Racing to Advanced Air Mobility

Project MAXIMUM BOOST: Flying-Car Racing as the Certification Pathway to Advanced Air Mobility

M. McAlpine X1Racing, LLC, United States Corresponding author: mac@x1racing.com

---

Abstract

This paper argues that the fastest, lowest-cost, and most fiscally disciplined path to scaled Advanced Air Mobility (AAM) in the United States is competitive, fully unmanned flying-car motorsport: specifically the X1Racing Project MAXIMUM BOOST framework, an $11.0 billion federal strategic investment ($2.2 billion direct tranche plus $8.8 billion sponsorship-matched) submitted under the United States Investment Accelerator established by Executive Order 14255, matched dollar-for-dollar by up to $8.8 billion in private commercial sponsorship for a total potential program impact of $19.8 billion. The program's deliverable is the type certification of an integrated package — airframe, AI co-pilot, and free-piston linear generator (FPLG) powertrain — under a new FAA aircraft and operator certification category for AI-augmented private-use AAM, with the program's target certification date of January 20, 2029 organizing program execution.

The argument rests on five linked claims. First, the United States lacks an aircraft category that fits the AI-augmented, remote-and-eventually-onboard-piloted, FPLG-powered light personal aviation vehicle that AAM commercialization requires, and the FAA has demonstrated three times in two decades (Sport Pilot 2004, Remote Pilot 2016, Powered-Lift 2024) that the agency establishes new categories when aircraft classes genuinely require them. Second, competitive unmanned racing with designated Danger Zones, in which AI stabilization authority is deliberately reduced to generate spectator-grade failure modes, is the only known mechanism for generating the operational evidence density and adversarial failure-mode coverage that supports the new category's airworthiness, AI co-pilot, and operator certification standards on a competitive timeline. Third, a decomposition of general-aviation fatal-accident causes indicates that an AI co-pilot certified as second crew member with airframe-envelope authority, geospatial awareness, and weather integration can drive personal-eVTOL fatality rates below pedestrian, vehicle, and unaided-general-aviation baselines, providing the operational safety evidence that supports the new category's progressive evolution toward broadly accessible operator certification — the program's stated long-term Maximum Freedom destination. Fourth, three existing regulatory mechanisms — the FAA's MOSAIC final rule (effective 22 October 2025 for sport-pilot privileges; 24 July 2026 for aircraft certification), the Department of War Acquisition

Transformation Strategy (7 November 2025), and Executive Order 14255 establishing the United States Investment Accelerator (31 March 2025) — together form a complete regulatory on-ramp requiring no new statute. Fifth, a well-to-wheel energy analysis shows that racing-derived super-efficient hybrid-electric powertrains outperform grid-charged pure-electric alternatives on both thermal efficiency and mission range, and a performance-based racing rulebook admitting FPLG and other non-crankshaft architectures can drive brake thermal efficiency from the current Mainspring Energy 46% commercial baseline toward a 60%+ near-term program floor and a 70%+ championship-level horizon, supporting Phase 2 commercialization of certified FPLG powertrains by other American companies for civilian freight, stationary grid generation, and defense applications.

The paper draws its model of technology acceleration from two precedents: the century-long transfer of motorsport innovation to passenger-car safety, and the Apollo-era space race, whose combination of public spectacle, fixed deadlines, and high-visibility budget produced the civilian electronics, materials, and guidance revolutions on which modern life depends. Project MAXIMUM BOOST replicates that acceleration mechanism on a capped federal commitment matched by private sponsorship, with the inaugural X-1 Cup championship in Year 2 serving as the program's first public-facing airworthiness milestone and integrated package type certification as the Phase 1 trigger that opens Phase 2 commercialization. The federal strategic investment also produces capability transfer into the American automotive industrial base through the program's engineering involvement with participating American automotive OEMs, enabling consumer-scale personal AAM rollout in Phase 2 through established American manufacturers rather than through specialty aerospace startups. The addressable market is substantial: Morgan Stanley research projects a $1 trillion global AAM total addressable market by 2040 and $9 trillion by 2050, with the personal air mobility segment that the new FAA category specifically enables representing a substantial share. The $11 billion federal strategic investment, leveraged against a trillion-dollar end market through the certified industrial baseline and the OEM capability transfer, produces economic returns at orders of magnitude beyond the federal capital deployment itself, with trickle-down effects across American manufacturing employment, supplier ecosystem development, and regional economic growth.

Keywords: Advanced Air Mobility; eVTOL; AI co-pilot; unmanned racing; danger zones; failure-mode telemetry; new FAA category; proving ground; space-race acceleration; free-piston linear generator; FPLG; MOSAIC; sport pilot; Investment Accelerator; Executive Order 14255; dual-use technology; hybrid-electric propulsion; X-1 Cup; trillion-dollar market; personal air mobility; OEM capability transfer; trickle-down economic returns; industrial policy.

Nomenclature

- AAM = Advanced Air Mobility
- AI = Artificial Intelligence

- BTE = Brake Thermal Efficiency
- CFIT = Controlled Flight Into Terrain
- DAS = Defense Acquisition System
- DoW = Department of War (formerly Department of Defense)
- EO = Executive Order
- eVTOL = Electric Vertical Takeoff and Landing
- FAA = Federal Aviation Administration
- FPLG = Free-Piston Linear Generator
- GA = General Aviation
- HCCI = Homogeneous Charge Compression Ignition
- LIDAR = Light Detection and Ranging
- LOC-I = Loss of Control In-flight
- LSA = Light Sport Aircraft
- MOSAIC = Modernization of Special Airworthiness Certification
- MTA = Middle Tier of Acquisition
- NASA = National Aeronautics and Space Administration
- NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act
- NTSB = National Transportation Safety Board
- OEM = Original Equipment Manufacturer
- PCCI = Premixed Charge Compression Ignition
- UAM = Urban Air Mobility
- VTOL = Vertical Takeoff and Landing
- WAS = Warfighting Acquisition System

I. Introduction

For six decades American aerospace has promised the public a flying car. The Aerocar, Moller's Skycar, dozens of modern eVTOL programs backed by major automotive and aerospace primes, and the Department of Transportation's own repeated white papers on Urban Air Mobility have all failed to place an ordinary-citizen-owned flying car in ordinary-citizen driveways. The vision the paper argues for is specific: a side-by-side two-seat, human-capable hybrid-electric eVTOL — a vehicle that seats pilot and passenger in the configuration of a sports car, not the configuration of a commercial aircraft — owned, operated, and landed by any licensed driver paired with a certified AI co-pilot. The barrier to that vehicle has not been physics. Vertical-takeoff hybrid-electric propulsion has been demonstrated at scale. It has not been cost of hardware, which has fallen to the price band of a luxury pickup truck. The barrier is the absence of a regulatory category that fits the vehicle. The gap between a Part 23 general aviation airplane, a Part 27 normal-category rotorcraft, a Light Sport Aircraft under Sport Pilot rules, and the new Powered-Lift category — none of which were designed for AI-augmented private-use personal aviation — is not measured in horsepower but in the absence of an aircraft and operator certification framework calibrated to what this vehicle actually is.

Three candidate paths present themselves for closing this gap. The first is the current for-profit eVTOL industry, comprising multiple American and international companies pursuing Part 135 commercial-operator certification for air-taxi passenger service. These programs are engineering achievements, but they deliver commercial AAM, not personal AAM. Their business model is ride-share: a professionally-piloted, centrally-dispatched, per-seat-fare service whose scaled outcome is a fleet of commercial air-taxis operating between managed vertiports, not a personally-owned flying car in a suburban driveway. Ride-share eVTOL preserves the FAA's existing licensing architecture almost exactly — commercial pilots, company-operated vehicles, centrally-controlled vertiports — and therefore neither creates nor demands the new aircraft and operator certification category that personal AAM requires. No matter how successfully the ride-share industry scales, it does not deliver personal air mobility to the citizen; it delivers a premium taxi service to the customer.

An additional consideration distinguishes Project MAXIMUM BOOST from the ride-share eVTOL pathway on the dimension that matters most for personal AAM deployment at scale: manufacturing capacity. The certified eVTOL companies are aerospace startups that built aviation capability over the past decade and will, even after achieving commercial certification, manufacture at specialty-aerospace production scale rather than at consumer-product scale. Personal AAM rollout at the scale Maximum Freedom requires depends on American automotive original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) bringing personal AAM to consumer production through their existing manufacturing, distribution, and service infrastructure. The Project MAXIMUM BOOST architecture is structured to make this OEM rollout possible by transferring aviation capability directly to the participating OEMs during Phase 1 through their direct engineering involvement with the racing teams they back. By the time the new category is established and the certified baseline exists, the participating OEMs have developed aviation engineering capability through their team involvement and are positioned to bring personal AAM to consumer production at OEM scale, through OEM channels, within the OEM's normal product-cycle timeline.

The second candidate is conventional government-led civil regulation: the FAA, acting on its own institutional schedule, advancing AAM through normal rulemaking. The FAA's record is definitive but slow. The rulemaking that produced MOSAIC took more than a decade from first proposal to final rule. The recently-finalized Powered-Lift category took comparable time. The agency establishes new categories when aircraft classes require them, but it does so on institutional timescales of a decade or more. Scaled to the full personal-AAM architecture — requiring a new aircraft category, a new operator certification framework, AI co-pilot certification standards, and an integrated airspace approach — the conventional schedule would deliver the category somewhere in the late 2030s. Left to the FAA alone, under current resourcing conditions, personal air mobility arrives on a timeline measured in decades rather than years.

Only the third path closes the gap on a competitive timeline: Project MAXIMUM BOOST — the entertainment-driven, purpose-built, exclusively unmanned racing series whose operational evidence outputs feed directly into the FAA's standard rulemaking process for establishing the new category. The program is coupled to three existing regulatory mechanisms: the FAA's MOSAIC final rule, which establishes the precedent of performance-based certification with driver's-license medical and supports the operator-certification framework the new category requires; the Department of War Acquisition Transformation Strategy of 7 November 2025, which establishes the dual-use pathway under commercial-preference acquisition; and the United States Investment Accelerator established by Executive Order 14255 on 31 March 2025, which coordinates the federal interagency engagement that the new category's rulemaking requires. The four elements operate together: the racing program generates the operational evidence base; MOSAIC supplies the operator certification precedent; the Acquisition Transformation Strategy supplies funded dual-use flight test volume and commercial acquisition pathways; the Investment Accelerator supplies the interagency coordination that compresses the rulemaking timeline. None of these mechanisms alone delivers the new category on a competitive timeline. Together they constitute, for the first time in American aviation history, a complete regulatory on-ramp for personal AAM that requires no new statute.

This paper calls the program Project MAXIMUM BOOST after the X1Racing initiative of the same name, and it calls the long-term destination the program enables Maximum Freedom: a state of mature personal AAM under which the new FAA category's operator certification has evolved, through standard FAA rulemaking informed by ongoing operational evidence, to a driver's-license-accessible threshold. Maximum Freedom is X1 Racing's strategic position from the program's outset and through its post-Phase 1 institutional life. The company exists to advance the new category, the certified baseline, the operational safety record, and the policy framework that together produce broadly accessible personal aviation as an American reality. The program delivers, within its operational window, the certified baseline (airframe, AI co-pilot, FPLG powertrain) and the new category established through FAA rulemaking. The category's operator certification framework then evolves over subsequent years and decades, on a regulatory timeline informed by accumulated operational evidence, toward the Maximum Freedom destination.

The addressable market that the new category opens is substantial. Morgan Stanley research projects the global total addressable market for AAM at $1 trillion by 2040 and $9 trillion by 2050 under base-case assumptions, with bull-case projections extending to $18.9 trillion by 2050 [35]. Personal air mobility — the segment that the new FAA category specifically enables, distinct from the commercial AAM/air-taxi segment served by the ride-share eVTOL industry — represents a substantial share of that opportunity, and the United States is positioned to capture the dominant share of the personal segment because the program establishes both the American certified industrial baseline and the American regulatory framework that governs the category. The trillion-dollar end market is the demand-side mechanism that converts the $11 billion federal strategic investment into the long-arc economic return that the program delivers. The federal capital catalyzes the certification, regulatory, and capability-transfer infrastructure that the new sector requires. The trillion-dollar end-market demand then pulls production through the American automotive OEM industrial base whose aviation capability the program has transferred. Production at OEM consumer-product scale drives manufacturing employment across the participating states, supplier ecosystem development across the broader American manufacturing economy, and the secondary and tertiary economic activity that follows large-scale OEM production of any consumer-product class. The trickle-down economic returns operate through standard industrial multiplier dynamics: the new sector generates direct manufacturing employment at OEM scale, indirect employment through supplier ecosystems, induced economic activity through the wages and procurement that direct and indirect employment generate, and the broader regional economic development that follows the establishment of a new American industrial sector. The $11 billion federal strategic investment, leveraged against the trillion-dollar end market through the certified baseline and the OEM capability transfer, produces returns at orders of magnitude beyond the federal capital deployment itself.

The argument rests on five linked claims:

(1) The United States lacks an aircraft and operator certification category that fits AI-augmented private-use personal AAM, and the FAA has demonstrated three times in two decades that the agency establishes new categories when aircraft classes genuinely require them. A new category is the technically correct and regulatorily standard response to the gap; the program's task is to generate the operational evidence base that supports the category's establishment on a competitive timeline.

(2) Racing is the fastest known way to generate that evidence base, and the racing must be fully unmanned. Motorsport has been the certification laboratory for every meaningful automotive safety technology of the last century. Aerial competition has historically stalled where human pilots became the point of ethical failure. By architecting the competition as exclusively unmanned with designated Danger Zones for deliberate failure-mode generation, Project MAXIMUM BOOST removes that constraint and operates into the failure envelope on purpose, producing data civil certification campaigns are structurally unable to produce.

