversals or delays in the opening of foreign markets, exchange controls, currency and political risks, taxation and changes in international government regulation of our operations, including the inability to obtain or retain needed route authorities and/or slots.

**Table of Contents**

**We could be adversely affected by an outbreak of a disease that affects travel behavior.**

In 2003, there was an outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), which primarily had an adverse impact on our Asia operations. More recently, there have been concerns about a potential outbreak of avian flu. If there were another outbreak of a disease (such as SARS or avian flu) that affects travel behavior, it could have a material adverse impact on us.

**Our labor costs are higher than our competitors.**

Wages, salaries and benefits constitute a significant percentage of our total operating expenses. In 2006, they constituted approximately 32 percent of our total operating expenses. All of the major hub-and-spoke carriers with whom American competes have achieved significant labor cost savings through or outside of bankruptcy proceedings. We believe American's labor costs are higher than those of its primary competitors, and it is unclear how long this labor cost disadvantage may persist.

**We could be adversely affected if we are unable to maintain satisfactory relations with any unionized or other employee work group.**

Our operations could be adversely affected if we fail to maintain satisfactory relations with any labor union representing our employees. In addition, any significant dispute we have with, or any disruption by, an employee work group could adversely impact us. Moreover, one of the fundamental tenets of our strategic Turnaround Plan is increased union and employee involvement in our operations. To the extent that we are unable to maintain satisfactory relations with any unionized or other employee work group, our ability to execute our strategic plans could be adversely affected.

**Our insurance costs have increased substantially and further increases in insurance costs or reductions in coverage could have an adverse impact on us.**

We carry insurance for public liability, passenger liability, property damage and all-risk coverage for damage to our aircraft. As a result of the Terrorist Attacks, aviation insurers significantly reduced the amount of insurance coverage available to commercial air carriers for liability to persons other than employees or passengers for claims resulting from acts of terrorism, war or similar events (war-risk coverage). At the same time, these insurers significantly increased the premiums for aviation insurance in general.

The U.S. government has agreed to provide commercial war-risk insurance for U.S. based airlines until August 31, 2007, covering losses to employees, passengers, third parties and aircraft. If the U.S. government does not extend the policy beyond August 31, 2007, or if the U.S. government at anytime thereafter ceases to provide such insurance, or reduces the coverage provided by such insurance, we will attempt to purchase similar coverage with narrower scope from commercial insurers at an additional cost. To the extent this coverage is not available at commercially reasonable rates, we would be adversely affected.

While the price of commercial insurance has declined since the period immediately after the Terrorist Attacks, in the event commercial insurance carriers further reduce the amount of insurance coverage available to us, or significantly increase its cost, we would be adversely affected.

**We may be unable to retain key management personnel.**

Since the Terrorist Attacks, a number of our key management employees have elected to retire early or leave for more financially favorable opportunities at other companies, both within and outside of the airline industry. There can be no assurance that we will be able to retain our key management employees. Any inability to retain our key management employees, or attract and retain additional qualified management employees, could have a negative impact on us.

**Table of Contents**

**We could be adversely affected by a failure or disruption of our computer, communications or other technology systems.**

We are heavily and increasingly dependent on technology to operate our business. The computer and communications systems on which we rely could be disrupted due to various events, some of which are beyond our control, including natural disasters, power failures, terrorist attacks, equipment failures, software failures and computer viruses and hackers. We have taken certain steps to help reduce the risk of some (but not all) of these potential disruptions. There can be no assurance, however, that the measures we have taken are adequate to prevent or remedy disruptions or failures of these systems. Any substantial or repeated failure of these systems could impact our operations and customer service, result in the loss of important data, loss of revenues, and increased costs, and generally harm our business. Moreover, a catastrophic failure of certain of our vital systems (which we believe is unlikely) could limit our ability to operate our flights for an extended period of time, which would have a material adverse impact on our operations and our business.



**Table of Contents****ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS**

The Company had no unresolved Securities and Exchange Commission staff comments at December 31, 2006.

**ITEM 2. PROPERTIES****Flight Equipment Operating**

Owned and leased aircraft operated by the Company at December 31, 2006 included:

Equipment Type	Average Seating Capacity	Owned	Capital Leased	Operating Leased	Total	Average Age (Years)
<b>American Airlines Aircraft</b>						
Airbus A300-600R	267	10		24	34	17
Boeing 737-800	148	67		10	77	7
Boeing 757-200	187	87	6	49	142	12
Boeing 767-200 Extended Range	167	3	11	1	15	20
Boeing 767-300 Extended Range	220	47		11	58	13
Boeing 777-200 Extended Range	246	46			46	6
McDonnell Douglas MD-80	136	138	72	115	325	17
Total		398	89	210	697	14
<b>AMR Eagle Aircraft</b>						
Bombardier CRJ-700	70	25			25	4
Embraer 135	37	39			39	7
Embraer 140	44	59			59	4
Embraer 145	50	108			108	4
Super ATR	64/66	39			39	12
Saab 340B/340B Plus	34	14	1	21	36	12
Total		284	1	21	306	7

Of the operating aircraft listed above, 25 McDonnell Douglas MD-80 aircraft 12 owned, eight operating leased and five capital leased and ten operating leased Saab 340B Plus aircraft were in temporary storage as of December 31, 2006.

A very large majority of the Company's owned aircraft are encumbered by liens granted in connection with financing transactions entered into by the Company.

**Table of Contents****Flight Equipment Non-Operating**

Owned and leased aircraft not operated by the Company at December 31, 2006 included:

Equipment Type	Owned	Capital Leased	Operating Leased	Total
<b>American Airlines Aircraft</b>				
Boeing 777-200 Extended Range	1			1
Boeing 767-200	1		1	2
Boeing 767-200 Extended Range			2	2
Fokker 100			4	4
McDonnell Douglas MD-80	13	6	6	25
Total	15	6	13	34
<b>AMR Eagle Aircraft</b>				
Embraer 145	10			10
Saab 340B/340B Plus	31	2		33
Total	41	2		43

American leased its Boeing 777-200ER not operated by the Company at December 31, 2006, to The Boeing Company through January 5, 2007. Subsequent to its return to the Company on January 5, 2007, the aircraft has been returned to operation.

