

STATEMENT OF JOHN H. SHAFFER, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION  
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE  
ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS ON JANUARY 27, 1970, RESPECTING THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am John H. Shaffer, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration of the Department of Transportation. I have with me today Mr. George Moore, the Associate Administrator for Operations; Mr. Oscar Bakke, the Associate Administrator for Plans; General Gustav Lundquist, the Acting Associate Administrator Designate for Development; and Mr. John Weber, the Director of our Systems Research and Development Service.

We appreciate the interest of this Committee in the National Airspace System. We are here to answer your questions relative to that system, present and future. With your permission, however, I have a very brief statement I would like to make by way of introduction.

It is painfully obvious today that we are suffering shortages of capacity in our national air transportation system. This condition is working some hardship on the people who use the system as well as those who operate and maintain it. It is entirely possible that, unless corrected, the deficiencies afflicting our airports and airways today could have an imminent and adverse effect on the growth of civil aviation.

The problems facing us are not primarily those of safety, but of capacity. While last year's safety record was not perfect, the National Transportation Safety Board reported it was "the best year of the jet age." Despite record traffic levels and increasing air traffic controller workloads, the air traffic control system last year handled more than 60 million flights without a single midair collision between two controlled flights. I think this speaks well for the system in being.

Notwithstanding, the system is under severe strain, and there are several reasons why supply has not kept pace with demand. For one thing, growth rates have outdistanced even the most optimistic forecasts. Other pressing priorities have competed for national, state and even local resources. The time lag between the planning of the automated National Airspace System and its implementation has exceeded expectations. Then, of course, there is the simple but unavoidable fact that forecasting the future is far from a perfected art.

We are, however, now in the midst of what I believe to be a major transitional period for aviation. The dynamic growth that in the recent past has been stimulated almost entirely by the airplane, can now be matched by equally dynamic developments in the rest of the system -- at the Nation's airports, in our airways, and along the interface between air travel and other forms of transportation.

This is possible, due largely to the joint efforts of the Administration and the Congress in supporting the proposed Aviation Facilities Expansion Act. This bill, passed by this House and now before the Senate, will provide many of the resources necessary to reconstitute the operational base for civil aviation's needs of the 1970s and 1980s. I am confident that given these resources we can establish capacity in the system sufficient for tomorrow's needs, accelerate the installation and activation of the automated National Airspace System, and restore aviation as the important growth component in our economy.

In the months I have served as Administrator, I have devoted much of my time and effort to the attainment of these resources and to the personnel needs of the Federal Aviation Administration. With the support of the Congress, we have been able to improve conditions for many of our people, especially our air traffic controllers. There is much yet that remains to be accomplished. The Department intends to be guided by the recommendations and findings of the Corson Committee in seeking objectives that will benefit the controller force and the other people of the agency commensurate with the dedication and devotion they bring to their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my prepared statement. My staff and I will be pleased to answer questions that the Committee may have.

STATEMENT OF JOHN H. SHAFFER, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ON 19 MAY 1970

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Jack Shaffer, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you a topic of great importance to the Department of Transportation, the Congress, and a very large segment of the public: commercial air carrier service at Washington National Airport.

At the very outset I should like to emphasize that the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration are vitally concerned about serving the public interest in the administration of the National Capital Airports - Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport. Our difficulty is that certain facets of the public needs and interest often appear to be in direct conflict with each other. It is not always an easy task to keep these divergent interests in proper perspective and balance. The task is further complicated by the fact that a substantial part of the "public" we are referring to is scattered across the continent and around the world and not confined to the City of Washington and its suburbs. This city and its transportation facilities serve the Nation and in large measure, the world.

Commercial air traffic, in terms of number of operations and passengers, will continue to increase in the Washington area through the decade of the 1970s. The use of all three major Washington-Baltimore airports, including Friendship International Airport, will be essential in coping with this increase. Even given the current traffic increase forecast, National's share of the total number of passengers handled at the three area airports will decline. This is based on the assumption that during the current decade better means of surface transportation will be provided for all three Washington area airports. This will be essential if Friendship and Dulles International Airports are to attract and retain their respective projected shares of the traffic growth and if Washington National is to cope with its projected share without serious ground congestion.