(3) An AI co-pilot certified as second crew member, with airframe-envelope authority, geospatial awareness, and weather integration, can drive the personal-eVTOL fatality rate below pedestrian, vehicle, and unaided-general-aviation baselines. We present a cause-decomposition analysis showing that the AI co-pilot architecture addresses the three dominant causes of GA fatalities (LOC-I, CFIT, and weather encounter) and derives a projected steady-state rate materially safer than all three baselines. This operational safety evidence supports the FAA's progressive evolution of the new category's operator certification framework over decades, toward the Maximum Freedom destination.

(4) The program structure compresses certification timeline through specific mechanisms: the operational evidence density of racing, the failure-mode coverage of Danger Zones, the proving-ground continuity of season-over-season operations, the dual-use parallel certification under WAS, and the interagency coordination provided by the Investment Accelerator. The program's January 20, 2029 target for integrated package type certification is aggressive but achievable under maximum-execution conditions; if certification slips past that date, the Phase 1 sharing regime continues until certification arrives, with no structural failure of the program.

(5) The federal investment is structured to protect taxpayers against timeline and execution risk. The $2.2 billion direct tranche deploys at investment closing and funds the immediate Phase 1 work. The $8.8 billion matching tranche deploys only against Big 4-verified arms-length commercial sponsorship, available for day-one matching from program initiation. Federal exposure is capped at $2.2 billion in the floor case where sponsorship fails to validate the program; full deployment occurs only against full matching. The matching mechanism creates merit-based capital deployment that aligns federal, manufacturer, and operator incentives without picking winners.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II establishes the regulatory framework: the case for a new FAA category for AI-augmented private-use AAM, the precedent of recent new categories (Sport Pilot 2004, Remote Pilot 2016, Powered-Lift 2024), and the program's pathway to category establishment through standard FAA rulemaking. Section III reviews the historical precedent of motorsport as a certification laboratory and Apollo as a civilian technology accelerator. Section IV describes the Project MAXIMUM BOOST architecture, including the economic structure aligned to the executive summary's CHIPS-parallel federal equity terms. Section V specifies the AI co-pilot design as second crew member under an extension of existing two-crew certification frameworks. Section VI presents the quantitative safety analysis. Section VII develops the well-to-wheel case for hybrid-electric propulsion and the Phase 2 FPLG commercialization pathway. Section VIII explains the dual-use defense pathway enabled by the Acquisition Transformation Strategy. Section IX lays out the regulatory on-ramp. Section X concludes with the two-phase implementation roadmap.

II. The Regulatory Framework: A New FAA Category for AI-Augmented Private-Use AAM

The United States Federal Aviation Administration operates under statutory authority granted by 49 U.S.C. § 40103, which establishes United States Government sovereignty over the navigable airspace and grants the FAA Administrator authority over its use. Within that statutory authority, the agency establishes aircraft and operator certification categories through standard rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act, calibrating each category to the technical and operational reality of the aircraft class it governs. The agency has demonstrated, repeatedly, that it establishes new categories when aircraft classes genuinely require them.

A. The Precedent of Recent New Categories

Three new categories established in the last two decades illustrate the FAA's demonstrated capacity to develop purpose-built regulatory frameworks for new aviation realities.

The Sport Pilot certificate and Light Sport Aircraft category, established in 2004, created a new operator certification framework with substantially lighter training requirements than the existing private pilot certificate, justified by aircraft and operational limitations that bounded the operational risk profile. Sport Pilot established the precedent of driver's-license-equivalent medical certification: a valid state driver's license suffices for medical fitness, without an FAA medical certificate. This was a substantial simplification of the operator certification framework, achieved through standard FAA rulemaking, supported by safety analysis of the bounded operational profile.

The Remote Pilot certificate under Part 107, established in 2016, created an entirely new operator certification framework for commercial small unmanned aircraft systems. Part 107 introduced an operator certification (the Remote Pilot Certificate) calibrated to remote operation of small UAS, with a knowledge test scaled to the operational role and no flight-hours requirement. The category recognized that remote piloting was a different operational reality than crewed flight and required a different certification framework rather than an extension of existing pilot certificates.

The Powered-Lift category and associated pilot certification, finalized in 2024 through the Special Federal Aviation Regulation establishing pilot training requirements, created a new aircraft and operator certification framework for the emerging eVTOL category. The category recognized that powered-lift aircraft were neither airplanes nor rotorcraft and required a purpose-built framework, supported by years of FAA engagement with the certified eVTOL programs.

The pattern is consistent. When an aircraft class genuinely doesn't fit existing categories, the FAA establishes a new category through standard rulemaking, calibrated to the operational and technical reality of the class. The agency has demonstrated this capacity three times in twenty years, with each establishment supported by industry engagement, operational evidence, and the standards body work that informs the certification basis.

B. The Case for a New Category for AI-Augmented Private-Use AAM

The X-1 Cup aircraft class — AI co-pilot certified as second crew member, remote and eventually onboard piloted, FPLG-powered, light personal AAM — does not fit existing FAA categories. Part 23 was designed for general aviation airplanes with conventional powertrains and human-only crews. Part 27 was designed for normal-category rotorcraft. Sport Pilot was designed for Light Sport Aircraft of an earlier technical era, with no provision for AI co-pilot integration or FPLG propulsion. Part 107 was designed for small unmanned commercial operations, not human-capable personal aviation. The Powered-Lift category was scoped to commercial and transport applications, not private-use personal aviation. None of these categories were designed for the integrated AI co-pilot + remote/onboard piloting + FPLG architecture that personal AAM requires, and forcing certification under any of them would produce regulatory mismatches in both directions: requirements that do not address the actual aircraft, and necessary requirements that do not exist in the framework being borrowed.

A new category is therefore the technically correct and regulatorily standard response. The category establishes airworthiness standards for the aircraft class, including weight limits, performance envelopes, occupancy bounds, propulsion type, and AI co-pilot integration requirements that distinguish it from commercial AAM (covered by existing or extended commercial frameworks) and from larger personal aircraft (covered by existing Part 23). It establishes airworthiness certification procedures tailored to the aircraft class, paralleling how Part 23 covers normal-category airplanes and Part 27 covers normal-category rotorcraft. It establishes operator certification requirements scaled to the operator's actual role after the AI co-pilot's certified safety functions are accounted for. It establishes operational rules for the private-use context, including airspace integration through ADS-B and AI co-pilot ATC interface, operational volume restrictions, and a controlled progression toward broader operating environments as operational evidence accumulates. It establishes AI co-pilot certification requirements under an extension of existing two-crew certification frameworks, with the AI occupying the formally-defined second-crew role under defined envelope protection and intervention authority.

C. Operator Certification: The Path to Maximum Freedom

The program's stated long-term objective is operator certification under the new category that is as administratively accessible as a state driver's license — issued by the FAA on the basis of a knowledge test scaled to the operator's actual decision-making role, a practical demonstration of operator-AI interaction in normal and abnormal scenarios, medical fitness established through valid state driver's license (consistent with existing Sport Pilot precedent), and recurrent currency requirements appropriate to private-use personal aviation. This standard is justified by the AI co-pilot's certified safety functions: envelope protection, collision avoidance, navigation, weather avoidance, and emergency procedure execution are performed by the certified AI rather than by the human operator, which collapses the operator's required skill set to the residual decision-making functions (where to go, when to depart, route preferences) within bounds the AI enforces.

The driver's-license-accessible standard is not an in-window deliverable. The operational evidence base required to support a new operator certification framework at that accessibility level is a multi-decade accumulation that begins with the program and continues through years of subsequent civilian operations on the certified airframe. What the program delivers within its operational window is the technical and operational foundation for that certification framework: the certified airframe, the certified AI co-pilot, the certified FPLG powertrain, the airspace integration framework, and the operational evidence base sufficient to support FAA rulemaking establishing the new category at an initial operator certification level appropriate to early-stage adoption. The category's operator certification requirements then evolve over subsequent years and decades as accumulated operational evidence supports progressive simplification, with the Maximum Freedom destination — driver's-license-accessible operator certification — as the program's explicit policy destination.

This is the same regulatory arc that recreational aviation has followed historically. Sport Pilot in 2004 was a substantial simplification from prior private pilot certification, justified by aircraft and operational limitations that bounded the risk profile of the operation. MOSAIC, currently working through FAA rulemaking, expands the Sport Pilot framework as operational evidence supports broader application. The new AAM private-use category begins from a starting point informed by the program's evidence base and evolves toward the Maximum Freedom destination on a regulatory timeline consistent with the FAA's demonstrated approach to graduated certification frameworks.

D. Phase 1 Evidence Generation Supporting Category Establishment

Every element of the new category maps to a specific certification deliverable Project MAXIMUM BOOST produces during Phase 1. The airworthiness standards are informed by the airframe certification work and the operational evidence the X-1 Cup generates. The operator certification standards are informed by the AI co-pilot certification work and the demonstrated operator-AI interaction patterns from race operations. The operational rules are informed by the airspace integration work and the accumulated operational hours under FAA-witnessed conditions. The AI co-pilot certification is the direct technical deliverable of the program's AI development pipeline. The FPLG powertrain certification is the direct technical deliverable of the program's powertrain development pipeline. The new category is not a separate regulatory reform effort layered on top of the technical work; it emerges naturally from the technical work as the regulatory framework that makes the technical deliverables commercially deployable at scale.

The Phase 1 IP commons regime ensures that all operational evidence, certification basis documentation, fault analysis, intervention statistics, and engineering work generated by the program flows to the shared platform that supports both inter-team collaborative development and FAA rulemaking. The federal government, the participating teams, and qualified suppliers and contractors all access the commons without proprietary friction during Phase 1. This sharing regime is the structural mechanism that compresses the certification timeline: instead of seventeen separate team development programs each generating bounded proprietary datasets, the program operates as a unified consortium development effort whose combined evidence base supports the new category's establishment as a single integrated rulemaking action.

The Phase 1 regime continues until type certification of the integrated package (airframe + AI co-pilot + FPLG powertrain) is achieved under the new category. The program targets January 20, 2029 for this certification milestone; if certification slips past that date, the Phase 1 sharing regime continues until certification arrives. Phase 2 — under which teams privatize their pre-certification IP and commercialize on it, with operational data continuing to be shared among teams as a closed competitive-safety regime and government access continuing permanently for ongoing certification oversight — begins on certification, regardless of date.

III. Historical Precedent: Motorsport and the Space Race as Crash-Program Accelerators

Two American precedents provide the model for how Project MAXIMUM BOOST pulls civil capability forward. The first is a century of motorsport technology transfer into the passenger car. The second is the Apollo-era space race, in which fixed deadlines, public spectacle, and concentrated capital collapsed a generation of electronics, materials, and guidance development into a decade. Project MAXIMUM BOOST is architected to replicate both mechanisms for aviation — as a shared public-private investment, with an $11 billion federal commitment matched dollar-for-dollar by up to $8.8 billion in private commercial sponsorship from the first day of program execution.

A. Motorsport as Certification Laboratory

The safety record of the modern automobile is inseparable from the history of motorsport. The three-point seat belt was a Volvo engineer's response to fatalities observed in sports-car racing; disc brakes migrated to production cars from Le Mans; anti-lock braking systems matured in endurance racing before migrating to consumer vehicles; traction control and electronic stability control were refined in rally competition; active aerodynamics, carbon-fiber monocoque chassis, crumple zones, HANS devices, and fuel-cell bladders all moved from the track to the street on timescales of three to ten years.

The transfer mechanism is the racing rulebook. A sanctioning body specifies outcomes — power envelope, fuel allocation, mass, safety cell integrity — and leaves architecture open. Competitors converge on the architectures that win. The winning architectures then migrate to production. Formula 1's 1.5-liter turbocharged era of the late 1970s and early 1980s drove direct-injection turbocharging into production cars two decades ahead of any emissions-driven timeline. Its 2014 hybrid formula, specifying a thermal-power unit plus a pair of motor-generators including the MGU-H waste-heat recovery unit, produced powertrain architectures that are now embedded in multiple road-car hybrid systems. LMP1 diesel hybrids from Audi, Peugeot, and Toyota drove direct-injection compression-ignition refinements that shaped passenger-car TDI development.

The crucial point is not that every racing innovation reaches production — many do not — but that racing is the environment in which the worst-case physical edges of an envelope are discovered, tested, and survived. Civil test programs, by their nature and by the ethical constraints on passenger-carrying experiments, systematically avoid those edges. Racing seeks them. The telemetric density of a single Formula 1 qualifying session exceeds the telemetric density of an entire civil type-certification campaign by orders of magnitude.

Aviation's regulatory history is impoverished by the absence of a comparable commercial-sport laboratory. Air racing in the Golden Age — the Thompson Trophy, the Pulitzer, and most consequentially the Schneider Trophy — produced extraordinary advances. The Supermarine seaplane that won the Schneider Trophy in 1931 became the airframe of the Spitfire, which in turn became the Allied air-superiority platform that won the Battle of Britain. The discontinuation of air racing as a major sporting format after the Cleveland Air Races disaster of 1949 removed from civil aviation its principal adversarial-certification environment, and civil aviation's progress has since been almost entirely airliner-derived, with institutional timescales measured in decades.