AMR Eagle has leased its 10 owned Embraer 145s not operated by the Company to Trans States Airlines, Inc.

For information concerning the estimated useful lives and residual values for owned aircraft, lease terms for leased aircraft and amortization relating to aircraft under capital leases, see Notes 1 and 5 to the consolidated financial statements.

Lease expirations for the aircraft included in the table of capital and operating leased flight equipment operated by the Company as of December 31, 2006 are:

Equipment Type	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012 and Thereafter
<b>American Airlines Aircraft</b>						
Airbus A300-600R		3	3	9	9	
Boeing 737-800						10
Boeing 757-200	14	9	1		1	30
Boeing 767-200 Extended Range		2	1	1	2	6
Boeing 767-300 Extended Range		3				8
McDonnell Douglas MD-80	1	7	4	12	21	142
Total	15	24	9	22	33	196

**AMR Eagle Aircraft**  
Saab 340B/340B Plus

14	8
14	8

**Table of Contents**

Substantially all of the Company's aircraft leases include an option to purchase the aircraft or to extend the lease term, or both, with the purchase price or renewal rental to be based essentially on the market value of the aircraft at the end of the term of the lease or at a predetermined fixed amount.

**Ground Properties**

The Company leases, or has built as leasehold improvements on leased property: most of its airport and terminal facilities; its training facilities in Fort Worth, Texas; its principal overhaul and maintenance bases at Tulsa International Airport (Tulsa, Oklahoma), Kansas City International Airport (Kansas City, Missouri) and Alliance Airport (Fort Worth, Texas); its headquarters building in Fort Worth, Texas; its regional reservation offices; and local ticket and administration offices throughout the system. American has entered into agreements with the Tulsa Municipal Airport Trust; the Alliance Airport Authority, Fort Worth, Texas; the New York City Industrial Development Agency; and the Dallas/Fort Worth, Chicago O'Hare, Newark, San Juan, and Los Angeles airport authorities to provide funds for constructing, improving and modifying facilities and acquiring equipment which are or will be leased to the Company. The Company also uses public airports for its flight operations under lease or use arrangements with the municipalities or governmental agencies owning or controlling them and leases certain other ground equipment for use at its facilities.

For information concerning the estimated lives and residual values for owned ground properties, lease terms and amortization relating to ground properties under capital leases, and acquisitions of ground properties, see Notes 1 and 5 to the consolidated financial statements.

**Table of Contents****ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS**

On July 26, 1999, a class action lawsuit was filed, and in November 1999 an amended complaint was filed, against AMR, American, AMR Eagle, Airlines Reporting Corporation, and the Sabre Group Holdings, Inc. in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, Western Division (Westways World Travel, Inc. v. AMR Corp., et al.). The lawsuit alleges that requiring travel agencies to pay debit memos to American for violations of American's fare rules (by customers of the agencies): (1) breaches the Agent Reporting Agreement between American and AMR Eagle and the plaintiffs; (2) constitutes unjust enrichment; and (3) violates the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act of 1970 (RICO). On July 9, 2003, the court certified a class that included all travel agencies who have been or will be required to pay money to American for debit memos for fare rules violations from July 26, 1995 to the present. The plaintiffs sought to enjoin American from enforcing the pricing rules in question and to recover the amounts paid for debit memos, plus treble damages, attorneys' fees, and costs. On February 24, 2005, the court decertified the class. The claims against Airlines Reporting Corporation have been dismissed, and in September 2005, the Court granted Summary Judgment in favor of the Company and all other defendants. Plaintiffs have filed an appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Although the Company believes that the litigation is without merit, a final adverse court decision could impose restrictions on the Company's relationships with travel agencies, which could have a material adverse impact on the Company.

Between April 3, 2003 and June 5, 2003, three lawsuits were filed by travel agents, some of whom opted out of a prior class action (now dismissed) to pursue their claims individually against American, other airline defendants, and in one case against certain airline defendants and Orbitz LLC. The cases, Tam Travel et. al., v. Delta Air Lines et. al., in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco (51 individual agencies), Paula Fausky d/b/a Timeless Travel v. American Airlines, et. al. in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division (29 agencies) and Swope Travel et al. v. Orbitz et. al. in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont Division (71 agencies) were consolidated for pre-trial purposes in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division. Collectively, these lawsuits seek damages and injunctive relief alleging that the certain airline defendants and Orbitz LLC: (i) conspired to prevent travel agents from acting as effective competitors in the distribution of airline tickets to passengers in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act; (ii) conspired to monopolize the distribution of common carrier air travel between airports in the United States in violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act; and that (iii) between 1995 and the present, the airline defendants conspired to reduce commissions paid to U.S.-based travel agents in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act. On September 23, 2005, the Fausky plaintiffs dismissed their claims with prejudice. On September 14, 2006, the court dismissed with prejudice 28 of the Swope plaintiffs. American continues to vigorously defend these lawsuits. A final adverse court decision awarding substantial money damages or placing material restrictions on the Company's distribution practices would have a material adverse impact on the Company.

Miami-Dade County (the County) is currently investigating and remediating various environmental conditions at the Miami International Airport (MIA) and funding the remediation costs through landing fees and various cost recovery methods. American and AMR Eagle have been named as potentially responsible parties (PRPs) for the contamination at MIA. During the second quarter of 2001, the County filed a lawsuit against 17 defendants, including American, in an attempt to recover its past and future cleanup costs (Miami-Dade County, Florida v. Advance Cargo Services, Inc., et al. in the Florida Circuit Court). The Company is vigorously defending the lawsuit. In addition to the 17 defendants named in the lawsuit, 243 other agencies and companies were also named as PRPs and contributors to the contamination. The case is currently stayed while the parties pursue an alternative dispute resolution process. The County has proposed draft allocation models for remedial costs for the Terminal and Tank Farm areas of MIA. While it is anticipated that American and AMR Eagle will be allocated equitable shares of remedial costs, the Company does not expect the allocated amounts to have a material adverse effect on the Company.