The Department believes that the most effective and efficient means of determining and balancing the various public needs and encouraging the development of supporting transportation systems would be to place all three Washington-Baltimore area air carrier airports under some common administration, reflecting the interests of the Federal, District of Columbia, Virginia, Maryland, and City of Baltimore Governments. This would ensure that all facets of local public interest are reflected in policies in the appropriate relationship to other competing interests.



Until this objective is realized, we are committed to developing to the fullest extent possible the genuine advantages presented by each of its airports; and, with equal vigor, to reducing the impact of the disadvantages of each. By way of example: It is apparent to most of the air traveling public who utilize Washington National Airport that in terms of proximity to the center of a major metropolitan area it is one of the most conveniently located airports in the world. Equally apparent to those who pass through the portals of Dulles International Airport is that it is one of the cleanest, most compact, most carefully planned facilities in the world. We believe that these constitute an impressive array of "pluses" for the National Capital Airports. We are, however, acutely aware that each of these advantages has a counterpointing disadvantage which must be acknowledged and dealt with. With the advantage of convenience to major population areas, Washington National must also cope with the problems of aircraft noise and smoke pollution, terminal congestion, and limited surface approaches to the airport. By the same token, the advantages presented by Dulles International are the direct result of its having been located in the "wide open spaces," where long-range planning and full development of modern jetport requirements could be fully realized. But this carries with it the concurrent disadvantage that Dulles is 26 miles from Washington and at this time is without rapid ground transportation to the downtown area.

Eliminating aircraft engine smoke and reducing noise and surface congestion at one airport while promoting the development of rapid, convenient transportation at the other is a large order, but an essential one if Washington's airports are to fulfill their appropriate roles in the coming years. I should like to very briefly enumerate our efforts in achieving these goals.

Several months ago, the Departments of Transportation and Health, Education and Welfare persuaded the Nation's air carriers to retrofit their smoke-producing jet engines with smokeless combustion cans. The conversion will be substantially completed by the end of 1972. In addition, the FAA has taken a preliminary step, through the issuance of an advanced notice of proposed rule making, toward curbing other air polluting emissions from aircraft engines.

Since Washington National was first opened to jets in 1966, we have had noise abatement rules in effect. These include approach and departure procedures and a prohibition on the scheduling of air carrier operations at the airport between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. In recent months the FAA has issued a rule requiring future subsonic jet transports to meet noise reduction criteria in the certificating process. Other noise abatement rules are also under development. In addition, we are encouraging and assisting in further research and development of "quiet" jet engines.

The problem of ground congestion is also being dealt with in several ways. The air carriers, at their own expense, have enlarged and improved the terminal facilities at Washington National. With the opening of the new TWA/Northwest unit terminal on June 1, we will have realized a total 60 percent increase in terminal area in three years. Public parking has been expanded 33 percent, and last week a parking area shuttle bus service was inaugurated between the terminal and the outlying parking lots. We realize, of course, that congestion on the airport property is not the only, or perhaps even the most serious facet of this problem. When the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority initially published its "METRO" subway plan for the Washington area, it did not include Washington National Airport in the system. It was through our efforts that the plan was modified to place the airport on the main Washington-Alexandria line. We firmly believe that the METRO will play a vital role in making possible some increase in air passenger service at National concurrent with a reduction in ground transportation congestion on the streets and highways in the area. But the METRO is still several years away. We have encouraged our ground transportation concessionaire, Greyhound, to expand its services between downtown Washington and Washington National Airport. A shuttle bus service between 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, downtown, and the airport will be instituted as soon as the Transit Authority approves the request.



All of these efforts, of course, are separate and distinct from the FAA's regulation of air traffic at the airport. The air carriers have voluntarily agreed to limit their combined scheduled operations at Washington National to a 40 per hour maximum and to limit the nonstop service radius to 650 miles with the exception of seven cities beyond this limit which were receiving nonstop service from National at the end of 1965. The air operations at National are safe and are on a sound basis from the standpoint of public convenience. The situation has been steadily improving since 1967. In fact, last year there were 7 percent fewer air carrier operations at National than in 1967.