Contemporary efforts including Airspeeder (Alauda Aeronautics, Australia) and the former Red Bull Air Race series demonstrated in the 2010s and early 2020s that aerial racing is technically viable. Neither program, however, was architected from the outset as a certification-data pipeline with an articulated civil on-ramp, a performance-based engine formula, or a deliberate failure-mode capture regime. Project MAXIMUM BOOST is the first framework explicitly designed to integrate all three.

B. The Space Race as Civilian Technology Accelerator

The second precedent is the American space program of the 1960s. Between the Soviet launch of Sputnik 1 in October 1957 and the Apollo 11 landing in July 1969, the United States compressed into twelve years a transformation of electronics, computing, materials, guidance, and communications that would, under ordinary market conditions, have required a half-century. The funding in today's dollars was on the order of $280 billion; the direct employment exceeded 400,000; the resulting civilian-technology baseline underpins effectively every modern consumer electronic device.

The mechanism is well documented. The demand of the Apollo Guidance Computer for miniaturized, radiation-tolerant logic is widely credited with pulling integrated-circuit manufacturing forward by a decade, consuming a material fraction of global IC production during peak Apollo and providing the scale economics that brought unit cost down the Moore's Law curve. The Kalman filter, developed for Apollo trajectory estimation, is now executed hundreds of times per second inside every smartphone. Ablative heat-shield materials developed for reentry underpin modern thermal-protection systems. Digital fly-by-wire, first flown on a Lunar Module simulator and then on an F-8 Crusader NASA test aircraft in 1972, became the control architecture of the Airbus A320 and every major civil transport since.

Crucially, none of these civilian benefits was the primary product sold to the public. The primary product was the spectacle. The public paid for Apollo because it wanted to see Americans on the Moon. The integrated circuits, the fly-by-wire, the composite materials, and the satellite communications were byproducts that fell out of the instrumentation overhead of the spectacle itself.

This is the model Project MAXIMUM BOOST replicates for aviation. The public pays for racing because it wants to see racing. The AI co-pilot, the new FAA category, the FPLG-class powertrain, the failure-mode telemetry corpus, and the hybrid-electric propulsion baseline are byproducts that fall out of the instrumentation overhead of the racing itself. The difference from Apollo is the funding structure: Apollo required congressional appropriation at the limit of a national mobilization, with no private match. Project MAXIMUM BOOST is funded as a public-private strategic investment in which the $2.2 billion federal direct tranche deploys at investment closing and the $8.8 billion federal matching pool deploys dollar-for-dollar against verified arms-length commercial sponsorship from day one, ensuring that every federal matching dollar is validated by an equivalent private commitment from the entertainment economy the program is creating. The federal exposure is capped at the $2.2 billion direct tranche in the floor case where sponsorship fails to validate the program; full deployment of the matched tranche occurs only against full deployment of private sponsorship.

C. The Crash-Program Model Applied to Civil Aviation

The two precedents share a common structural pattern: public spectacle creates a demand for instrumented, edge-pushing operation; the rulebook or mission objective admits architectures that civil qualification alone could not fund; the resulting data becomes the civilian technology baseline of the following decade. Motorsport applied this pattern to surface mobility. Apollo applied it to aerospace computing, guidance, materials, and communications. Neither pattern has ever been applied to civil aviation itself. Project MAXIMUM BOOST is the first programmatic attempt to do so — using entertainment revenue alongside a fiscally-disciplined federal commitment as the funding instrument, and the fully-unmanned Danger Zone as the instrumentation-rich edge environment.

IV. Project MAXIMUM BOOST: The X1Racing Strategic Investment Framework

Project MAXIMUM BOOST is structured as a strategic investment by the United States, executed under the coordination of the Investment Accelerator established by Executive Order 14255, deploying federal capital alongside private commercial sponsorship to establish a new American industrial sector in AI-augmented private-use Advanced Air Mobility. The investment thesis is that public capital co-invested with private commercial validation, deployed through a competitive racing program that generates operational evidence supporting establishment of a new FAA aircraft and operator certification category, produces a certified industrial baseline (airframe, AI co-pilot, FPLG powertrain) on a timeline and at a cost that no other mechanism — purely private development, conventional government grant, or unilateral federal procurement — can match. The investment's return to the United States is both financial (federal equity position in X1 Racing) and strategic (the certified industrial baseline, the new aircraft category, the dual-use defense capability, the energy sovereignty implications of FPLG commercialization, the capability transfer into the American automotive industrial base, and the long-arc policy framework that the program positions American industry to advance).

A. Program Architecture: Three Integrated Tracks

Project MAXIMUM BOOST is a multi-track competition architecture with an integrated proving-ground function:

Track 1: X1Racing Game (Digital Qualification Ladder and Live-Race Control Interface). A high-fidelity simulation platform open to the public. The X1Racing Game is not a separate product from the live racing series; it is the same control interface. A player competing in the sim ladder operates a gaming interface that is functionally identical to the ground-station consoles from which live race aircraft are remotely piloted. Top finishers from the sim ladder qualify for real-world racing events not by switching interfaces, but by the program routing their inputs from the simulated airframe in the game to a live unmanned airframe on the closed course. The interface continuity is deliberate: it collapses the distinction between esports and aviation into a single progression, and it collapses the distinction between training data and operational command into a single stream.

This architecture produces three assets simultaneously. First, a training dataset for the on-vehicle AI drawn from millions of human decision-cycles in adversarial, multi-vehicle air traffic — a dataset orders of magnitude larger than any existing flight-instruction corpus, and continuously refreshed as new players enter the ladder. Second, a qualification funnel that permits the program to demonstrate empirically whether piloting skill correlates more strongly with gaming-interface performance than with flight hours logged in conventional training — a hypothesis that, if validated, provides operational evidence for the new category's operator certification framework. Third, a reservoir of trained remote pilots available to the live series without the decade-scale pipeline conventional aviation requires to produce an operator.

Track 2: Unmanned Closed-Course Competition with Designated Danger Zones. Purpose-built racing eVTOLs compete, fully unmanned, on a closed, electronically-bounded course. No human is ever on board a racing airframe. The racing vehicles are, however, human-capable by design: each is a side-by-side two-seat airframe — the same platform that will carry a licensed driver and passenger in civil service — built to the structural and safety envelope of a crewed aircraft and operated without occupants for the duration of racing competition. This distinction matters for certification: the airworthiness data generated on the race course applies to the integrated airframe under the new category because the airframe is the same.

Instead of human occupants, each aircraft is remotely piloted from a ground station by a human operator drawn from the X1Racing Game ladder described in Track 1, using the same gaming interface that the operator used to qualify. Command inputs pass over low-latency radio to the airframe, where they are received by the on-vehicle AI system that X1Racing calls the "AI boost." The AI boost sits between the remote pilot's raw input and the airframe's control surfaces and propulsors, performing low-level stabilization, envelope protection, terrain awareness, and traffic avoidance. The remote pilot commands intent — turn, climb, dive, overtake, hold — and the AI boost executes those intents within the certified limits of the airframe. This is the operating architecture of the civil AI co-pilot specified in Section V. The race vehicle and the civil vehicle run the same AI; the racing season is what trains and validates it.

The architectural innovation is the Danger Zone. Each race course is segmented into standard AI-authority zones, in which the on-vehicle AI boost retains full envelope protection and collision-avoidance authority and smooths the remote pilot's inputs into safe airframe response, and designated Danger Zones, in which the AI boost authority is deliberately dialed down on a published and telemetrically-logged schedule. In a Danger Zone, the AI's role is reduced to allow controlled collisions, and the airframe is permitted to enter proximity conditions that trigger contact, exceed transient envelope limits the civil AI co-pilot would refuse, and experience — by design — loss-of-control events, terrain encounters, and mid-air collisions. The remote pilot retains full command throughout; what changes between zones is the strength of the AI's assistance.

These are the spectator moments that fund the series. They are also the single richest source of failure-mode data available to civil aviation, because every crash is captured with both the full remote-pilot input trace and the full reduced-boost AI decision trace in perfect synchronization. Failure data is the asset civil type-certification campaigns are structurally unable to produce. Certification programs sample the envelope; they do not cross it, because crossing it kills pilots. A civil rotorcraft program over a five-year type-design certification produces on the order of 10^0 to 10^1 non-fatal in-flight anomaly events with full telemetry capture. A single Project MAXIMUM BOOST season, operated aggressively into Danger Zones, produces on the order of 10^2 to 10^3 complete failure-mode captures per season — each with full sensor state, AI decision trace, and post-event forensic recovery of the airframe. This is a factor-of-hundred compression of the failure-mode corpus that regulators would otherwise accumulate only through decades of operational service fatalities.

The program is structured to operate through direct engineering involvement with American automotive original equipment manufacturers. This structure is a deliberate capability transfer mechanism. OEM engineering involvement means the manufacturer's engineers work directly alongside the racing team's engineers on airframe development, AI co-pilot integration, FPLG powertrain development, and operational systems throughout Phase 1. This continuous engineering co-development transfers aviation capability into the OEM's existing engineering organization on a timeline measured in months and years rather than the decade-plus that conventional aviation capability building requires. The participating OEMs collectively bring the manufacturing scale, supply chain depth, dealer infrastructure, and consumer-product engineering culture that personal AAM deployment at scale requires. The federal strategic investment, by structuring the program around direct OEM engineering involvement with teams, ensures that aviation capability transfers into the American automotive industrial base as a structural consequence of program execution.

Track 3: The X-1 Cup. The X-1 Cup is the culminating championship event of each season. The name references the Bell X-1, the first aircraft to exceed the speed of sound in level flight on 14 October 1947, and the civil archetype of purpose-built experimental aviation advancing the boundary of what the airspace system is understood to permit. The X-1 Cup title is awarded to the aircraft-plus-AI pairing that completes the championship course — including its Danger Zones — with the best combined performance and telemetry-integrity score. The X-1 Cup serves both as a spectator event and as a public-facing airworthiness milestone: the airframe-and-AI pairing that wins has by definition demonstrated survivable operation in the most stressful civil-relevant envelope that has been constructed to date. The inaugural X-1 Cup is staged in Year 2, establishing the championship as an annual public-facing airworthiness milestone from the program's second year.

B. The Two-Phase Structure

Project MAXIMUM BOOST is structured in two phases divided by the type certification of the integrated package (airframe, AI co-pilot, FPLG powertrain) under the new FAA aircraft and operator certification category for AI-augmented private-use AAM.

Phase 1 (Pre-Certification). The program's organizing target for Phase 1 completion is January 20, 2029 — type certification of the integrated package by that date, with Phase 2 commercialization commencing on certification. Phase 1 is characterized by full operational and IP sharing. All program-generated intellectual property, operational data, engineering work, test results, and design refinements flow to a shared platform accessible to all participating teams, the federal government, qualified suppliers and contractors, and the FAA as part of the rulemaking evidence base. This sharing regime is the structural mechanism that compresses the certification timeline: instead of seventeen separate team development programs each generating bounded proprietary datasets, the program operates as a unified consortium development effort whose combined evidence base supports the new category's establishment as a single integrated rulemaking action.

Phase 1 racing operations occur under existing FAA authorities: Special Airworthiness Certificates issued for experimental and racing operations under 14 CFR Part 21; Certificates of Waiver or Authorization for race events with defined operational parameters; special flight permits for development and demonstration flight; and event-specific authorizations coordinated with FAA Air Traffic Organization for airspace integration. These are existing FAA mechanisms with established processes; the Investment Accelerator's coordination function supports their issuance on the program's compressed timeline. The X-1 Cup in Year 2 operates under this regulatory accommodation. Demonstration races, development races, and the full Phase 1 racing season operate under the same framework.

If the program's certification trigger is not achieved by January 20, 2029, the Phase 1 sharing regime continues until certification arrives. Phase 2 commencement is structurally tied to the certification milestone, not to a calendar date, ensuring that no team or party privatizes pre-certification IP until the public-good deliverable (the certified baseline) that the shared regime was meant to produce actually exists.

Phase 2 (Post-Certification). Phase 2 begins on type certification of the integrated package. Teams privatize their pre-certification IP and commercialize on it. Operational data continues to be shared among the competing teams as a closed competitive-safety regime — every team benefits from every other team's operational learning, but the data does not flow to outside parties beyond the consortium. Government access to operational data continues permanently for ongoing certification oversight and for the regulatory evolution of the new category's operator certification framework over time. Other American companies build commercial applications on the certified baseline through the public domain that type certification provides — the certified airframe design and FPLG powertrain reference specifications enable downstream commercialization for civilian freight, defense, stationary grid generation, and broader civilian AAM applications, with X1 Racing operating the championship and the technology baseline available to qualified American licensees and developers through the certification record.

The X1 Racing championship operates as a permanent entertainment property in Phase 2, generating media rights revenue, sponsorship, gate, hospitality, and merchandise revenue independently of federal capital. Federal investment deployment sunsets on its own structural timeline as the matching mechanism completes against verified sponsorship over the Phase 2 tail; the federal equity position in X1 Racing continues as the federal taxpayer's ongoing participation in the program's commercial success.

C. Capital Structure

The federal strategic investment in Project MAXIMUM BOOST totals $11.0 billion across two tranches, with up to $8.8 billion in private commercial sponsorship co-invested for a total potential program scale of $19.8 billion.

The $2.2 Billion Initial Tranche. Deployed at investment closing. Funds the immediate Phase 1 work: standing up the X-1 Cup series, building racing infrastructure, fielding the unmanned airframes, launching the X1Racing Game, beginning the airframe/AI co-pilot/FPLG powertrain development pipeline, pass-through funding to teams for early R&D against show-up-and-start milestones, technical infrastructure for FAA-witnessed operations, ground stations and remote-pilot interfaces, and the audit and verification infrastructure required to support the matched investment tranche. This is the federal investment's at-risk capital. It deploys on investment closing without conditionality on subsequent sponsorship.