**Table of Contents**

American is defending an appeal of a lawsuit, filed as a class action but not certified as such, arising from allegedly improper failure to refund certain governmental taxes and fees collected by American upon the sale of nonrefundable tickets when such tickets are not used for travel. In Harrington v. Delta Air Lines, Inc., et al. (filed November 24, 2004 in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts), the plaintiffs sought unspecified actual damages (trebled), declaratory judgment, injunctive relief, costs, and attorneys' fees. The suit asserted various causes of action, including breach of contract, conversion, and unjust enrichment against American and numerous other airline defendants. The defendants filed a motion to dismiss, which was granted. The plaintiffs appealed to the First Circuit Court of Appeals. On February 7, 2007, the First Circuit affirmed the dismissal. American is vigorously defending the suit and believes it to be without merit. However, a final adverse court decision requiring American to refund collected taxes and/or fees could have a material adverse impact on the Company.

On July 12, 2004, a consolidated class action complaint, that was subsequently amended on November 30, 2004, was filed against American and the Association of Professional Flight Attendants (APFA), the union which represents the American's flight attendants (Ann M. Marcoux, et al., v. American Airlines Inc., et al. in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York). While a class has not yet been certified, the lawsuit seeks on behalf of all of American's flight attendants or various subclasses to set aside, and to obtain damages allegedly resulting from, the April 2003 Collective Bargaining Agreement referred to as the Restructuring Participation Agreement (RPA). The RPA was one of three labor agreements American successfully reached with its unions in order to avoid filing for bankruptcy in 2003. In a related case (Sherry Cooper, et al. v. TWA Airlines, LLC, et al., also in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York), the court denied a preliminary injunction against implementation of the RPA on June 30, 2003. The Marcoux suit alleges various claims against the APFA and American relating to the RPA and the ratification vote on the RPA by individual APFA members, including: violation of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (LMRDA) and the APFA's Constitution and By-laws, violation by the APFA of its duty of fair representation to its members, violation by American of provisions of the Railway Labor Act (RLA) through improper coercion of flight attendants into voting or changing their vote for ratification, and violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act of 1970 (RICO). On March 28, 2006, the district court dismissed all of various state law claims against American, all but one of the LMRDA claims against the APFA, and the claimed violations of RICO. This leaves the claimed violations of the RLA and the duty of fair representation against American and the APFA (as well as one LMRDA claim and one claim against the APFA of a breach of its constitution). Although the Company believes the case against it is without merit and both American and the APFA are vigorously defending the lawsuit, a final adverse court decision invalidating the RPA and awarding substantial money damages would have a material adverse impact on the Company.

**Table of Contents**

On February 14, 2006, the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice (the DOJ) served the Company with a grand jury subpoena as part of an ongoing investigation into possible criminal violations of the antitrust laws by certain domestic and foreign air cargo carriers. At this time, the Company does not believe it is a target of the DOJ investigation. The New Zealand Commerce Commission notified the Company on February 17, 2006 that it is also investigating whether the Company and certain other cargo carriers entered into agreements relating to fuel surcharges, security surcharges, war risk surcharges, and customs clearance surcharges. On February 22, 2006, the Company received a letter from the Swiss Competition Commission informing the Company that it too is investigating whether the Company and certain other cargo carriers entered into agreements relating to fuel surcharges, security surcharges, war risk surcharges, and customs clearance surcharges. On December 19, 2006, the Company received a request for information from the European Commission seeking information regarding the Company's revenue and pricing announcements for air cargo shipments to and from the European Union. On January 23, 2007, the Brazilian competition authorities, as part of an ongoing investigation, conducted an unannounced search of the Company's cargo facilities in Sao Paulo, Brazil. The authorities are investigating whether the Company and certain other foreign and domestic air carriers violated Brazilian competition laws by illegally conspiring to set fuel surcharges on cargo shipments. The Company intends to cooperate fully with these investigations. In the event that these or other investigations uncover violations of the U.S. antitrust laws or the competition laws of some other jurisdiction, such findings and related legal proceedings could have a material adverse impact on the Company. Approximately 44 purported class action lawsuits have been filed in the U.S. against the Company and certain foreign and domestic air carriers alleging that the defendants violated U.S. antitrust laws by illegally conspiring to set prices and surcharges on cargo shipments. These cases, along with other purported class action lawsuits in which the Company was not named, were consolidated in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York as In re Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation, 06-MD-1775 on June 20, 2006. Plaintiffs are seeking trebled money damages and injunctive relief. The Company has not been named as a defendant in the consolidated complaint filed by the plaintiffs. However, the plaintiffs have not released any claims that they may have against the Company, and the Company may later be added as a defendant in the litigation. If the Company is sued on these claims, it will vigorously defend the suit, but any adverse judgment could have a material adverse impact on the Company. Also, on January 23, 2007, the Company was served with a purported class action complaint filed against the Company, American, and certain foreign and domestic air carriers in the Supreme Court of British Columbia in Canada (McKay v. Ace Aviation Holdings, et al.). The plaintiff alleges that the defendants violated Canadian competition laws by illegally conspiring to set prices and surcharges on cargo shipments. The complaint seeks compensatory and punitive damages under Canadian law. American will vigorously defend these lawsuits; however, any adverse judgment could have a material adverse impact on the Company.

On June 20, 2006, the DOJ served the Company with a grand jury subpoena as part of an ongoing investigation into possible criminal violations of the antitrust laws by certain domestic and foreign passenger carriers. At this time, the Company does not believe it is a target of the DOJ investigation. The Company intends to cooperate fully with this investigation. In the event that this or other investigations uncover violations of the U.S. antitrust laws or the competition laws of some other jurisdiction, such findings and related legal proceedings could have a material adverse impact on the Company. Approximately 52 purported class action lawsuits have been filed in the U.S. against the Company and certain foreign and domestic air carriers alleging that the defendants violated U.S. antitrust laws by illegally conspiring to set prices and surcharges for passenger transportation. These cases, along with other purported class action lawsuits in which the Company was not named, were consolidated in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California as In re International Air Transportation Surcharge Antitrust Litigation, M 06-01793 on October 25, 2006. Plaintiffs are seeking trebled money damages and injunctive relief. American will vigorously defend these lawsuits; however, any adverse judgment could have a material adverse impact on the Company.