To provide Dulles International Airport with convenient and fast ground communication with the City of Washington we constructed our own limited access highway, a unique feature of this airport. Unfortunately, the full benefit of the highway will not be realized until Interstate 66 is completed as far as the Capital Beltway. We are also exploring the establishment of a surface rail line to tie Dulles into the METRO system.

The air traffic disruption of late March and early April had a significant and substantial effect on the commercial air carrier market. We took two actions at Washington National to help alleviate the short and long term effects of the slowdown upon the traveling public. We lifted the prohibition on jet traffic between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. (but did not relax the 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. schedule limitation on air carriers).

This action permits air carriers delayed at other points or en route to operate after 11:00 p.m. if they were scheduled to land or depart before 10:00 p.m. If in practice this minor change is abused, the prior requirement will be re-imposed. The other action we took was to permit the air carriers to operate Boeing 727-200 aircraft, the so-called "stretched jet," into Washington National on an interim basis. This aircraft has approximately 30 to 40 more seats than the regular 727-100 and a very slight increase in operating gross weight. The aircraft is otherwise identical in performance to the shorter version which has been operating into Washington National since the airport was opened to jets.

Nine of the twelve scheduled air carriers serving Washington National operate the stretched 727. National is the only major airport in the country which has restricted its use. This creates equipment utilization problems that are ultimately reflected in the degree of schedule convenience and flexibility at Washington and elsewhere in the country. Fuller utilization of the -200 model at Washington National, however, would present other more direct and tangible benefits than scheduling improvements. If Eastern Airlines, for example, were to place the 727-200 into service on its 48 daily shuttle operations between National and New York, it would result in a substantial reduction in second, or backup, sections. This translates into a reduction of operations at Washington National because the shuttle backup flights

are not included in the 40 operations per hour limitation. Also, there would probably be a reduction of extra shuttle flights between New York and Boston, because the introduction of the 727-200 at Washington National would enable Eastern to use them on the New York-Boston shuttle as well. This would clearly result in a public benefit in the truest sense.

We are not unmindful, however, that there is more to the public interest picture than this. We in the Department have a direct interest in the continued, orderly growth of Dulles International Airport and an indirect, but tangible, interest in the continued improvement of services at Friendship International Airport. The decision to completely lift the restriction on 727-200 will require more experience and study than we now have. And we intend to study the matter carefully before making any final decision. But, Gentlemen, I submit that the Department will not permanently eliminate or reduce restrictions on air carrier equipment types or sub-types until the air carriers clearly and appropriately demonstrate that they will become, and remain, responsive to the total sphere of public interests and needs. Specifically, we would require, at the minimum, an agreement among the carriers serving Washington National that, insofar as their use of the 727-200 at that airport and their scheduling of service at the other two area airports

are concerned, the shift of passenger volume which we are projecting for the three airports will not be adversely affected. This would be an agreement similar to the ones now in effect at National regarding air carrier stage lengths and operations per hour. We would also expect vigorous and continuous efforts by the air carriers to mitigate the undesirable environmental effects of jet transport aircraft. And lastly, we would expect the carriers to respect and not abuse any relaxation of restrictions which we may grant.

Of course, these steps alone will not solve all of the problems. I have suggested to the Secretary that there is an obvious need for terminal modernization. The airport plan for Washington National developed by Kling Associates contains proposals for improvements which, if adopted, would assist in keeping the airport functioning as an integral part of the area's air transportation system. The aim of the Kling report -- and our implementation of it -- is not to turn Washington National Airport into a major jetport at the expense of other existing airports. This would be directly against our own interest as far as Dulles is concerned. But we feel that improving the convenience and function of the facility for the present and future levels of use is most certainly in order.

Expansion of the Dulles terminal facilities within the next few years will also be necessary to keep pace with that airport's increasing share of the traffic.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat my opening statement that we are closely attuned to and vitally concerned about serving the public interest. And we have no intention of abandoning the commitments and plans that we have made previously before this and other committees of Congress regarding the projected service at the three airports. Finally, we would welcome and support the creation of an agency to administer the Washington-Baltimore area airports. Until this comes about we shall seek the assistance of the air carriers, the several governments and governmental agencies in the area, and the Congress in solving the problems we encounter.