The $8.8 Billion Matched Investment Tranche. Available for deployment from investment closing on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis against arms-length commercial sponsorship verified by a designated Big 4 audit firm at fair market value. The matching mechanism is structured to permit day-one matching deployment: any commercial sponsorship arriving with teams or the series at investment closing is matched immediately, ensuring the program operates at the scale required to hit its target timeline from initiation rather than ramping up over months or years. Continuing matching deploys against continuing verified sponsorship over the Phase 1 window and into the Phase 2 tail until the matching pool is exhausted or the program's structural matching window closes. Federal exposure is capped at the $2.2 billion initial tranche in the floor case where sponsorship fails to validate the program; full deployment of the matched tranche occurs only against full deployment of private sponsorship.

Private Commercial Sponsorship (Up to $8.8 Billion). Raised by teams and by the series from OEM partners, broadcasters, title sponsors, technology partners, and the broader entertainment economy. The 17 inaugural teams are the structural mechanism for sponsorship recruitment, drawing on existing sponsor relationships and commercial sales channels. Series-level sponsorship (title rights, broadcast rights, technology partnerships) is recruited by the series as a complement to team-level sponsorship. Both team-level and series-level sponsorship qualifies for federal matching under the same Big 4 verification standard.

Total Program Scale. $2.2B federal initial + $8.8B federal matched + $8.8B private = $19.8B potential total program impact in the full-deployment case. $2.2B federal + minimal private = floor case program in the failure scenario. The matching mechanism ensures that federal capital scales with market validation: no federal dollar beyond the initial tranche deploys without an equivalent private dollar validating the program's commercial viability.

D. Federal Equity Structure

The United States acquires, in consideration of the $11.0 billion strategic investment, a federal equity position in X1 Racing structured in parallel to the CHIPS Act Intel deployment (9.9% common equity for $8.9 billion) with structural improvements that strengthen taxpayer protection and program discipline. The federal equity terms are designed to give the United States meaningful upside participation in the program's commercial success while providing downside protection that the CHIPS framework lacked.

Federal Common Equity Position: 10% of X1 Racing, Non-Voting. The United States holds 10% common equity in X1 Racing on a non-voting basis. The non-voting structure preserves operational control with the program's operators and management while giving the federal taxpayer pro-rata participation in distributions, exit proceeds, and other common equity rights.

The 10% position is closely modeled on the CHIPS Intel structure (9.9%) and represents the federal taxpayer's strategic-investment participation in the entertainment property that the racing program creates.

Senior-Preferred Conversion Mechanism. In the event that Project MAXIMUM BOOST fails to achieve a defined Year 3 demonstrator-flight milestone — meaning the program has not produced a credibly airworthy demonstrator aircraft capable of public flight by the end of Year 3 — the federal equity position converts from non-voting common to senior-preferred equity with first-claim status on remaining program assets and proceeds in any dissolution, wind-down, or liquidation event. The conversion is automatic upon milestone failure and is structured to ensure that taxpayer capital, in the program's downside scenario, has first priority on whatever value the program has produced when assets are distributed. The senior-preferred conversion grants the federal position liquidation preference only; it does not grant voting rights or operational governance authority over the going concern. Leadership retains operational control through any post-milestone-failure scenario, including the authority to continue operations, restructure the program, pursue alternative resolution paths, or wind down the company on terms consistent with maximizing total value to all stakeholders. This separation between economic priority (federal position) and operational control (leadership) reflects standard private-equity conventions for senior-preferred equity and ensures that taxpayer protection does not come at the cost of operational continuity in scenarios where the company can recover or restructure. This mechanism is a structural improvement over the CHIPS framework: under CHIPS, federal capital at Intel was common equity with no preferred conversion in failure scenarios, meaning federal taxpayers had no priority claim on Intel's assets if the company failed to meet its milestones. Under Project MAXIMUM BOOST, federal capital becomes senior-preferred with liquidation priority in the program's defined downside, providing the taxpayer downside protection that CHIPS lacked while preserving the operational continuity that responsible program execution requires.

Three-Year Reinvestment Covenant. For the first three years following investment closing, X1 Racing is contractually bound to reinvest all net profits into program R&D, certification, and operational development before distributing dividends to common equity holders (including the federal position). This ensures that all early-stage commercial success flows back into the program's certification and development objectives rather than into distributions to shareholders, including X1 Racing's private equity holders. The covenant strengthens program discipline and aligns all equity holders with the program's certification deliverables during the critical pre-certification window.

Reverse-Vesting Clawback to Treasury. Team equity, leadership equity, and other private equity positions in X1 Racing are subject to reverse-vesting provisions that return non-participating equity to the treasury reserve. A team that ceases racing operations, a leadership member who departs without cause, or any other holder who fails to meet ongoing participation requirements forfeits unvested equity back to the treasury. This mechanism ensures that equity positions remain tied to ongoing program contribution rather than becoming inert holdings.

E. Team Equity Structure

Inaugural team partners receive equity in X1 Racing on a per-car basis with an aggregate cap and milestone-based vesting:

0.5% Per Car, Up To 4 Cars Per Team Entity. Each car number that a team entity fields qualifies for 0.5% of X1 Racing non-voting common equity, with a cap of four cars per team entity for a maximum 2% per team entity. The per-car structure aligns equity allocation with team investment in the program: a four-car team entity is contributing four times the certification-relevant flight hours, four times the development pressure, four times the risk capital, and proportionally more operational sophistication than a single-car team, and the equity structure reflects that contribution scaling.

25% Aggregate Cap at 50 Cars. The total team equity allocation is capped at 25% of X1 Racing across all teams in aggregate, corresponding to 50 cars at 0.5% per car. The first 50 cars to commit to the program through the inaugural team recruitment process earn the 0.5% per car equity; the 50-car cap is hard and not subject to pro-rata dilution. The inaugural team field targets 17 team entities; with the 4-car cap per entity, the 50-car aggregate cap is reached through a distribution across the inaugural field that X1 Racing manages through inaugural team selection. The first-come-first-served structure creates real urgency for inaugural team commitment and rewards teams that move decisively to commit at the program's launch.

Anti-Affiliation Provisions. "Team entity" is defined for equity purposes to look through common ownership and beneficial control. Affiliated entities under common ownership, parent-subsidiary structures, joint ventures, or other common-control arrangements count as a single team entity for the four-car cap. This prevents the per-car structure from being gamed through affiliated team formations and ensures the four-car cap operates as intended.

Show-Up-And-Start Milestone Vesting. Team equity vests on a per-car basis through participation in sanctioned race events. Each car number's equity vests in tranches against the car's appearances at scheduled race events: a car that passes technical inspection and takes the green flag at a sanctioned race event earns the next tranche of its equity vesting. Cars that miss races miss vesting tranches. Teams that habitually fail to start lose unvested equity to the treasury reserve under the reverse-vesting clawback. The vesting structure ensures that team equity is earned through sustained operational participation in the program rather than through nominal team formation.

Phase 1 and Phase 2 Vesting Distribution. Vesting is structured as a hybrid: a Phase 1 portion that vests on milestone-based participation through the certification trigger, and a Phase 2 portion that vests on continued participation through a defined post-certification tail. This bridges both alignment goals — getting teams to the certification finish line during Phase 1, and keeping teams invested in the long-term entertainment property's success during Phase 2.

F. Treasury Reserve and Leadership Equity

14% Treasury Reserve. A 14% equity position is held in treasury reserve for strategic partnerships, employee equity pool, and clawback recoveries. The treasury reserve provides flexibility for the program to deploy equity to strategic partners (technology partners, key suppliers, additional sponsor-aligned positions) over the program window, to fund an employee equity pool for X1 Racing's staff and key contributors, and to absorb equity recovered through reverse-vesting clawbacks from teams and individuals who exit before fully vesting.

51% Leadership Super-Voting. Leadership holds 51% of X1 Racing on a super-voting basis. This majority position preserves operational control with the program's founding leadership, while the federal position (non-voting), team positions, and treasury reserve provide the participation rights without compromising the operational governance the program requires for execution at scale. The super-voting structure includes single-trigger change-of-control acceleration for the leadership position, ensuring that operational control cannot be removed from the founding team through hostile acquisition or capital-structure manipulation during the critical pre-certification window.

Private Capital and the Universal Non-Voting Rule. Private capital enters the program through two channels, both of which are non-voting. The first channel is commercial sponsorship, which funds the matching mechanism described in Section IV.C and does not take an equity position in X1 Racing. The second channel is direct private capital investment, which takes non-voting equity positions within the cap table allocations described above (within the team allocation where the investor is participating as a team principal, within the treasury reserve where treasury deploys equity to strategic partners, or otherwise as the structure provides). No private capital channel takes voting equity. Voting control remains exclusively with the leadership super-voting position throughout the program's life, including through any downside scenario or program resolution. This structure ensures that operational governance is not exposed to dilution or contention from private capital partners, while preserving X1 Racing's ability to attract private capital at scale through the participation and economic rights the non-voting positions provide. The senior-preferred conversion mechanism described in Section IV.D — which grants the federal position liquidation priority on Year 3 milestone failure — does not create an exception to this rule, because the conversion grants economic priority only and does not transfer voting rights. The universal non-voting rule for non-leadership positions is operative through normal execution and through any downside scenario, ensuring that operational continuity is preserved regardless of program outcome.

Cap Table Summary: Federal 10% (non-voting common, converts to senior-preferred with liquidation priority on Year 3 demonstrator-flight milestone failure; conversion grants economic priority only, no voting rights). Teams 25% aggregate (non-voting, per-car with cap, vesting via show-up-and-start). Treasury 14% (non-voting reserve for strategic partnerships, employee pool, clawback recoveries). Leadership 51% (super-voting through all scenarios). Total: 100%. All non-leadership positions are non-voting through the program's life.

G. The Investment Thesis

The federal taxpayer's investment in Project MAXIMUM BOOST produces returns across six dimensions:

Financial Return: 10% Equity in X1 Racing. X1 Racing emerges from the program as the founding institutional operator of a new American industrial sector. The entertainment property — racing championship, media rights, sponsorship pipeline, brand value — has independent commercial value that the 10% federal position participates in. Comparable entertainment-sports property valuations (Formula 1 at $20+ billion enterprise value, F1 Group's growth trajectory under Liberty Media, NASCAR's commercial structure) suggest a multi-billion-dollar federal equity position at maturity even before accounting for the broader industrial sector X1 Racing catalyzes.

Strategic Return: The New American Industrial Sector. The certified baseline (airframe, AI co-pilot, FPLG powertrain) under the new FAA category becomes the foundation on which American industry builds commercial AAM, freight transport, defense aviation, stationary grid generation, and the broader personal aviation sector. The United States acquires industrial baseline ownership of a new aviation category and the regulatory framework that governs it. This is the same kind of strategic return that the CHIPS Act sought to produce in semiconductor manufacturing — domestic industrial baseline in a critical sector that the country cannot afford to depend on foreign supply for.

Capability Transfer to the American Automotive Industrial Base. The program's direct engineering involvement with American automotive OEMs transfers aviation engineering capability — airframe design, AI co-pilot integration, FPLG powertrain development, certified manufacturing processes — into the engineering organizations of the participating automotive OEMs during Phase 1. By Phase 2 commencement, the OEMs are positioned to bring personal AAM to consumer production at OEM manufacturing scale, through OEM distribution networks, with established brand recognition, at consumer price points. This is the structural mechanism that distinguishes Project MAXIMUM BOOST from any other AAM development pathway: certified eVTOL programs, even when successful, manufacture at specialty-aerospace production scale, while OEM-integrated personal AAM emerges from Phase 2 at consumer-product scale. The federal investment thus produces, beyond the new aviation category and the certified baseline, the industrial integration that makes consumer-scale personal AAM commercially deployable through the existing American manufacturing base.

Dual-Use Defense Capability. The racing-derived airframe and FPLG powertrain enter Department of War procurement under the Acquisition Transformation Strategy's commercial-preference cascade (Section VIII), with the program's commercial development reducing the cost and timeline of fielding small-unit aerial resupply, contested-edge ISR, electronic warfare, and other mission classes that the Department has prioritized. The dual-use pathway is funded as part of the strategic investment but produces defense capability at a fraction of the conventional defense-acquisition cost basis.

Energy Sovereignty. The FPLG architecture, certified for aviation and separately certified for stationary applications in Phase 2, displaces foreign-supplied battery cells in the AAM application and displaces lower-efficiency gas turbine peakers in the stationary application (Section VII and Exhibit B). The strategic return on the energy-sovereignty dimension is independent of the AAM commercial success and is significant in its own right.

Trillion-Dollar Market Capture and Trickle-Down Economic Returns. The new American industrial sector addresses the personal AAM segment of the global Advanced Air Mobility market, projected by Morgan Stanley research at $1 trillion total addressable market by 2040 and $9 trillion by 2050 [35]. Because the program establishes both the American certified industrial baseline and the American regulatory framework governing the category, the United States is positioned to capture the dominant share of the personal AAM segment globally. The trillion-dollar end-market demand pulls production through the American automotive OEM industrial base whose aviation capability the program has transferred, generating direct manufacturing employment at OEM scale, indirect employment through supplier ecosystem development, and induced economic activity through standard industrial multiplier dynamics. The federal capital catalyzes the certification and regulatory infrastructure; the infrastructure unlocks market demand; market demand pulls OEM production at consumer-product scale; OEM production drives the manufacturing employment, supplier ecosystem, and broader regional economic development that constitute the trickle-down returns of the strategic investment.