American is defending a lawsuit (Love Terminal Partners, L.P. et al. v. The City of Dallas, Texas et al.) filed on July 17, 2006 in the United States District Court in Dallas. The suit was brought by two lessees of facilities at Dallas Love Field Airport against American, the cities of Fort Worth and Dallas, Southwest Airlines, Inc., and the Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport Board. The suit alleges that an agreement by and between the five defendants

with respect to Dallas Love Field violates Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act. Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief and compensatory and statutory damages. American will vigorously defend this lawsuit; however, any adverse judgment could have a material adverse impact on the Company.



**Table of Contents**

On August 21, 2006, a patent infringement lawsuit was filed against American and American Beacon Advisors, Inc. (a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company), in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas (Ronald A. Katz Technology Licensing, L.P. v. American Airlines, Inc., et al.). The plaintiff alleges that American and American Beacon infringe a number of the plaintiff's patents, each of which relates to automated telephone call processing systems. The plaintiff is seeking past and future royalties, injunctive relief, costs and attorneys' fees. Although the Company believes that the plaintiff's claims are without merit and is vigorously defending the lawsuit, a final adverse court decision awarding substantial money damages or placing material restrictions on existing automated telephone call system operations would have a material adverse impact on the Company.

American is defending a lawsuit (Kelley Kivilaan v. American Airlines, Inc.), filed on September 16, 2004 in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee. The suit was brought by a flight attendant who seeks to represent a purported class of current and former flight attendants. The suit alleges that several of the Company's medical benefits plans discriminate against females on the basis of their gender in not providing coverage in all circumstances for prescription contraceptives. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and monetary damages. The case has not been certified as a class action, but we anticipate that a motion for class certification will be filed in the first quarter of 2007. American will vigorously defend this lawsuit; however, any adverse judgment could have a material adverse impact on the Company.

**Table of Contents**

**ITEM 4. SUBMISSION OF MATTERS TO A VOTE OF SECURITY HOLDERS**

No matters were submitted to a vote of the Company's security holders during the last quarter of its fiscal year ended December 31, 2006.

**Executive Officers of the Registrant**

The following information relates to the executive officers of AMR as of the filing of this Form 10-K/A.

- Gerard J. Arpey                      Mr. Arpey was elected Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer of AMR and American in May 2004. He was elected Chief Executive Officer of AMR and American in April 2003. He served as President and Chief Operating Officer of AMR and American from April 2002 to April 2003. He served as Executive Vice President - Operations of American from January 2000 to April 2002, Chief Financial Officer of AMR from 1995 through 2000 and Senior Vice President - Planning of American from 1992 to January 1995. Prior to that, he served in various management positions at American since 1982. Age 48.
- Daniel P. Garton                      Mr. Garton was elected Executive Vice President - Marketing of American in September 2002. He is also an Executive Vice President of AMR. He served as Executive Vice President - Customer Services of American from January 2000 to September 2002 and Senior Vice President - Customer Services of American from 1998 to January 2000. Prior to that, he served as President of AMR Eagle from 1995 to 1998. Except for two years service as Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Continental between 1993 and 1995, he has been with the Company in various management positions since 1984. Age 49.
- Thomas W. Horton                      Mr. Horton was named Executive Vice President of Finance and Planning and Chief Financial Officer of AMR Corporation in March 2006 upon returning to American from AT&T Corp., a telecommunications company, where he had been Vice Chairman and Chief Financial Officer. Prior to leaving for AT&T Corp., Mr. Horton was Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of AMR and American from January 2000 to 2002. From 1994 to January 2000 Mr. Horton served as a Vice President of American and has served in various management positions of American since 1985. Age 45.
- Gary F. Kennedy                      Mr. Kennedy was elected Senior Vice President and General Counsel in January 2003. He is also the Corporation's Chief Compliance Officer. He served as Vice President - Corporate Real Estate of American from 1996 to January 2003. Prior to that, he served as an attorney and in various management positions at American since 1984. Age 51.
- Robert W. Reding                      Mr. Reding was elected Senior Vice President - Technical Operations for American Airlines in May 2003. He joined the Company in March 2000 and served as Chief Operations Officer of AMR Eagle through May 2003. Prior to joining the Company, Mr. Reding served as President and Chief Executive Officer of Reno Air from 1992 to 1998 and President and Chief Executive Officer of Canadian Regional Airlines from 1998 to March 2000. Age 57.

There are no family relationships among the executive officers of the Company named above.

There have been no events under any bankruptcy act, no criminal proceedings, and no judgments or injunctions material to the evaluation of the ability and integrity of any director or executive officer during the past five years.

**Table of Contents****PART II****ITEM 5. MARKET FOR REGISTRANT S COMMON STOCK AND RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS**

The Company s common stock is traded on the New York Stock Exchange (symbol AMR). The approximate number of record holders of the Company s common stock at February 16, 2007 was 16,320.

The range of closing market prices for AMR s common stock on the New York Stock Exchange was:

<b>Quarter Ended</b>	2006		2005	
	High	Low	High	Low
March 31	\$28.88	\$18.76	\$11.04	\$ 7.83
June 30	28.76	21.88	14.16	10.11
September 30	27.66	18.83	14.47	10.32
December 31	34.10	24.10	22.71	11.08

No cash dividends on common stock were declared for any period during 2006 or 2005.

26

---

**Table of Contents****ITEM 6. SELECTED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL DATA**

(in millions, except per share amounts)

	2006 <sup>1,2</sup>	2005 <sup>1,3</sup>	2004 <sup>1,3</sup>	2003 <sup>1,4</sup>	2002 <sup>1,4,5</sup>
Total operating revenues	\$22,563	\$20,712	\$18,645	\$17,440	\$17,420
Operating income (loss)	1,060	(89)	(134)	(843)	(3,331)
Income (loss) before cumulative effect of accounting change	231	(857)	(751)	(1,227)	(2,524)
Net income (loss)	231	(857)	(751)	(1,227)	(3,512)
Loss per share before cumulative effect of accounting change:					
Basic	1.13	(5.18)	(4.68)	(7.75)	(16.22)
Diluted	0.98	(5.18)	(4.68)	(7.75)	(16.22)
Net loss per share:					
Basic	1.13	(5.18)	(4.68)	(7.75)	(22.58)
Diluted	0.98	(5.18)	(4.68)	(7.75)	(22.58)
Total assets	29,145	29,495	28,773	29,330	30,267
Long-term debt, less current maturities	11,217	12,530	12,436	11,901	10,888
Obligations under capital leases, less current obligations	824	926	1,088	1,225	1,422
Obligation for pension and postretirement benefits	5,341	4,998	4,743	4,803	4,730
Stockholders' equity (deficit)	(606)	(1,430)	(537)	80	990

<sup>1</sup> Includes the impact of adopting FSP AUG AIR-1 Accounting for Planned Major Maintenance Activities as described in Note 1 to the consolidated financial statements.