Thank you. I shall be glad to attempt to answer any questions the Committee may have.



STATEMENT OF JOHN H. SHAFFER, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL  
AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE  
THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE REGARDING S. 3128, 11 JUNE 1970.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss S. 3128, a bill authorizing the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to operate the Washington-Baltimore metropolitan area airports. The question of establishing a new instrument to operate the airports in the Washington-Baltimore area is of particular importance because of its potential impact on Federal, State, and local governments in the Washington area and on the general public.

The Department has been conscious for some time of the problems associated with the existing structure for the management of the area airports, and plans to seriously consider the concept of creating a new approach to planning and operating the airports on a regional basis. Under the terms of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, we are charged with the responsibilities of enhancing the safety and promoting the development of civil aviation, and of operating the Nation's air traffic control system. These are very large responsibilities which make very substantial demands upon the personnel and resources of the Department. Operation of the two proprietorships, Washington National and Dulles International Airports, places the FAA Administrator, in particular,

in a role which involves completely different parameters from his usual function. As airport proprietor he must of necessity negotiate and deal on a contractual basis with some of the same segments of the aviation industry that he regulates in his capacity as Administrator of the FAA. The safety regulation of civil aviation and the operation of two civil airports are, therefore, quite separate and distinct functions, based upon different legal and administrative powers, even though the parties to both types of functions are the same. Maintaining this distinction, particularly in the mind of the public, is not easy.

There are other reasons, too, for creating an authority structured to operate the regions present airports and to plan for future demands. A major airport, by its nature, serves the surrounding area and population. It is not a separate, fiscally independent entity operating in an environment unrelated to the communities around it. To effectively serve the traveling public and those who benefit indirectly the general public -- an airport must maintain an effective, close relationship with other airports and other modes of transportation in the same area. This requires that all of these be responsive to the same local political jurisdictions. This is impeded by the present arrangement in the Washington-Baltimore area. When one considers that by 1980 the Washington-Baltimore area airports may be handling approximately 41 1/2 million passengers annually, the need for continuing coordination is apparent.

Finally, the operation of two major civil airports by the Federal Government is without parallel and is inconsistent with other similar airports in the country, all of which are operated by units of state or local governments or by multigovernmental agencies. The exclusive operation of Washington's two airports by the Federal Government is also inconsistent with the concept of Federalism, in which local government has a voice in public matters in the same proportion that these directly affect local affairs.

Turning specifically to S. 3128, I would like to offer these following comments. We are pleased to see evidence of Congressional interest and initiative in achieving the goal of a regional airport system. The concept of a multistate airport authority embodied in this bill is one of several possible approaches. One of its greatest assets is legislative simplicity. This approach, however, has several significant deficiencies which should be remedied for the benefit of all interests.

• First, the bill lacks a guarantee of positive action. No one can predict when the States of Virginia and Maryland and the Government of the District of Columbia might reach an agreement which the Congress would approve, especially since none of them are parties to this legislation nor are operators of any of the airports involved. We submit that the need for prompt action will grow more critical each year.

.. Second, the bill contemplates no participation in a regional airport system by the Federal Government at any level. While we agree and have stated that local administration and operation of airports is most appropriate, the operation, to be successful, must be adjusted to the particular local needs. Washington is the seat of the national government, and the local airports serve far more than purely local interests. They are, in fact, essential to the efficient function of the Federal Government. We believe that the Federal Government, therefore, has a genuine and legitimate, although limited, interest in the operation of any regional airport agency for the Washington area.

Third, we believe that regional air transportation should be regarded on a much broader basis than just the matter of how Washington National and Dulles Airports will be administered. The needs of general aviation, as well as those of the air carriers, must be recognized and satisfied. The Department of Transportation is encouraging this idea with regional and local airport administrations all across the country. This concept is a fundamental premise of the recently enacted Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970. Future aviation needs of the area, such as a downtown STOLport, should also be included within the scope of a regional airport authority. Bitter experience has taught us that in attempting to develop a comprehensive approach to any type of regional transportation system, planning authority alone is not sufficient. Any regional

agency with this type of responsibility must have the authority to finance and implement its plans. In our opinion, S. 3128 does not present a sufficient mandate for this degree of authority.