The combined return profile justifies the investment scale. The United States deploys $11 billion of federal capital (with $2.2 billion at structural risk and $8.8 billion contingent on market validation) and acquires: 10% equity in the founding entertainment property, the certified baseline for a new aviation category, the regulatory framework establishing the category, capability transfer into the American automotive industrial base, dual-use defense capability, energy-sovereignty implications through FPLG commercialization, and the institutional sector advocate (X1 Racing) that will continue advancing the policy framework long after the program window closes. Against the Morgan Stanley-projected $1 trillion AAM total addressable market by 2040 and $9 trillion by 2050, the $11 billion federal capital deployment represents approximately a 1:100 ratio of federal investment to addressable market size at the 2040 reference point — a leverage ratio that reflects the program's function as the certification, regulatory, and capability-transfer infrastructure that unlocks the trillion-dollar end market for American industry. This is the most capital-efficient strategic investment in American transportation and aviation industrial capability the United States has executed since the Interstate Highway System catalyzed continental-scale automotive industrial capability and the

Apollo program accelerated American aerospace and electronics capability. The Interstate System, authorized in 1956 with federal capital matched against state contributions, deployed approximately $114 billion in nominal dollars over 35 years and unlocked multi-trillion-dollar economic returns through the automotive industrial sector, freight logistics, suburbanization, tourism, and continental commercial integration that the highway infrastructure enabled — a precedent of federal infrastructure investment catalyzing private industrial capability at orders-of-magnitude leverage. Project MAXIMUM BOOST replicates this structural pattern for personal AAM: federal capital deployed against the certification and regulatory infrastructure that the new aviation sector requires, unlocking the trillion-dollar end market through American industrial capability that scales against the federal commitment.

V. AI Co-Pilot Architecture: From Racing Telemetry to Civil Certification

The AI co-pilot must satisfy three properties to be acceptable as a condition of civil certification under the new FAA category for AI-augmented private-use AAM:

Envelope Completeness. The co-pilot must have observed, during training, every state the civilian pilot might encounter in ordinary operation plus every adversarial extreme of the certified envelope.

Crew Authority. The co-pilot must be certified as the second member of the operating crew under an extension of existing FAA two-crew certification frameworks, with defined envelope protection, intervention authority, and the formally-defined crew functions of system monitoring, cross-checking pilot inputs, and handling certified emergency procedures.

Demonstrability. The co-pilot's decision logic must be inspectable, auditable, and certifiable under emerging FAA frameworks for machine-learning system airworthiness, extending the existing DO-178C, DO-254, ARP4754A, and related standards to AI/ML components in defined crew roles.

A. The Two-Crew Certification Framework

The AI co-pilot is certified as the second member of the operating crew under an extension of the FAA's existing two-crew certification framework. This framing is structurally important and reflects deliberate program design: the AI co-pilot does not replace human judgment, and the program does not propose autonomous AI flight. The AI co-pilot occupies the formally-defined second-crew role that two-pilot aircraft have been certified around for decades, with the AI performing the cross-monitoring, envelope protection, system monitoring, and emergency procedure functions that the second human pilot performs in conventional two-pilot certification. The human operator — remote-piloted during racing operations, eventually onboard in the civilian variant — provides command intent and high-level decision-making; the AI co-pilot provides the safety-critical control loop the second crew member performs.

This is the same architectural framing under which EASA has been developing its AI roadmap and concept paper on machine learning certification, and under which the FAA has been engaging with industry on AI/ML certification frameworks. The program's contribution is the operational evidence base supporting the FAA's finalization of an extension to existing two-crew certification frameworks for AI co-pilots in light civilian aviation. The certification basis is not invented by the program; it is the standard two-crew certification basis extended to admit AI as the second crew member, with the specific extension developed through FAA rulemaking informed by the program's evidence base.

A.1. Leveraging Existing American AI/Autonomy Capability

The program does not develop AI co-pilot capability from first principles. The United States has accumulated, over the past fifteen years across automotive autonomy, defense autonomy, and civilian AAM development, a substantial AI/autonomy capability base for safety-critical real-time control in complex operating environments. This capability base — encompassing perception, planning, control, sensor fusion, fault detection, and human-machine teaming — represents the foundation on which the AI co-pilot for the new aviation category can be built without starting from scratch. Project MAXIMUM BOOST leverages this existing capability base by partnering with established American AI/autonomy developers, adapting demonstrated capability into the aviation safety-critical domain under the two-crew certification framework extension described in Section V.A.

Potential capability-leverage partners include established automotive autonomy developers that have publicly indicated openness to third-party licensing of their autonomy technology. Tesla, in particular, has publicly stated this openness: Tesla's CEO Elon Musk posted on X on 28 September 2024 that "If I were another car company, I would license FSD" [34]. The program intends to explore licensing arrangements with Tesla and similar capability providers as part of the AI co-pilot development pathway, adapting mature automotive autonomy technology — refined through operation at scale in the surface-mobility context — into the aviation safety-critical domain under the program's two-crew certification framework.

Capability adapted from mature automotive autonomy systems, integrated under the aviation-specific certification framework the program develops, accelerates the AI co-pilot timeline materially relative to first-principles development. The program's structural contribution to AI co-pilot certification is the operational evidence base, the certification framework development through FAA engagement, and the integration of adapted capability into the certified airframe — not first-principles AI development. The capability-leverage strategy is part of why the program's compressed timeline is achievable: the AI components are adapted from mature systems with operational track records, not invented during the program window.

B. Racing Telemetry as Certification Evidence Base

Racing telemetry uniquely satisfies Envelope Completeness, and unmanned racing with designated Danger Zones satisfies it in a way no manned program could. A co-pilot trained on prop-to-prop unmanned flight at racing speed in a gust-loaded, multi-aircraft environment has by construction covered the ordinary cruise envelope. A co-pilot additionally trained on hundreds of Danger Zone failure-mode captures per season — loss-of-control events, terrain encounters, mid-air collisions, power-loss and thermal-runaway events, each with complete sensor-state and decision-trace logging — has covered the failure envelope that civil certification campaigns structurally cannot sample. This is a data regime the FAA has never previously been offered. Its availability materially changes what a regulator can reasonably accept as the evidentiary basis for the new category's AI co-pilot certification.

The program's racing operations generate the operational evidence base under FAA-witnessed conditions. Technical inspection at race events operates against a certification-aligned standard developed in coordination with the FAA, tightening over the program window toward the standard the eventual type certification will require. Race events serve as flight test events under a regime where the FAA's regulatory function and the program's commercial function are co-aligned: the program needs the FAA's certification, the FAA needs the operational evidence the racing produces, and the technical inspection regime is the operational integration of those two needs. By the closing races of Phase 1, technical inspection is effectively a conformity inspection against the certification basis, and the cars that pass technical inspection are functionally conforming to the type design that the certification will issue.

C. Crew Authority Implementation: The Dual-Rail Control Architecture

Crew Authority is implemented through a dual-rail control architecture: the human pilot commands a high-level intent (turn, climb, descend, approach, go-to, land), and the AI executes low-level stabilization, envelope protection, and terrain and traffic avoidance. This mirrors the proven architecture of modern helicopter fly-by-wire systems and is entirely consistent with the FAA's expressed MOSAIC vision of expanded sport-pilot capabilities enabled by modern avionics.

Crucially, it is the same architecture that runs on the race vehicles. The on-vehicle AI boost that sits between a remote pilot's gaming-interface inputs and the racing airframe's control surfaces is not a conceptual analogue of the civil AI co-pilot; it is the civil AI co-pilot, calibrated for racing operation. The difference between the race-configured and civil-configured system is a set of operator-side parameters — which envelope limits are hard, how aggressively the AI smooths transient inputs, when the authority reduces in a Danger Zone — not a different underlying control stack. This is why racing validates civil certification: the artifact under test is the same side-by-side two-seat, human-capable airframe with the same AI co-pilot that will carry a licensed driver and a passenger to work.

D. Demonstrability and Auditability

Demonstrability is the hardest engineering problem and is addressed by the AI-Augmented Remote Flight Testing methodology developed for hybrid-electric eVTOL platforms and described in McAlpine (2025) [1]. Under that methodology, flight articles are operated remotely with full state telemetry streamed in real time under AI supervision, and each co-pilot decision is logged with an explanation trace. The result is an auditability property strictly stronger than that of human-only flight testing: every AI action is captured and explained; not every human action is. Agency certification engineers can replay any decision moment against the full sensor state that produced it.

Standards body work supporting the AI co-pilot certification extension occurs through industry channels — RTCA Special Committees on AI/ML certification, ASTM F38 on aircraft and unmanned systems, SAE aerospace committees — with the program's operational evidence contributing to the standards development that the FAA will reference in the certification basis. The Investment Accelerator's coordination function under EO 14255 supports alignment between the program's evidence generation and the FAA's standards-referencing rulemaking, ensuring that operational evidence reaches the agency in a form and at a pace that supports timely certification.

VI. Safety Analysis: Why AI-Augmented Personal Aviation Can Be Safer Than Walking

The claim that AI-augmented personal aviation can be made safer than walking is a statistical one and must be treated as such. The claim is foundational to the Maximum Freedom destination — broadly accessible operator certification under the new FAA category, evolved over decades toward driver's-license-equivalent accessibility, requires the demonstrated safety record that justifies progressively simpler operator certification frameworks. The program's racing operations during Phase 1 produce the operational evidence supporting the safety claim; Phase 2 fleet operations on the certified baseline produce the long-arc operational record that supports the regulatory framework's evolution.

A. Benchmark Rates

United States pedestrian fatalities in 2023 totaled approximately 7,522 against an estimated 41 billion annual walking-miles, for a pedestrian fatality rate on the order of 180 fatalities per billion pedestrian-miles. General aviation in the same period produced roughly 340 fatalities against approximately 22 million flight hours; converted at a representative cruise speed of 150 knots (≈173 mph) to a per-mile basis, this yields approximately 90 fatalities per billion flight-miles. U.S. road traffic produced approximately 150 fatalities per billion vehicle-miles across all conditions.

A naïve reading of these figures suggests existing GA flight is already safer per mile than walking. The catch is that GA pilots are a highly self-selected population: current and recently-medically-cleared, extensively trained, and disproportionately experienced. The relevant question for Maximum Freedom is whether, after expanding the personal-flight population by approximately two orders of magnitude to include any holder of a future broadly-accessible operator certification under the new category, the fatality rate can be held at or below the pedestrian rate.

A third point of comparison sits internal to the motorsport community itself. Over the past half-century, a cumulative count on the order of thirty motor-racing personnel — active drivers, retired champions, team owners, senior engineering staff, family members traveling with them, and team pilots — have been lost in private general-aviation accidents while traveling to or from races. Out of respect for families and teams this paper names no one individually, but the NTSB dockets on those incidents collectively show that the dominant failure categories are the same three that account for roughly three-quarters of all U.S. general-aviation fatalities overall — loss of control in-flight during approach or landing, controlled flight into terrain under degraded weather, and VFR-into-IMC weather encounters. An AI co-pilot of the class developed and validated through Project MAXIMUM BOOST is precisely the technology that would have prevented the majority of these losses. The motorsport community's cumulative aviation fatality record is therefore both a reason the program is emotionally resonant within motorsport and a direct quantitative motivation for the AI co-pilot: the technology that the unmanned racing series is forged to prove is the technology that would have saved the community's own.

The claim the paper makes is, accordingly, stronger than "safer than walking." AI-augmented personal aviation, operated under the new category's certification framework as it evolves toward Maximum Freedom, will be simultaneously safer than walking, safer than ground-vehicle driving, and safer than unaided general-aviation flight — and the substitution of AI-augmented personal aviation for any of the three will save lives on a population-weighted basis. The Project MAXIMUM BOOST projected rate of 30–70 fatalities per billion vehicle-miles, developed and defended below, sits below all three benchmarks.

B. Cause Decomposition

NTSB data identify three dominant causes of GA fatal accidents:

Loss of control in-flight (LOC-I). Approximately 40% of fatal accidents. Principal driver: pilot inputs outside the airframe envelope, most often during takeoff, landing, or maneuvering flight.

Controlled flight into terrain (CFIT). Approximately 20% of fatal accidents. Principal driver: spatial disorientation, instrument-meteorological-conditions encounter by a visual-flight-rules pilot, or night-operations terrain misjudgment.

Weather-related encounters. Approximately 15% of fatal accidents. Principal driver: inadequate preflight weather assessment, in-flight decision failures, or aircraft not capable of the conditions encountered.

The residual 25% of fatal accidents is distributed across fuel mismanagement, mechanical failure, mid-air collision, and a long tail of low-frequency causes.

C. Projected Rate Under the AI Co-Pilot Regime

Each dominant cause is directly addressed by the AI co-pilot architecture specified in Section V:

LOC-I is structurally eliminated by envelope-protection authority: the co-pilot, as the certified second crew member, does not permit control inputs that would exceed certified airframe limits. This is identical in principle to the Airbus flight-control-law philosophy that has operated in commercial service since 1988 with excellent safety results.

CFIT is eliminated by continuous integration of geospatial data, terrain databases, LIDAR, and standard transponder-based traffic awareness. A co-pilot with these inputs and the certified intervention authority does not fly into terrain.

Weather-encounter fatalities are materially mitigated by real-time weather integration and a go/no-go advisory function with configurable authority to refuse departures into forecast conditions beyond the airframe's certification.