<sup>2</sup> Includes the impact of adopting Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 123(R),

Share-Based  
Payment as  
described in  
Note 9 to the  
consolidated  
financial  
statements.

- <sup>3</sup> Includes restructuring charges (for a further discussion of these items, see Item 7, Management's Discussion and Analysis and Note 2 to the consolidated financial statements).
- <sup>4</sup> Includes restructuring charges and U.S. government grant.
- <sup>5</sup> Includes a one-time, non-cash charge, effective January 1, 2002, of \$988 million, net of tax, to write-off all of AMR's goodwill. This charge resulted from the adoption of Statement of Financial Accounting Standards Board No. 142, Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets and was

reflected as a cumulative effect of accounting change in the consolidated financial statements.

- 6 For the year ended December 31, 2002, the Company recorded an additional minimum pension liability adjustment resulting in an after tax charge to stockholders equity (deficit) of approximately \$1.0 billion. The Company recorded a reduction to the additional minimum pension liability resulting in a credit to stockholders equity (deficit) of approximately \$337 million for the year ended December 31, 2003 and \$129 million for the year ended December 31, 2004. The Company recorded an additional charge resulting in a debit to

stockholders  
equity  
(deficit) of  
\$379 million for  
the year ended  
December 31,  
2005. Effective  
December 31,  
2006, the  
Company  
adopted SFAS  
158 Employers  
Accounting for  
Defined Benefit  
Pension and  
Other  
Postretirement  
Plans . This  
adoption  
decreased  
Stockholders  
equity by  
\$1.0 billion and  
increased the  
obligation for  
pension and  
other  
postretirement  
benefits by  
\$880 million.

No cash dividends were declared on AMR's common shares during any of the periods above.

Information on the comparability of results is included in Item 7, Management's Discussion and Analysis and the notes to the consolidated financial statements.

**Table of Contents****ITEM 7. MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS****Forward-Looking Information**

The discussions under Business, Risk Factors, Properties and Legal Proceedings and the following discussions under Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations and Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk contain various forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, which represent the Company's expectations or beliefs concerning future events. When used in this document and in documents incorporated herein by reference, the words expects, plans, anticipates, indicates, believes, forecast, guidance, outlook, may, will, should, and similar expressions are intended to identify forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements include, without limitation, the Company's expectations concerning operations and financial conditions, including changes in capacity, revenues, and costs, future financing plans and needs, overall economic conditions, plans and objectives for future operations, and the impact on the Company of its results of operations in recent years and the sufficiency of its financial resources to absorb that impact. Other forward-looking statements include statements which do not relate solely to historical facts, such as, without limitation, statements which discuss the possible future effects of current known trends or uncertainties, or which indicate that the future effects of known trends or uncertainties cannot be predicted, guaranteed or assured. All forward-looking statements in this report are based upon information available to the Company on the date of this report. The Company undertakes no obligation to publicly update or revise any forward-looking statement, whether as a result of new information, future events, or otherwise. The Risk Factors listed in Item 1A, in addition to other possible factors not listed, could cause the Company's actual results to differ materially from historical results and from those expressed in forward-looking statements.

**Overview**

The Company recorded net earnings of \$231 million in 2006 compared to a net loss of \$857 million in 2005. In addition, the Company's unrestricted cash and short-term investments balance increased \$901 million, from \$3.8 billion to \$4.7 billion. The Company's 2006 results reflected an improvement in revenues somewhat offset by fuel prices and certain other costs that were higher in 2006 compared to 2005. While the Company recorded positive earnings in 2006, AMR incurred total losses of more than \$8 billion in the five years prior to 2006 and remains heavily indebted.

The Company's 2006 earnings were due in part to the Company's success in implementing fare increases to partially offset higher fuel prices. In 2006, mainline passenger load factor increased 1.5 points year-over-year to 80.1 percent and mainline passenger revenue yield increased 6.7 percent year-over-year. However, passenger revenue yield remains low by historical standards. The Company believes this is the result of excess industry capacity and its reduced pricing power resulting from greater cost sensitivity on the part of travelers (especially business travelers), increased competition from LCCs, the use of the internet, and other factors. The Company believes its reduced pricing power could persist indefinitely.

Offsetting these fare increases, the Company's 2006 fuel expense increased \$787 million compared to 2005 despite a decrease in mainline capacity of more than one percent. In 2006, the price of a gallon of jet fuel was 129.7 percent higher than in 2003 and the Company's fuel expense was \$3.6 billion higher in 2006 than in 2003 on a mainline capacity increase of approximately 5.0 percent.

The Company's 2006 earnings reflect the continuing joint efforts between the Company and its employees to identify and implement initiatives designed to increase efficiencies and revenues and reduce costs under the Turnaround Plan. The Turnaround Plan is the Company's strategic framework for returning to sustained profitability and has four tenets: (i) lower costs to compete, (ii) fly smart - give customers what they value, (iii) pull together, win together and (iv) build a financial foundation.



**Table of Contents**

Under the Turnaround Plan, the Company has implemented hundreds of cost savings initiatives estimated to save approximately \$3.5 billion in annual expense. In combination with the Company's 2003 restructuring of labor and other contracts, these initiatives have more than offset the Company's non-fuel inflationary and other cost pressures during this period. Employee productivity (measured in available seat miles per equivalent head) and aircraft productivity (measured in miles flown per day) have consistently increased under the Turnaround Plan and established new Company records in 2006.

The Company has also implemented numerous efforts to find additional revenue sources and increase existing ones. In addition to improving core passenger and cargo revenues, these efforts have contributed to a 36 percent increase in Other revenues since 2004 to \$1.4 billion in 2006.