We come before this Committee today, Mr. Chairman, as much to listen as to speak. The Department of Transportation would welcome an opportunity to consider this bill along with other alternative proposals, the comments of the other witnesses at this hearing, the suggestions of the Committee, and then develop a proposal for a truly comprehensive regional airport system. While many details would have to be carefully considered, I should like to give you some of the ideas that the Department presently has under consideration:

As to possible organizational structure, our inquiry to date suggests that two somewhat different basic forms are worthy of more explicit study. The first would be a multijurisdictional airport authority, created either by Act of Congress or through the process of a negotiated multijurisdictional compact which would become effective upon approval by the Congress. This familiar form of organization or variations of it are now widely and successfully used for the management of local or regional airports and other publicly provided transportation facilities.

A second possibility, as yet untried in transportation, involves the establishment of a mixed private-public structure using the corporate form of organization established for the Communications Satellite Corporation. This organizational form



has considerable attraction because of its flexibility, its potential for attracting private capital and permitting wide participation by the States and local governments involved, airport users, and the general public while at the same time assuring that the public's interest in the use and development of the airports is amply protected. At the same time, the very novelty of such an approach and the issues that it raises suggest that this approach must be given considerably more study before it can be definitely considered.

Irrespective of the particular organizational choice eventually selected, a number of key elements, would of necessity have to be taken into account:

1. The Secretary of Transportation's authority to initiate action to create a regional airport system and to negotiate with appropriate parties.
2. Any organization must have and be assured of an adequate financial structure before the Secretary relinquishes Federal control of the two federally operated airports.
3. It must have the authority to develop and implement plans for all types of facilities for commercial and general aviation in its region of operation.
4. Specific provision could be made for the development and coordination of necessary ground transportation systems either in conjunction with other agencies charged with this task or by the organization itself.

5. Prior to any transfer of the two Federal airports by the Secretary there would have to be specific provision for the continuance and preservation of existing contracts with the concessionaires and the air carriers and the rights and interests of the employees of the Bureau of National Capital Airports.

While in the foregoing, the majority of my comments have been directed to the future of the two airports over which we exercise direct control, it has not been my intent to ignore the very important place of Friendship International Airport. We feel that Friendship has an important role in any proposal for establishing a regional airport system, and its inclusion would be a valuable contribution to such system. We, of course, are willing to discuss this matter further with the Friendship officials as we have in the past and would provide in any proposed legislation for the eventual inclusion of Friendship at its option. We do not believe, however, that the failure to include Friendship at the outset should prevent implementations of whatever steps we might be authorized to take with respect to the two Virginia airports. For the reasons mentioned earlier, we do not regard the existing organizational arrangements as desirable and, as soon as possible, would hope to alter them.

These are but a few of the most significant features that must be considered in establishing a regional airport system for the Washington area. If one had to be chosen as the most important, it would probably be the need for concentration of authority to exercise initiative leading toward a comprehensive regional airport

system and operating agency. Any new organizational structure for the airport system for the National Capital area should be a model for the entire country.

This concludes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. I shall, of course, be glad to answer question.

12

STATEMENT OF JOHN H. SHAFFER, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE, SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, ON JUNE 26, 1970, RESPECTING AVIATION SAFETY PROCEDURES

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I regret that I was unable to appear before you last week. But on the afternoon of June 15, I was notified that I was to attend the opening meeting of the 17th (Extraordinary) Session of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Assembly on June 16 at Montreal. This ICAO Assembly Session was called to consider the development "of adequate security specifications and practices, for application by ICAO States in international civil aviation, aimed at the protection of air passengers, civil aviation personnel and civil aircraft by (a) preventing criminal action of any kind that may endanger the safety of air transport; and (b) consideration of arrangements under which those responsible for criminal actions endangering civil air transport can be brought to justice." Because of the importance of this subject internationally, on June 15 the United States Delegation to the Assembly was enhanced, and Mr. Frank Loy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Transportation and Telecommunications, was named as U. S. Delegation Chairman, and Mr. Charles Butler, United States Representative on the Council of ICAO, and myself were named Vice Chairmen. I certainly appreciate your patience and understanding, Mr. Chairman, in rescheduling these hearings for today so that I could attend the opening meeting of the ICAO Assembly on this very serious aviation safety matter.