The residual cause classes — fuel management, mechanical failure, mid-air collision — are respectively addressed by hybrid-electric powertrain architecture with automated range-to-alternate monitoring (Section VII), by the redundant-multi-propulsor topology characteristic of eVTOL vehicles, and by electronically-bounded corridor routing enforced at the airspace-management layer.

A conservative composite projection yields a steady-state personal-aviation fatality rate of 30–70 per billion vehicle-miles under the new category framework as it matures toward Maximum Freedom-accessible operator certification. This is approximately three to six times safer per mile than walking (180 per billion pedestrian-miles), approximately twice to five times safer per mile than driving (roughly 150 per billion vehicle-miles), and materially safer than today's GA baseline despite operating with a vastly expanded operator population. These projections are subject to empirical validation; validating them against operational data is precisely the function of the Project MAXIMUM BOOST telemetry pipeline through Phase 1 racing operations and the Phase 2 fleet operations on the certified baseline.

Cause Class	GA Share	AI Co-Pilot Mitigation Mechanism	Residual Risk
Loss of control in-flight (LOC-I)	~40%	Envelope-protection authority; AI as certified second crew does not permit inputs outside certified airframe limits	Rare (requires simultaneous structural anomaly and envelope breach)
Controlled flight into terrain (CFIT)	~20%	Continuous terrain-database, LIDAR, and radar-altimeter integration; geofenced corridors	Near-zero under nominal sensor state
Weather encounter	~15%	Real-time weather integration; AI-gated go/no-go with forecast authority	Forecast-accuracy-limited; unexpected microbursts
Fuel / energy mismanagement	~8%	Hybrid-electric range-to-alternate monitoring; automated divert	Equipment-failure-limited
Mechanical failure	~7%	Redundant multi-propulsor eVTOL topology; fault-isolation autoreconfiguration	>95% mission-retained after single-propulsor fail
Mid-air collision	~3%	Corridor routing, mandatory transponder, AI see-and-avoid with priority logic	Near-zero within managed corridor
Other (incl. pilot health/incapacitation)	~7%	AI takeover on operator incapacitation;	Materially reduced vs. current GA

Cause Class	GA Share	AI Co-Pilot Mitigation Mechanism	Residual Risk
		auto-land to nearest vetted vertiport	

Table 3. U.S. General-Aviation Fatal-Accident Cause Decomposition and AI Co-Pilot Mitigation Mapping. Each dominant cause class has a direct architectural response in the AI co-pilot specification of Section V, which is the basis for the sub-pedestrian-rate safety projection that supports Maximum Freedom-accessible operator certification framework evolution.

D. Safer Than Walking: The Public-Acceptance Implication

Walking is the unmarked baseline of American life. It is what citizens do without a license, without training, without medical certification, and without regulatory permission. The public-acceptance significance of showing that AI-augmented personal aviation is statistically safer than walking is that it establishes the empirical basis for the new category's operator certification framework to evolve over time toward Maximum Freedom-accessible accessibility. When operational evidence demonstrates that personal aviation under the AI co-pilot regime is materially safer than the unlicensed baseline activity of walking, the FAA's rulemaking process for progressive simplification of the operator certification framework is supported by the safety record that justifies the simplification.

This is the regulatory arc the new category will follow. Phase 1 establishes the initial operator certification framework appropriate to early-stage adoption — likely more stringent than Sport Pilot, given the operational maturity of the new aircraft class at certification. Phase 2 fleet operations on the certified baseline accumulate the operational evidence base. As that evidence base demonstrates the projected safety performance — sub-pedestrian-rate fatalities, sub-vehicle-rate fatalities, sub-GA-rate fatalities — the FAA's rulemaking for progressive simplification of the operator certification framework proceeds on standard agency processes. The Maximum Freedom destination is reached not through a single rulemaking action but through the natural evolution of the new category's framework over years and decades, supported at each step by the operational evidence the program and its successors generate.

VII. Powertrain Sovereignty: The Well-to-Wheel Case and the FPLG Commercialization Pathway

The most common objection to mass AAM deployment is energy: batteries are too heavy for credible mission range, charging infrastructure is inadequate, and the electrical grid cannot support the load. This objection applies to pure-battery eVTOL. It does not apply to the hybrid-electric architecture Project MAXIMUM BOOST is built around, and the reasons are important for both the AAM case and for the broader American industrial sector that Phase 2 commercialization of the certified FPLG powertrain enables.

A. Well-to-Wheel Efficiency

A modern grid-charged battery-electric vehicle in most U.S. states is, on a well-to-wheel basis, running on natural gas or coal combustion at a central generating station operating at 35–45% thermal efficiency, followed by transmission losses (6–8%), charging losses (10–15%), and battery round-trip losses (5–10%). The net fossil-fuel-to-wheel efficiency is typically 25–32%.

A purpose-built racing-derived combustion core operated at air-fuel ratios, combustion pressures, and mixture compositions that are unattainable in a mass-market road car because of surface-vehicle emissions regulations that do not apply to closed-course aircraft operation — and subsequently scaled into production under the relaxed noise and emissions envelope appropriate to aircraft use — achieves 60% indicated thermal efficiency as its near-term program floor and approaches 70%+ under championship-level development. Run as a series hybrid with a small buffer battery dedicated to vertical takeoff and landing and transient demand, the well-to-wheel efficiency of the AI-augmented personal aircraft substantially exceeds that of the grid-charged EV. This is the structural claim of X1Racing Exhibit A ("Well-to-Wheel Freight Efficiency Analysis") and the companion analyses.

Federal validation of the underlying FPLG architecture is already in place: in March 2026 the U.S. Department of the Air Force awarded a contract to Mainspring Energy, Inc. to deploy a 250 kW linear generator at Travis Air Force Base, California, via the Tradewinds Solutions Marketplace administered by the Air Force Office of Energy Assurance [33]. The Mainspring deployment achieves approximately 46% fuel-to-electricity efficiency on the existing commercial deployment — already superior to conventional natural-gas gensets and optimized for fuel flexibility rather than peak efficiency, establishing the architecture's commercial baseline before any racing-derived efficiency optimization has been applied.

The Mainspring deployment is the federal proof-of-concept that the FPLG architecture is real, fielded, and outperforming conventional alternatives in government service. X1 Racing has no relationship with Mainspring Energy; the Travis Air Force Base deployment is cited as independent third-party validation of the architecture class. The program's claim is that racing-derived development of FPLG architectures — under the performance-based rulebook described in Section VII.D — pushes the efficiency envelope substantially beyond the Mainspring baseline, into the 60%+ near-term program floor and the 70%+ championship-level horizon, on a timeline compressed relative to any conventional development pathway.

B. Decoupling from Grid Expansion

Exhibit B ("American Energy Sovereignty") extends this observation to stationary grid generation: the same racing-derived combustion core can serve as a 60%+ efficient on-demand grid asset, displacing peaker plants that typically run at 33–40%. The implication for AAM is decisive: a fleet built around hybrid-electric architecture can scale ahead of the grid rather than waiting on it. An AAM deployment schedule built on pure-battery architecture is hostage to the slowest transmission-expansion permitting regime in the developed world. An AAM deployment schedule built on hybrid-electric architecture fuels from the domestic liquid-fuel infrastructure that already exists.

C. Energy Sovereignty

A grid-charged pure-battery AAM fleet at national scale requires either massive new domestic battery-cell manufacturing capacity or continued structural dependence on East Asian cell supply chains, principally Chinese. A hybrid-electric AAM fleet operates on the domestic liquid-fuel infrastructure. From a strategic-materials perspective, the hybrid-electric pathway substantially reduces critical-mineral intensity (the lithium, cobalt, and nickel burden of the buffer battery is a fraction of that of a full-range traction battery). The sovereign option is hybrid-electric.

This is the energy-sovereignty dimension of the federal strategic investment's return. The certified FPLG powertrain, commercialized in Phase 2 for civilian freight, stationary grid generation, and broader civilian applications by other American companies building on the certified baseline, displaces foreign-supplied battery cells in transportation and displaces lower-efficiency gas turbine peakers in stationary power. The strategic return on the energy-sovereignty dimension is independent of the AAM commercial success and is significant in its own right.

D. Rulebook as Accelerator: FPLG and Next-Generation Combustion

The civil aircraft engine fleet is an engineering museum. The Continental O-470, Lycoming IO-540, and Rotax 912 families that power the overwhelming majority of the U.S. piston general-aviation fleet are fundamentally mid-twentieth-century designs, refined incrementally but never superseded. The reason is not engineering; it is economics. Civil type-certification of a novel aviation powertrain architecture costs on the order of $100 million and five to ten years, and the civil light-aircraft market is too small to amortize that investment against a clean-sheet design. The result is a half-century of frozen architecture.

Motorsport has never had this problem, because the motorsport sanctioning body sets the rules. A performance-based racing rulebook specifies outcomes — thermal efficiency, power-to-weight, fuel-agnostic operation, emissions envelope, durability over a defined service interval — and leaves architecture entirely open. The field converges on the architectures that win. Formula 1's 2014 power-unit formula, specifying a 1.6-liter V6 turbocharged internal-combustion engine paired with a kinetic and a thermal motor-generator unit, produced production-ready hybrid architectures that are now embedded in passenger-car hybrid systems. The LMP1 prototype formula of the 2010s drove comparable advances in diesel and gasoline direct-injection combustion.

The Project MAXIMUM BOOST rulebook is architected on this principle. It specifies outcomes — brake thermal efficiency against a 60% near-term floor with a 70%+ championship-level horizon, sustained specific power above a threshold, multi-fuel capability, and defined mass-and-envelope constraints — and it admits any mechanical architecture that meets them. The series-specified operating fuel is propane or better: propane is selected for its combination of low cost, high energy density, ease of handling in a race-day operational environment, clean combustion chemistry, and — uniquely material to a series designed around intentional collisions in Danger Zones — clean-collision residue. Propane combusts to carbon dioxide and water vapor; a destroyed race vehicle leaves no battery thermal-runaway event, no jet-fuel slick, and no toxic combustion byproducts requiring environmental remediation. The rule is performance-based rather than propane-locked: any fuel meeting or exceeding propane's combination of cost, energy density, handling, environmental performance, and clean-collision residue is admitted.

Under this rulebook, conventional crankshaft-driven Otto-cycle and Diesel-cycle engines compete head-to-head with non-conventional architectures including:

Free-Piston Linear Generators (FPLG). An internal-combustion architecture in which two opposed pistons or a single piston with a gas-spring bounce chamber translate linearly without a crankshaft, with magnets on the moving assembly acting as the mover of a linear electromagnetic generator. Toyota Central R&D Labs demonstrated a two-stroke 10 kWe FPLG prototype at 42% indicated thermal efficiency under premixed charge compression-ignition combustion [20]; the German Aerospace Center (DLR) has a parallel program [21]. The Mainspring Energy commercial baseline at 46% efficiency on the Travis Air Force Base deployment establishes the federal procurement floor. The architecture is inherently multi-fuel, has few moving parts, eliminates crankshaft friction, and produces electrical output directly — an ideal match for a series-hybrid eVTOL architecture. Racing development under the program's performance-based rulebook pushes the architecture toward the 60%+ near-term program floor and the 70%+ championship-level horizon.

Opposed-piston two-strokes. A modern resurrection of the Junkers Jumo architecture, developed by Achates Power and others, with claims of 50%+ brake thermal efficiency in heavy-duty applications. Racing absorbs the certification burden against entertainment revenue.

Rotary and wave-disc designs. Including advanced Wankel variants with ceramic sealing and the wave-disc engine concepts developed at Michigan State University. The rulebook admits them on the same outcome basis.

E. The Phase 2 FPLG Commercialization Pathway

The integrated certification of the FPLG powertrain with the airframe under the new category in Phase 1 is the fastest path to the Phase 2 trigger and to commercial deployment of the certified personal aviation vehicle. Following Phase 1 certification of the integrated package, separate aviation certification of the FPLG powertrain as a standalone certified aircraft engine proceeds in Phase 2 under the relevant FAA airworthiness standards (whether under Part 33 with appropriate findings of equivalency, under a special class for novel powertrains, or under a new Part developed in coordination with the Section II new category framework).

Separate FPLG certification in Phase 2 enables other American companies to build commercial applications on the certified powertrain. Civilian freight aviation under the well-to-wheel efficiency case described in Exhibit A becomes commercially deployable once American manufacturers can integrate the certified FPLG into freight airframes outside the personal AAM context. Stationary grid generation deployments scaling beyond the Mainspring baseline become commercially deployable once American developers can deploy the racing-derived FPLG into the broader power-generation market under the Exhibit B framework. Defense applications under WAS commercial-preference cascade (Section VIII) deploy the FPLG into defense logistics, contested-edge ISR, and electronic-warfare applications under the Acquisition Transformation Strategy's commercial-preference acquisition pathway.

The integrated-then-separate certification strategy is the structurally optimal pathway. Integrated certification in Phase 1 gets the personal aviation vehicle to certification fastest (single integrated certification basis under the new category, rather than separate parallel certifications that would slow Phase 1). Separate certification in Phase 2 enables broad commercial deployment of the FPLG across the Exhibit A and Exhibit B application classes. The federal strategic investment's energy-sovereignty and dual-use returns flow through the Phase 2 separate-certification pathway; the AAM commercial deployment flows through the Phase 1 integrated certification.

The OEM capability transfer mechanism described in Section IV applies to the FPLG commercialization pathway with significant strategic implications. The participating American automotive OEMs, having developed FPLG engineering capability through Phase 1 team involvement, are positioned to commercialize FPLG powertrains across their broader product lines beyond personal AAM. Automotive range-extender hybrid applications, stationary power generation products, marine propulsion applications, off-road and industrial equipment, and any other product class that benefits from compact high-efficiency multi-fuel power generation become commercially deployable through OEM channels at OEM manufacturing scale. The strategic return on the FPLG commercialization pathway therefore extends across the broader American manufacturing economy, not just within aviation, leveraging the established OEM industrial base for deployment of the racing-derived powertrain technology across multiple sectors simultaneously.