As part of its effort to build greater employee involvement, the Company has sought to make its labor unions and its employees its business partners in working for continuous improvement under the Turnaround Plan. Among other things, the senior management of the Company meets regularly with union officials to discuss the Company's financial results as well as the competitive landscape. These discussions include (i) the Company's own cost reduction and revenue enhancement initiatives, (ii) a review of initiatives, in-place or contemplated, at other airlines and the impact of those initiatives on the Company's competitive position, and (iii) benchmarking the Company's revenues and costs against what would be considered "best in class" (the Company's Performance Leadership Initiative).

The Company's ability to become consistently profitable and its ability to continue to fund its obligations on an ongoing basis will depend on a number of factors, many of which are largely beyond the Company's control. Certain risk factors that affect the Company's business and financial results are discussed in the Risk Factors listed in Item 1A. In addition, four of the Company's largest domestic competitors have filed for bankruptcy in the last several years and have used this process to significantly reduce contractual labor and other costs. In order to remain competitive and to improve its financial condition, the Company must continue to take steps to generate additional revenues and to reduce its costs. Although the Company has a number of initiatives underway to address its cost and revenue challenges, the ultimate success of these initiatives is not known at this time and cannot be assured.

**Table of Contents**

**LIQUIDITY AND CAPITAL RESOURCES**

**Cash, Short-Term Investments and Restricted Assets**

At December 31, 2006, the Company had \$4.7 billion in unrestricted cash and short-term investments and \$468 million in restricted cash and short-term investments.

**Significant Indebtedness and Future Financing**

Substantial indebtedness is a significant risk to the Company as discussed in the Risk Factors listed in Item 1A. During 2004, 2005 and 2006, in addition to refinancing its Credit Facility and certain debt with an institutional investor (see Note 6 to the consolidated financial statements), the Company raised an aggregate of approximately \$3.2 billion of financing to fund capital commitments (mainly for aircraft and ground properties), operating losses, debt maturities, and employee pension obligations, and to bolster its liquidity. As of the date of this Form 10-K, the Company believes that it should have sufficient liquidity to fund its operations for the foreseeable future, including repayment of debt and capital leases, capital expenditures and other contractual obligations. However, to maintain sufficient liquidity as the Company has significant debt, lease and other obligations in the next several years, as well as substantial pension funding obligations (refer to Contractual Obligations in this Item 7), the Company may need access to additional funding. The Company also continues to evaluate the economic benefits and other aspects of replacing some of the older aircraft in its fleet prior to 2013. The Company's possible financing sources primarily include: (i) a limited amount of additional secured aircraft debt (a very large majority of the Company's owned aircraft, including virtually all of the Company's Section 1110-eligible aircraft, are encumbered) or sale-leaseback transactions involving owned aircraft, (ii) debt secured by new aircraft deliveries, (iii) debt secured by other assets, (iv) securitization of future operating receipts, (v) the sale or monetization of certain assets, (vi) unsecured debt and (vii) issuance of equity and/or equity-like securities. However, the availability and level of these financing sources cannot be assured, particularly in light of the Company's and American's recent financial results, substantial indebtedness, reduced credit ratings, high fuel prices, revenues that are weak by historical standards, and the financial difficulties being experienced in the airline industry. The inability of the Company to obtain additional funding on acceptable terms could have a material adverse impact on the Company and on the ability of the Company to sustain its operations over the long-term.

**Credit Ratings**

AMR's and American's credit ratings are significantly below investment grade. Additional reductions in AMR's or American's credit ratings could further increase its borrowing or other costs and further restrict the availability of future financing.

**Credit Facility Covenants**

American has a fully drawn \$740 million credit facility which consists of a fully drawn \$295 million senior secured revolving credit facility, with a final maturity on June 17, 2009, and a fully drawn \$445 million term loan facility, with a final maturity on December 17, 2010 (the Revolving Facility and the Term Loan Facility, respectively, and collectively, the Credit Facility). American's obligations under the Credit Facility are guaranteed by AMR.

**Table of Contents**

The Credit Facility contains a covenant (the Liquidity Covenant) requiring American to maintain, as defined, unrestricted cash, unencumbered short term investments and amounts available for drawing under committed revolving credit facilities of not less than \$1.25 billion for each quarterly period through the life of the Credit Facility. In addition, the Credit Facility contains a covenant (the EBITDAR Covenant) requiring AMR to maintain a ratio of cash flow (defined as consolidated net income, before interest expense (less capitalized interest), income taxes, depreciation and amortization and rentals, adjusted for certain gains or losses and non-cash items) to fixed charges (comprising interest expense (less capitalized interest) and rentals). The required ratio was 1.20 to 1.00 for the four quarter period ending December 31, 2006 and will increase gradually for each four quarter period ending on each fiscal quarter thereafter until it reaches 1.50 to 1.00 for the four quarter period ending June 30, 2009. AMR and American were in compliance with the Liquidity Covenant and the EBITDAR covenant as of December 31, 2006 and expect to be able to continue to comply with these covenants. However, given fuel prices that are high by historical standards and the volatility of fuel prices and revenues, it is difficult to assess whether AMR and American will, in fact, be able to continue to comply with these covenants, and there are no assurances that AMR and American will be able to do so. Failure to comply with these covenants would result in a default under the Credit Facility which if the Company did not take steps to obtain a waiver of, or otherwise mitigate, the default could result in a default under a significant amount of the Company's other debt and lease obligations and otherwise have a material adverse impact on the Company. See Note 6 to the consolidated financial statements for the required ratios at each measurement date through the life of the Credit Facility.

**Cash Flow Activity**

The Company's cash flow from operating activities improved in 2006. Net cash provided by operating activities during the year ended December 31, 2006 was \$1.9 billion, an increase of \$915 million over 2005, due primarily to an improved revenue environment and the impact of certain Company initiatives to improve revenue.

Capital expenditures during 2006 were \$530 million and primarily included the acquisition of two Boeing 777-200ER aircraft and the cost of improvements at JFK. Substantially all of the Company's construction costs at JFK are being reimbursed through a fund established from a previous financing transaction. See Note 6 to the consolidated financial statements for additional information.