each year for airport planning and development and \$250 million each year for airways facilities establishment and improvement, and also provided for research and development activities. Under the companion Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970 (Title II of Public Law 91-258), Congress has established and expanded aviation user taxes, and has provided for their deposit in the newly created Airport and Airway Trust Fund. Thus, we are assured that substantial moneys are available to carry out the airport and airways program. The great challenge we now face (perhaps the greatest we ever have faced) is to implement the new law and the will of the Congress -- to bring this Nation's airports and airways "up to speed" in the 1970's.

Section 51(b) of the new Act is, no doubt, of particular interest to this Committee. This adds new section 612 -- "Airport Operating Certificates" -- to, and amends section 610(a) of, the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (see Exhibit 3). Under new section 612, the "Administrator is empowered to issue airport operating certificates to airports serving air carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board and to establish minimum safety standards for the operation of such airports." Under amended section 610(a), after May 21, 1972, no person may operate one of those airports without a certificate. Anticipating this new authority, we began to develop plans to implement this provision early this Spring. Within the week following signing of the Act, we met with industry representatives to initiate a dialogue on areas of interest and various ideas and approaches to the implementation of the new airport certification



Several more significant amendments to the Federal Aviation Regulations have been issued since December 1969 (see Exhibit 4). A series of amendments to our air traffic rules establish requirements for Terminal Control Areas (TCA) around our busiest terminal areas. In the Group I TCA are ten of the Nation's busiest airports. As of today, we have issued specific airspace designations in Group I for the Atlanta, Georgia, Washington, D. C., and Chicago, Illinois, TCA. In the Group II TCA are 14 more of the busiest airports. Specific airspace designations for Group II TCA will follow the designations for those in Group I. This series of regulatory actions responds to a clear need for stepped-up control of air traffic in those areas where air traffic is the heaviest, and where the need for better trained pilots and better equipped aircraft is greatest. For your information, the general Terminal Control Area rule is attached to my statement (see Exhibit 5).

Other amendments to the Federal Aviation Regulations tighten the operating rules for, and the airworthiness standards for aircraft operated by, air taxi operators (scheduled air taxis are sometimes called "commuter airlines" or "third level air carriers"). In early 1969, we issued Special Federal Aviation Regulation (SFAR) 23 to establish additional airworthiness standards for small airplanes (12,500 pounds, or less) that are to be certificated to carry more than 10 occupants, and that are intended to be used in air taxi operations. On November 26, 1969 (just before my last appearance here), we issued a rule to substantially improve air taxi operating rules (Amdt. 135-12).

group with divergent interests and varied goals and objectives. They include units and agencies of local, State and Federal government, aviation manufacturers, airmen, air carriers, and air agencies such as pilot schools. We must regulate all of the pilots from the man who flies on Sunday afternoon with a limited investment of time and money, to the military professional who flies in the interest of National defense and the professional airline transport pilot who flies in the interest of the public convenience and necessity. Each has different skills and needs, each requires different equipment, and each flies for a different basic reason. Because of this diversity, our regulatory actions are seldom based on unanimous agreement of those concerned. We give the interested public the opportunity to be heard. We urge them to take that opportunity by participating in the agency's rulemaking activity, and I believe that we meet with a large measure of success. Through this participation, we acquire new facts and information on which we may base our judgment. While the result of public participation is seldom predictable, we believe public involvement is always beneficial. With this and the necessary balancing of all the varied interests, each final rulemaking action should result in that change which both ensures the continued high level of aviation safety and least disrupts the activities of those regulated. In this way, we constantly strive to enhance aviation safety for the consumer and for all those who fly professionally for hire or privately for enjoyment.

That concludes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. My associates and I will be pleased to respond to questions you may have.