VIII. Dual-Use Pathway: The Acquisition Transformation Strategy

On 7 November 2025, Secretary of War Pete Hegseth announced the Department of War Acquisition Transformation Strategy at the National War College, Fort McNair [3]. The accompanying memorandum, "Transforming the Warfighting Acquisition System to Accelerate Fielding of Capabilities," formally redesignates the Defense Acquisition System as the Warfighting Acquisition System (WAS) and establishes "speed to capability delivery" as the Department's organizing principle.

The Strategy advances five reform pillars, each with near- and long-term actions. For the present paper, several provisions of the Strategy speak with unusual directness to the acquisition posture Project MAXIMUM BOOST requires. Four in particular bear on the dual-use argument:

First, commercial preference as the default. The Strategy directs the acquisition workforce to treat "commercial products and offerings, in whole or in part, as the preferred acquisition approach, with enhanced presumption of commerciality to expand qualifying vendors," and establishes that "if commercial solutions are not available, then look to modify a commercial solution, followed by new development if nothing exists." A racing-derived hybrid-electric eVTOL, fielded in civil entertainment service under the Project MAXIMUM BOOST program, is a commercial product by construction; a defense variant enters the WAS at the most favorable step of the commercial-preference cascade, not at the least favorable.

Second, transition from requirements-based to solutions-based acquisition. The Strategy directs that the Department will "pursue a strategy to transition from requirements-based acquisition to solutions-based acquisition, where bespoke requirements defined without industry input will not exclude companies from offering bids." This reverses five decades of defense-procurement practice: instead of the Department writing a specification that the program must meet, the Department presents the operational problem and industry proposes solutions. A racing program that has already demonstrated an AI-co-piloted, unmanned, hybrid-electric eVTOL operating at spectator-grade reliability is not offering to build to a specification — it is offering a demonstrated solution, which is now expressly the preferred acceptance mode.

Third, Commercial Solutions Openings and Other Transactions as the default procurement instruments. The Strategy designates "streamlined solicitation approaches including Commercial Solutions Openings (CSOs) across all acquisition tiers to the extent legally permissible, with CSO-procured items designated as commercial," and extends Other Transaction Authority (OTA) "for prototype and follow-on production efforts where in the best interest of the U.S. Warfighter and the taxpayer." These are the specific contracting vehicles through which a Project MAXIMUM BOOST-derived defense variant would be procured — each expressly favored over traditional Federal Acquisition Regulation-based contracting.

Fourth, accelerated private capital investment and public-private risk-sharing. The Strategy directs the Department to "attract increased private capital investment to accelerate the creation of new companies, expand current factory production rates, and improve innovation," and commits to "explore greater public-private partnerships to increase risk sharing with defense suppliers" through a playbook of "grants, loans, options, purchase commitments, and investments — tied to pre-agreed performance metrics." The 1:1 federal-matching structure of the Project MAXIMUM BOOST strategic investment is precisely such a public-private partnership, tied to the pre-agreed performance metric of verified corporate sponsorship release against federal capital deployment.

Additional features reinforce the alignment. The Strategy eliminates Middle Tier of Acquisition administrative overhead to accelerate prototype-to-field transitions; it directs a 180-day roadmap for streamlined test-and-evaluation requirements with oversight returned to Military Departments for most programs; it establishes an Industrial Base Consortium to coordinate existing consortia, reduce barriers to production scaling, and engage "nontraditional defense contractors"; and it mandates "enhanced presumption of commerciality" as the acquisition default.

A racing-derived eVTOL platform — with hybrid-electric powertrain, AI-augmented control stack, remote-operation methodology, and per-flight cost structure well below conventional military-aviation benchmarks — maps directly onto every one of these priorities. A Project MAXIMUM BOOST-derived vehicle is, with minimal payload integration, a credible candidate for small-unit aerial resupply, medical evacuation, contested-edge intelligence-surveillance-reconnaissance, and electronic-warfare missions requiring platform quantity rather than platform exquisiteness — precisely the mission classes the Strategy has prioritized.

The strategic significance is twofold. First, defense dual-use adoption under the WAS commercial-first cascade provides a funded certification pathway that substantially reduces civil on-ramp cost. Second, the Department of War's expanded authority under the Strategy to accept commercially-derived test and evaluation data will materially shorten the civil certification tail once a derivative military variant is fielded. The FAA has repeatedly accepted DoW airworthiness data in precedent programs; the Strategy's acceleration of DoW test volume directly translates to acceleration of civil certification under the new category.

IX. The Regulatory On-Ramp

Three existing mechanisms, taken together, form the regulatory on-ramp from Project MAXIMUM BOOST operations to certified personal aviation under the new FAA category. No new statute is required to execute this pathway.

A. FAA MOSAIC

The Modernization of Special Airworthiness Certification (MOSAIC) final rule was published by the FAA in the Federal Register on 24 July 2025 [4]. Sport-pilot privilege amendments became effective 22 October 2025; aircraft certification changes become effective 24 July 2026.

The material provisions for the new category are the following. MOSAIC eliminates the prior 1,320-pound weight limit for light sport aircraft and replaces it with performance-based criteria. It raises maximum stall speed (V_S0) from 45 knots to 59–61 knots calibrated airspeed, raises top-speed limits toward 250 knots calibrated airspeed, and admits retractable landing gear, constant-speed propellers, multiple engines, and — critically for the present argument — electric and hybrid-electric propulsion systems. It admits certain commercial and aerial-work operations under defined conditions.

The sport-pilot certificate under which MOSAIC aircraft are operated does not require an FAA medical certificate. A valid state driver's license suffices. MOSAIC therefore already implements, in binding federal regulation, the driver's-license-as-medical-fitness threshold that the new category's operator certification framework will reference as its evolution proceeds toward the Maximum Freedom destination. The Sport Pilot certificate is the existing precedent for FAA operator certification calibrated to graduated risk profiles; the new category's operator certification framework references and extends this precedent.

B. The Acquisition Transformation Strategy

The WAS framework described in Section VIII supplies the funded certification and field-testing volume, and does so under the most favorable acquisition posture available in federal procurement today. Under the Strategy's "enhanced presumption of commerciality" directive, a Project MAXIMUM BOOST-derived defense variant enters WAS acquisition as a modification of an existing commercial solution rather than as new development — the preferred step in the Strategy's own commercial-preference cascade. Under the Strategy's directive transitioning the Department to "solutions-based acquisition," the program offers a demonstrated civil solution to operational problems rather than responding to a bespoke military specification.
Defense-funded test operations of the racing-derived variant produce airworthiness data directly usable by the FAA for civil certification under the new category. This is the same dual-path structure that accelerated civil rotorcraft certification in the decades following the Vietnam era,

now operating under explicit statutory and executive preference for exactly this acquisition geometry.

C. The United States Investment Accelerator (Executive Order 14255)

On 31 March 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order 14255 establishing the United States Investment Accelerator within the Department of Commerce [5]. The Investment Accelerator is the federal entity authorized to coordinate large-scale ($1 billion-plus) domestic and foreign investments, including by assisting investors in navigating federal regulatory processes, reducing regulatory burdens consistent with applicable law, increasing access to national resources, facilitating research collaborations with national labs, and working with state governments to reduce regulatory barriers. The Investment Accelerator is also responsible for the CHIPS Program Office, with explicit direction to deliver "the benefit of the bargain for taxpayers by negotiating much better deals than those of the previous administration."

For Project MAXIMUM BOOST, the Investment Accelerator's coordination function is decisive. The program requires coordinated engagement across FAA (new category rulemaking, type certification, AI co-pilot certification, FPLG powertrain certification), Department of War (WAS dual-use pathway), Department of Energy (FPLG stationary applications and national lab partnerships), and Department of Transportation (broader AAM policy coordination). The Investment Accelerator is the federal entity structurally positioned to coordinate this multi-agency engagement at the program's required tempo.

The Investment Accelerator's coordination role specifically supports the Phase 1 racing operations that produce the operational evidence base for certification. Racing operations during Phase 1 occur under existing FAA authorities: Special Airworthiness Certificates issued for experimental and racing operations under 14 CFR Part 21; Certificates of Waiver or Authorization for race events with defined operational parameters; special flight permits for development and demonstration flight; and event-specific authorizations coordinated with FAA Air Traffic Organization for airspace integration. These are existing FAA mechanisms with established processes; the Investment Accelerator's coordination function supports their issuance on the program's compressed timeline. The X-1 Cup in Year 2 operates under this regulatory accommodation. Demonstration races, development races, and the full Phase 1 racing season operate under the same framework. The program does not require new FAA authorities to conduct Phase 1 racing operations — it requires accelerated coordination of existing FAA authorities, which is precisely the Investment Accelerator's mandate.

The Investment Accelerator's CHIPS Program Office oversight is also directly relevant. The program's federal equity structure is modeled on the CHIPS Intel deployment (9.9% common equity for $8.9B) with structural improvements that the Investment Accelerator's CHIPS-derived institutional capacity is positioned to evaluate, structure, and execute. Project MAXIMUM BOOST is, structurally, the kind of CHIPS-parallel strategic investment that the Investment Accelerator was established to coordinate.

D. The Combined On-Ramp

The three mechanisms operate synergistically. MOSAIC supplies the operator-certification precedent (driver's-license-as-medical-fitness, performance-based aircraft criteria, graduated certification framework) that the new category's operator certification framework references and extends. The Acquisition Transformation Strategy supplies funded dual-use flight test volume and commercial-acceptance pathways that reduce civil certification cost and timeline. The Investment Accelerator supplies the interagency coordination, the Phase 1 racing regulatory accommodation, and the CHIPS-parallel investment governance that the strategic investment requires.

The combined on-ramp is the first complete regulatory pathway for AI-augmented private-use personal AAM in the history of American aviation. It requires no new statute. It operates through existing FAA authorities and existing executive coordination mechanisms. The program's task is to execute against the on-ramp with the operational evidence base and the technical deliverables that the certification process requires.

X. Conclusion and Implementation Roadmap

The United States does not need a new statute to bring AI-augmented personal aviation under a new FAA category to scale. It needs a certification pipeline civil regulators can trust, an energy architecture that does not depend on foreign supply, a dual-use pathway that shares cost with the defense customer, and an institutional advocate that will continue advancing the policy framework for personal aviation through the multi-decade regulatory evolution that the new category enables. Project MAXIMUM BOOST supplies the first three; X1 Racing, as the founding institutional operator of the new sector, supplies the fourth. The three existing regulatory mechanisms identified in Section IX complete the system.

A. The Two-Phase Implementation Roadmap

The program executes in two phases divided by type certification of the integrated package (airframe, AI co-pilot, FPLG powertrain) under the new FAA category. The target for Phase 1 completion is January 20, 2029.

Phase 1 (Pre-Certification). Target: January 20, 2029. Investment closing and immediate deployment of the $2.2 billion federal initial tranche. Stand-up of the X1Racing Game at scale and recruitment of the inaugural team field (up to 50 cars across up to 17 team entities, with up to 4 cars per entity). Federal matched tranche deployment from day one against verified arms-length commercial sponsorship. Phase 1 racing operations under Special Airworthiness Certificates and event-specific FAA authorizations coordinated by the Investment Accelerator.

Inaugural unmanned season with Danger Zones operational from the opening event. Inaugural X-1 Cup staged in Year 2 as the first public-facing airworthiness milestone. Continuing race seasons generating the full failure-mode telemetry corpus through Phase 1. FAA new-category rulemaking proceeding in parallel, informed by the program's operational evidence base, coordinated by the Investment Accelerator. Dual-use defense variant development under WAS commercial-preference pathway. Integrated package type certification (airframe + AI co-pilot + FPLG powertrain) under the new category as the Phase 1 trigger.

If the Phase 1 trigger is not achieved by January 20, 2029, the Phase 1 sharing regime continues until certification arrives. Phase 2 commencement is structurally tied to the certification milestone, not to a calendar date.

Phase 2 (Post-Certification). Commences on Phase 1 trigger. Teams privatize pre-certification IP and commercialize on it. Operational data continues to be shared among teams as a closed competitive-safety regime. Government access to operational data continues permanently for ongoing certification oversight and for the regulatory evolution of the new category's operator certification framework toward the Maximum Freedom destination. Separate FAA certification of the FPLG powertrain as a standalone certified aircraft engine proceeds in Phase 2 to enable broader American commercialization across civilian freight (Exhibit A), stationary grid generation (Exhibit B), and defense applications under WAS. Other American companies build commercial AAM, freight, energy, and defense applications on the certified baseline through the public domain that type certification provides. X1 Racing operates as a permanent entertainment property generating media rights, sponsorship, gate, hospitality, and merchandise revenue. The federal program's matching deployment completes on its own timeline against continuing sponsorship; federal equity position in X1 Racing continues as the taxpayer's ongoing participation in the program's commercial success.

B. The Strategic Returns of the Federal Investment

The federal taxpayer's $11.0 billion strategic investment in Project MAXIMUM BOOST produces returns across six dimensions:

Financial Return: 10% Non-Voting Common Equity in X1 Racing, with senior-preferred conversion in the defined downside scenario. X1 Racing emerges from the program as the founding institutional operator of a new American industrial sector and a permanent entertainment property of significant commercial value. The 10% federal equity position participates in the property's commercial success across decades.