During the second quarter of 2006, the Company issued and sold 15 million shares of its common stock. The Company realized \$400 million from the equity sale.

During 2006, the Company repurchased approximately \$190 million of its debt and lease obligations. Going forward, depending on market conditions, its cash position and other considerations, the Company may from time to time redeem or repurchase its debt, or take other steps to reduce its debt or lease obligations or otherwise improve its balance sheet.

**Working Capital**

AMR (principally American) historically operates with a working capital deficit, as do most other airline companies. In addition, the Company has historically relied heavily on external financing to fund capital expenditures. More recently, the Company has also relied on external financing to fund operating losses, employee pension obligations and debt maturities.

**Off Balance Sheet Arrangements**

American has determined that it holds a significant variable interest in, but is not the primary beneficiary of, certain trusts that are the lessors under 84 of its aircraft operating leases. These leases contain a fixed price purchase option, which allows American to purchase the aircraft at a predetermined price on a specified date. However, American does not guarantee the residual value of the aircraft. As of December 31, 2006, future lease payments required under these leases totaled \$2.3 billion.

**Table of Contents**

Certain special facility revenue bonds have been issued by certain municipalities primarily to purchase equipment and improve airport facilities that are leased by American and accounted for as operating leases. Approximately \$1.8 billion of these bonds (with total future payments of approximately \$4.6 billion as of December 31, 2006) are guaranteed by American, AMR, or both. Approximately \$495 million of these special facility revenue bonds contain mandatory tender provisions that require American to make operating lease payments sufficient to repurchase the bonds at various times: \$100 million in 2007, \$218 million in 2008, \$112 million in 2014 and \$65 million in 2015. Although American has the right to remarket the bonds, there can be no assurance that these bonds will be successfully remarketed. Any payments to redeem or purchase bonds that are not remarketed would generally reduce existing rent leveling accruals or be considered prepaid facility rentals and would reduce future operating lease commitments.

In addition, the Company had other operating leases, primarily for aircraft and airport facilities, with total future lease payments of \$4.6 billion as of December 31, 2006. Entering into aircraft leases allows the Company to obtain aircraft without immediate cash outflows.

**Table of Contents****Contractual Obligations**

The following table summarizes the Company's obligations and commitments as of December 31, 2006 (in millions):

Contractual Obligations	Total	Payments Due by Year(s) Ended December 31,				2012 and Beyond
		2007	2008 and 2009	2010 and 2011		
Operating lease payments for aircraft and facility obligations <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11,484	\$ 1,098	\$ 1,961	\$ 1,715	\$	6,710
Firm aircraft commitments <sup>2</sup>	2,770			23		2,747
Capacity purchase agreements <sup>3</sup>	179	97	82			
Long-term debt <sup>4</sup>	18,396	2,025	3,595	4,566		8,210
Capital lease obligations	1,541	197	411	282		651
Other purchase obligations <sup>5</sup>	1,328	326	370	323		309
Other long-term liabilities <sup>6,7</sup>	6,242	552	1,492	1,611		2,587
<b>Total obligations and commitments</b>	<b>\$ 41,940</b>	<b>\$ 4,295</b>	<b>\$ 7,911</b>	<b>\$ 8,520</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>21,214</b>

<sup>1</sup> Certain special facility revenue bonds issued by municipalities which are supported by operating leases executed by American are guaranteed by AMR and/or American. The special facility revenue bonds with mandatory tender provisions discussed above are included in this table under their ultimate maturity date rather than their mandatory tender provision date. See Note 5 to the

consolidated  
financial  
statements for  
additional  
information.

2 As of  
December 31,  
2006, the  
Company had  
commitments to  
acquire an  
aggregate of 47  
Boeing  
737-800s and  
seven Boeing  
777-200ERs in  
2013 through  
2016.

3 The table  
reflects  
minimum  
required  
payments under  
capacity  
purchase  
contracts  
between  
American and  
two regional  
airlines,  
Chautauqua  
Airlines, Inc.  
(Chautauqua)  
and Trans States  
Airlines Inc. If  
the Company  
terminates its  
contract with  
Chautauqua  
without cause,  
Chautauqua has  
the right to put  
its 15 Embraer  
aircraft to the  
Company. If  
this were to  
happen, the  
Company would  
take possession

of the aircraft and become liable for lease obligations totaling approximately \$21 million per year with lease expirations in 2018 and 2019. These lease obligations are not included in the table above. See Note 4 to the consolidated financial statements for additional information.

- 4 Amounts represent contractual amounts due, including interest. Interest on variable rate debt was estimated based on the current rate at December 31, 2006.

**Table of Contents**

5 Includes noncancelable commitments to purchase goods or services, primarily construction related costs at JFK and information technology related support. Substantially all of the Company's construction costs at JFK will be reimbursed through a fund established from a previous financing transaction. The Company has made estimates as to the timing of certain payments primarily for construction related costs. The actual timing of payments may vary from these estimates. Substantially all of the Company's purchase orders issued for other purchases in the ordinary course of business contain a 30-day cancellation clause that allows the Company to



cancel an order  
with 30 days  
notice.

6 Includes  
expected  
pension  
contributions  
based on  
actuarially  
determined  
estimates and  
other  
postretirement  
benefit  
payments based  
on estimated  
payments  
through 2015.  
See Note 10 to  
the consolidated  
financial  
statements.

7 Excludes a  
\$2.2 billion  
accident  
liability, related  
to the Terrorist  
Attacks and  
flight 587,  
recorded in  
Other liabilities  
and deferred  
credits, as  
discussed in  
Note 2 to the  
consolidated  
financial  
statements. This  
liability is offset  
in its entirety by  
a receivable,  
recorded in  
Other assets,  
which the  
Company  
expects to  
receive from  
insurance  
carriers as

claims are  
resolved.