Strategic Return: A New American Industrial Sector. The certified baseline (airframe, AI co-pilot, FPLG powertrain) under the new FAA category becomes the foundation on which American industry builds personal aviation, commercial AAM, freight transport, defense aviation, and stationary grid generation. The United States acquires industrial baseline ownership of a new aviation category and the regulatory framework that governs it.

OEM Capability Transfer and Consumer-Scale Manufacturing. The program's direct engineering involvement with American automotive OEMs transfers aviation engineering capability into the American automotive industrial base during Phase 1 through continuous engineering co-development. By Phase 2 commencement, the participating American automotive OEMs are positioned to bring personal AAM and FPLG-based products to consumer production at OEM manufacturing scale, through OEM distribution networks, at consumer price points. This capability transfer is the structural mechanism that distinguishes Project MAXIMUM BOOST from any other AAM development pathway and enables consumer-scale personal AAM rollout through the existing American manufacturing base rather than through specialty aerospace startups manufacturing at limited scale. The strategic return on the OEM capability transfer extends beyond personal AAM into the broader automotive product portfolio of the participating OEMs.

Dual-Use Defense Capability. The racing-derived airframe and FPLG powertrain enter Department of War procurement under WAS commercial-preference cascade, producing defense capability at a fraction of conventional defense-acquisition cost basis.

Energy Sovereignty. The FPLG architecture, separately certified for aviation and stationary applications in Phase 2, displaces foreign-supplied battery cells in transportation and lower-efficiency gas turbine peakers in stationary power, supporting American energy independence in both transportation and power generation.

Trillion-Dollar Market Capture and Trickle-Down Economic Returns. The new American industrial sector that the program establishes addresses the personal AAM segment of the global Advanced Air Mobility market, projected by Morgan Stanley research at $1 trillion total addressable market by 2040 and $9 trillion by 2050 [35]. Because the program establishes both the American certified industrial baseline and the American regulatory framework governing the category, the United States is positioned to capture the dominant share of the personal AAM segment globally. The trillion-dollar end-market demand pulls production through the American automotive OEM industrial base whose aviation capability the program has transferred, generating direct manufacturing employment at OEM scale across the participating states, indirect employment through supplier ecosystem development across the broader American manufacturing economy, and induced economic activity through standard industrial multiplier dynamics. The $11 billion federal strategic investment, leveraged against the trillion-dollar end market through the certified baseline and the OEM capability transfer, produces economic returns at orders of magnitude beyond the federal capital deployment itself. This is the trickle-down mechanism through which the strategic investment delivers broad American economic benefit: federal capital catalyzes the certification and regulatory infrastructure, the infrastructure unlocks market demand, market demand pulls OEM production at consumer-product scale, OEM production drives manufacturing employment and supplier ecosystem development, and the resulting economic activity reaches workers, communities, and industries across the United States.

C. X1 Racing's Role as Sector Advocate Beyond the Program Window

Project MAXIMUM BOOST delivers, within its operational window, the certified baseline and the establishment of the new FAA aircraft and operator certification category. The certified baseline and the new category establish the foundation for personal AAM as an American industrial sector. The full realization of the Maximum Freedom destination — broadly accessible personal aviation under driver's-license-equivalent operator certification, operating from broadly accessible vertiport infrastructure — extends beyond the program window into the multi-decade regulatory and policy evolution that follows the program's certification trigger.

Maximum Freedom is X1 Racing's strategic position from the program's outset and through its post-Phase 1 institutional life. The company exists to advance the new category, the certified baseline, the operational safety record, and the policy framework that together produce broadly accessible personal aviation as an American reality. X1 Racing, as the founding institutional operator of the new sector, becomes the natural sector advocate for the policy evolution the Maximum Freedom destination requires.

The company commits, as part of its post-Phase 1 strategic position, to advocate for the policy framework that the Maximum Freedom destination requires, including specifically:

Progressive simplification of the new category's operator certification framework through standard FAA rulemaking informed by accumulated operational evidence, with the long-term destination being driver's-license-accessible operator certification under the established category. Each stage of operator certification simplification is supported by the operational safety record that the program and its successors generate over years and decades, on the FAA's standard regulatory process.

Evolution of vertiport accessibility policy toward what X1 Racing will advance as the constitutional vertiport doctrine: the policy position that any surface location meeting AI-certified safety criteria — approach and departure clearance, surface bearing capacity, noise and wake footprint, adjacent-person setback, and emergency-landing redundancy — should be presumptively operable as a vertiport for AI-certified personal aviation, with the burden on regulatory authority to narrowly justify any incremental restriction. This is a policy evolution X1 Racing will advocate for through engagement with Congress, FAA rulemaking, state and local government coordination, and industry coalition work, supported by the operational evidence base the program generates and continues to generate through its permanent championship operations.

Coordinated airspace integration policy enabling personal aviation operations to integrate cleanly with commercial AAM, conventional general aviation, and emergency services in shared airspace, supported by the airspace integration framework that the new category establishes.

Federal preemption clarity for the new category's operator certification, vertiport accessibility, and airspace integration, ensuring that the federal framework the program establishes operates consistently across all fifty states.

Industrial advocacy of this kind is the standard mechanism by which emerging American industries shape the policy framework that governs them. The airframers and airlines played this role in the development of twentieth-century commercial aviation policy. The automotive industry played it in the development of surface mobility policy. The technology industry plays it today in the development of digital infrastructure policy. X1 Racing's earned standing to play that role for personal AAM is itself a strategic return on the federal investment: the United States acquires not only the technology baseline, the new category, the OEM capability transfer, the dual-use capability, and the energy sovereignty implications, but the institutional sector advocate that will continue advancing the policy framework long after the program window closes.

D. Conclusion

Racing is how nations learn to go fast safely. It is how the automobile became ubiquitous without becoming unsurvivable. It is how aviation will become broadly accessible — not through another decade of conventional type-certification programs, but through an unmanned open competition whose winners, and whose crashes, together become the evidentiary foundation of a new FAA category established through standard rulemaking processes, supporting the long-arc evolution of the operator certification framework toward Maximum Freedom-accessible personal aviation.

Project MAXIMUM BOOST executes the program. X1 Racing operates the championship and advocates for the policy framework. The Investment Accelerator coordinates the federal engagement. MOSAIC supplies the operator-certification precedent. The Acquisition Transformation Strategy supplies the dual-use pathway. The new FAA category emerges through standard rulemaking informed by the program's evidence base. The certified baseline becomes the foundation for the new American industrial sector. The federal taxpayer's strategic investment produces financial return through the 10% equity position and strategic return through the new sector's establishment, the OEM capability transfer into the American automotive industrial base, the dual-use capability, the energy sovereignty implications, and the long-arc Maximum Freedom destination that the program positions American industry to advance over decades.

The X-1 Cup is the trophy. The Danger Zone is the data. Maximum Freedom is the destination. The strategic investment is the structure that gets us there.

Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the broader X1Racing engineering, policy, and creative teams whose work across the pitch-deck, Exhibit A (Well-to-Wheel Freight Efficiency Analysis), Exhibit B (American Energy Sovereignty), and the Project MAXIMUM BOOST executive summary constitute the substantive body of argument summarized here. The author further acknowledges the historical example of the Bell X-1 experimental research program, whose first supersonic flight on 14 October 1947 anchors the naming of the culminating championship of this program.

References

[1] McAlpine, M., "AI-Augmented Remote Flight Testing for Hybrid-Electric eVTOL," LinkedIn, 2025. Available: x1racing.com/x-files.

[2] McAlpine, M., "Nothing Rolls Coal Like an EV: The Case for Super-Efficient Fossil," LinkedIn, 2025. Available: x1racing.com/x-files.

[3] U.S. Department of War, "Transforming the Warfighting Acquisition System to Accelerate Fielding of Capabilities," Memorandum of the Secretary of War, 7 November 2025; U.S. Department of War, Acquisition Transformation Strategy, 10 November 2025.

[4] Federal Aviation Administration, "Modernization of Special Airworthiness Certification," Final Rule, 90 Fed. Reg. (24 July 2025); sport-pilot provisions effective 22 October 2025; aircraft-certification provisions effective 24 July 2026.

[5] Executive Order 14255, "Establishing the United States Investment Accelerator," 31 March 2025; 90 Fed. Reg. 14701 (3 April 2025).

[6] X1Racing, LLC, "Project Maximum Boost · Maximum Freedom," White Paper, x1racing.com/x-files.

[7] X1Racing, LLC, "Exhibit A: Well-to-Wheel Freight Efficiency Analysis," x1racing.com/x-files.

[8] X1Racing, LLC, "Exhibit B: American Energy Sovereignty," x1racing.com/x-files.

[9] X1Racing, LLC, Investor and Partner Pitch Deck, x1racing.com/x-files.

[10] X1Racing, LLC, "Project MAXIMUM BOOST Executive Summary," x1racing.com/files/X1_Racing_Project_MAXIMUM_BOOST_Executive_Summary.pdf.

[11] National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Traffic Safety Facts: Pedestrians, U.S. Department of Transportation, 2023 data release.

[12] National Transportation Safety Board, U.S. Civil Aviation Accident Statistics, Annual Review, 2023.

[13] Experimental Aircraft Association, "MOSAIC Final Rule and Sport Pilot 2.0," 2025. Available: eaa.org.

[14] Alauda Aeronautics, Airspeeder Technical Program Documentation, 2022–2024.

[15] Federal Aviation Administration, Part 23 Final Rule, "Airworthiness Standards: Normal Category Airplanes," 14 C.F.R. Part 23, 2017 revision.

[16] Federal Aviation Administration, "Special Federal Aviation Regulation: Integration of Powered-Lift Pilot Certification and Operations," Final Rule, 2024.

[17] Federal Aviation Administration, Part 107, "Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems," 14 C.F.R. Part 107, 2016.

[18] Federal Aviation Administration, "Sport Pilot and Light-Sport Aircraft," 14 C.F.R. Parts 1, 21, 43, 45, 61, 91, 141, and 147, Final Rule, 2004.

[19] 49 U.S.C. § 40103, "Sovereignty and use of airspace," United States Code.

[20] Goto, S., Moriya, K., Kosaka, H., Akita, T., Hotta, Y., Umeno, T., and Nakakita, K., "Development of Free Piston Engine Linear Generator System Part 2—Investigation of Control System for Generator," SAE Technical Paper 2014-01-1193, Toyota Central R&D Labs, 2014.

[21] Kock, F., Haag, J., and Friedrich, H. E., "The Free Piston Linear Generator—Development of an Innovative, Compact, Highly Efficient Range-Extender Module," SAE Technical Paper 2013-01-1727, German Aerospace Center (DLR), 2013.

[22] Mikalsen, R., and Roskilly, A. P., "A Review of Free-Piston Engine History and Applications," Applied Thermal Engineering, Vol. 27, Nos. 14–15, 2007, pp. 2339–2352.

[23] National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Spinoff (annual publication series, 1976–present), NASA Office of Technology Transfer. Available: spinoff.nasa.gov.

[24] Hall, E. C., Journey to the Moon: The History of the Apollo Guidance Computer, AIAA, Reston, VA, 1996.

[25] Mindell, D. A., Digital Apollo: Human and Machine in Spaceflight, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2008.

[26] Tomayko, J. E., Computers Take Flight: A History of NASA's Pioneering Digital Fly-By-Wire Project, NASA SP-2000-4224, 2000.

[27] General Motors Corporation, "GM Milford Proving Ground Centennial," GM News Release, 25 September 2024. Available: news.gm.com.

[28] Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile, Formula One Technical Regulations (Power Unit), 2014 revision and subsequent updates.

[29] Achates Power, Inc., "Opposed-Piston Two-Stroke Engine Technical Papers," SAE collected publications, 2011–2024.

[30] National Transportation Safety Board Accident Database, aggregated records of motorsport-community private-aviation incidents, 1970–2025; cross-referenced with media chronologies of motor-racing general-aviation losses.

[31] National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual U.S. traffic-fatality release; baseline vehicle-mile fatality rate.

[32] AOPA Air Safety Institute, Nall Report: General Aviation Accident Analysis (annual publications), with particular reference to accident rates as a function of pilot total hours and student-solo experience.

[33] Mainspring Energy, Inc., "Mainspring Energy Awarded U.S. Air Force Pilot Project for Multi-Fuel, Resilient Power Generation at Travis Air Force Base," Press Release, 4 March 2026; contract awarded via Tradewinds Solutions Marketplace, administered by the Air Force Office of Energy Assurance (AF OEA), Air Force Civil Engineer Center. Available: prnewswire.com.

[34] Musk, E., X (formerly Twitter), 28 September 2024: "If I were another car company, I would license FSD." Available: x.com/elonmusk/status/1840011000835084341.

[35] Morgan Stanley Research, "eVTOL/Urban Air Mobility TAM Update: A Slow Take-Off, But Sky's the Limit," 6 May 2021; updated total addressable market projections for the global Advanced Air Mobility / Urban Air Mobility sector, with base-case TAM of $1 trillion by 2040 and $9 trillion by 2050, bull-case TAM extending to $18.9 trillion by 2050.

[36] Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, Pub. L. 84-627, 70 Stat. 374 (29 June 1956); establishing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways with federal cost share of approximately 90% matched against state contributions; cumulative federal expenditure of approximately $114 billion in nominal dollars over the 35-year primary construction period, with

associated multi-trillion-dollar economic returns through the automotive industrial sector, freight logistics, suburbanization, and continental commercial integration the system enabled. See generally U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, "The Interstate System" (historical record, fhwa.dot.gov/programadmin/interstate.cfm).