**Pension Obligations** The Company is required to make contributions to its defined benefit pension plans under the minimum funding requirements of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA). As included in the table above, the Company's estimated 2007 contributions to its defined benefit pension plans are approximately \$364 million. This estimate reflects the provisions of the Pension Funding Equity Act of 2004 and the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

**Results of Operations**

The Company recorded net earnings of \$231 million in 2006 compared to a net loss of \$857 million in 2005. The Company's 2006 results reflected an improvement in revenues somewhat offset by fuel prices and certain other costs that were higher in 2006 compared to 2005. The 2006 and 2005 results were impacted by a decrease in depreciation expense of \$108 million in each year related to a change in the depreciable lives of certain aircraft types discussed further below, in Critical Accounting Policies in this Item 7, and in Note 1 to the consolidated financial statements, and productivity improvements and other cost reductions resulting from progress under the Turnaround Plan. The Company's 2005 results were also impacted by a \$155 million aircraft charge, a \$73 million facility charge, an \$80 million charge for the termination of a contract, a \$37 million gain related to the resolution of a debt restructuring and a \$22 million credit for the reversal of an insurance reserve. All of these amounts are included in Other operating expenses in the consolidated statement of operations, except for a portion of the facility charge which is included in Other rentals and landing fees. Also included in the 2005 results was a \$69 million fuel tax credit. Of this amount, \$55 million is included in Aircraft fuel expense and \$14 million is included in Interest income in the consolidated statement of operations. In addition, the Company did not record a tax provision or benefit associated with its 2006 earnings or 2005 and 2004 losses.

Although the Company is currently receiving a depreciation expense benefit from the change in estimate of depreciable lives discussed above, the Company's operating expenses excluding depreciation will likely be higher during the extended life of the MD-80 aircraft than they would be for new aircraft. For example, based on current estimates, the Company's MD-80 aircraft consume more fuel and incur higher maintenance expense than a new aircraft that requires minimal maintenance during the first several years of operation.

**Table of Contents****Revenues**

**2006 Compared to 2005** The Company's revenues increased approximately \$1.9 billion, or 8.9 percent, to \$22.6 billion in 2006 compared to 2005. American's passenger revenues increased by 7.5 percent, or \$1.2 billion, despite a capacity (available seat mile) (ASM) decrease of 1.2 percent. American's passenger load factor increased 1.5 points to 80.1 percent and passenger revenue yield per passenger mile increased 6.7 percent to 12.81 cents. This resulted in an increase in passenger revenue per available seat mile (RASM) of 8.8 percent to 10.26 cents. In 2006, American derived approximately 64 percent of its passenger revenues from domestic operations and approximately 36 percent from international operations. Following is additional information regarding American's domestic and international RASM and capacity:

	Year Ended December 31, 2006			
	RASM (cents)	Y-O-Y Change	ASMs (billions)	Y-O-Y Change
DOT Domestic	10.24	9.3%	111	(3.2)%
International	10.30	7.8	63	2.7
DOT Latin America	10.78	13.7	30	(2.1)
DOT Atlantic	10.34	2.6	25	4.6
DOT Pacific	8.49	4.6	8	16.7

Regional Affiliates' passenger revenues, which are based on industry standard proration agreements for flights connecting to American flights, increased \$354 million, or 16.5 percent, to \$2.5 billion as a result of increased capacity and load factors. Regional Affiliates' traffic increased 11.5 percent to 10.0 billion revenue passenger miles (RPMs), while capacity increased 6.6 percent to 13.6 billion ASMs, resulting in a 3.2 point increase in passenger load factor to 73.6 percent.

Cargo revenues increased 5.5 percent, or \$43 million as a result of a \$31 million increase in mail revenue and a \$26 million increase in freight fuel surcharges.

Other revenues increased 17.7 percent, or \$206 million, to \$1.4 billion due in part to increased third-party maintenance contracts obtained by the Company's maintenance and engineering group and increases in certain passenger fees.

**Table of Contents**

**2005 Compared to 2004** The Company's revenues increased approximately \$2.1 billion, or 11.1 percent, to \$20.7 billion in 2005 compared to 2004. American's passenger revenues increased by 10.6 percent, or \$1.6 billion, on a capacity (available seat mile) (ASM) increase of 1.2 percent. American's passenger load factor increased 3.8 points to 78.6 percent and passenger revenue yield per passenger mile increased 4.0 percent to 12.01 cents. This resulted in an increase in passenger revenue per available seat mile (RASM) of 9.3 percent to 9.43 cents. In 2005, American derived approximately 65 percent of its passenger revenues from domestic operations and approximately 35 percent from international operations. Following is additional information regarding American's domestic and international RASM and capacity:

	Year Ended December 31, 2005			
	RASM (cents)	Y-O-Y Change	ASMs (billions)	Y-O-Y Change
DOT Domestic	9.37	10.6%	115	(2.3)%
International	9.56	6.6	61	8.6
DOT Latin America	9.48	7.9	30	6.0
DOT Atlantic	10.08	9.0	24	6.7
DOT Pacific	8.12	(7.7)	7	30.1

Regional Affiliates' passenger revenues, which are based on industry standard proration agreements for flights connecting to American flights, increased \$272 million, or 14.5 percent, to \$2.1 billion as a result of increased capacity and load factors. Regional Affiliates' traffic increased 22.8 percent to 8.9 billion revenue passenger miles (RPMs), while capacity increased 17.3 percent to 12.7 billion ASMs, resulting in a 3.2 point increase in passenger load factor to 70.4 percent.

Cargo revenues increased 6.2 percent, or \$46 million, primarily due to a \$49 million increase in freight fuel surcharges and other service fees.

Other revenues increased 15.4 percent, or \$156 million, to \$1.2 billion due in part to increased third-party maintenance contracts obtained by the Company's maintenance and engineering group and increases in certain passenger fees.

**Table of Contents****Operating Expenses**

**2006 Compared to 2005** The Company's total operating expenses increased 3.4 percent, or \$702 million, to \$21.5 billion in 2006 compared to 2005. American's mainline operating expenses per ASM in 2006 increased 3.8 percent compared to 2005 to 10.90 cents. This increase in operating expenses per ASM is due primarily to a 16.5 percent increase in American's price per gallon of fuel (net of the impact of a fuel tax credit and fuel hedging) in 2006 relative to 2005.

(in millions)	Year	Change	Percentage
	ended		
Operating Expenses	December 31, 2006	from 2005	Change
Wages, salaries and benefits	\$ 6,813	\$ 58	0.9%
Aircraft fuel	6,402	787	14.0(a)
Other rentals and landing fees	1,283	21	1.7